

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Tuesday, November 13, 1951.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**POLIOMYELITIS TREATMENT.**

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Can the Chief Secretary say if anything further has been considered or done in order to arrest the outbreak of poliomyelitis? Last week 39 cases of poliomyelitis were reported, 28 being in the metropolitan area and 11 in the country.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I have nothing further to add to what has been said previously other than to assure the honourable member that if anybody has an answer to the problem and can give the Government any lead or information on the matter it will have no hesitation in taking the necessary steps. The latest information I have received from the committee dealing with poliomyelitis is only to the effect that people should exercise normal precautions, that is, avoid crowding and over-exertion and congregating in swimming pools where there is greater danger of germs being conveyed to swimmers. Nothing has been discovered which will give us any real lead on the side of prevention.

**UNCLAIMED DIVIDENDS AND WINNINGS TAX.**

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Last year £19,539 was received on account of unclaimed dividends and winnings tax. Will the Chief Secretary bring the matter before the Cabinet with a view to having the sum divided amongst charitable organizations which are prepared to accept it?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I will refer the matter to Cabinet, as requested.

**FINES ON INTERSTATE HAULIERS.**

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—On October 18 I asked the Attorney-General if there was any legal obstacle in the way of collecting fines imposed on hauliers for breaches of the Road and Railway Transport Act. Can he say what action has been taken?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—As I informed the honourable member at the time, two police officers of the Criminal Investigation Branch were detailed to execute warrants on persons in Victoria and New South Wales who had been fined in various courts in this State for breaches of the Road and Railway Transport Act. The officer who went to New South Wales has reported that he collected £1,157 11s. on

warrants; this money had been paid into revenue. Further amounts are expected after the service of warrants by the New South Wales police in country districts. A report has been submitted on a few cases where the warrants were not executed for various reasons. A similar report has been received from the police officer who was sent to Melbourne and collected £1,217 18s. 6d.

**ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

**INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3).**

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

**BUILDING MATERIALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

(Continued from November 8. Page 1170.)

Recommitted.

Clause 7—‘Requirements of building contracts’—reconsidered.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General)—I move—

That “penalty” in line 1 of paragraph (b) be deleted and “liable” inserted.

These are purely drafting amendments affecting subsection (4) of section 14 of the principal Act, which deals with the duties of building contractors who receive deposits on building contracts. This clause as it stands inserts certain words after “penalty” in section 14 (4), but they should be inserted after “liable.”

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—It would have been nicer, and certainly easier for some of us, had we known this was going to happen. I see the amendments are now on the files, but I had no knowledge of them until this moment, and one has to refer to the principal Act to gather their implication. Perhaps the Attorney-General could give us a little further explanation.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—Section 14 (4) of the principal Act is as follows:—

If any builder fails to pay any money aforesaid into a special purpose account as provided by this section, he shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred pounds . . . . .

In the Bill as we passed it the words “for a first offence” came after “penalty,” but it is better drafting to insert them after “liable.”

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed, and Bill reported with further amendments.

Y.M.C.A. OF PORT PIRIE ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Northern—Chief Secretary)—This is a short hybrid Bill which has been introduced at the request of the Young Men's Christian Association of Port Pirie. This association was incorporated by a public Act of 1918 and certain land was vested in it. The constitution of the association was set out in a schedule to the Act. Article VIII. of the constitution prescribed the method by which it could be amended, but declared that three of its articles should be incapable of being altered, namely, the articles relating to the name and object of the association, its membership, and the mode of altering its constitution. The association now desires to alter the provisions as to membership, and also desires a general power of altering its constitution. The reasons for the proposed alteration were set out in a letter written by the president of the association and handed to the Government by the member for Port Pirie. The relevant parts of the letter are as follow:—

The board of directors of the Y.M.C.A. wish to have power (with the consent of the members) to amend any part of the constitution of the association whenever it becomes necessary. The constitution has not been amended since the inception of the Port Pirie Y.M.C.A. in 1918. It is now intended to bring the constitution up-to-date and in line with a model constitution laid down by the National Committee of the Y.M.C.A. of Australia. At present the association may amend all the articles except Nos. I., II., and VIII. Important amendments are needed to bring article II. (membership), in particular, up-to-date with modern trends. At a recent regional conference of Y.M.C.A.'s in South Australia, it was stressed that one aim of the Y.M.C.A. was to encourage young men to become active members of the various churches. For this reason we feel that the scope of membership, as set out under the present constitution, is too limited, as a prospective member must be "a member in good standing of an Evangelical Church" or must subscribe to the Paris Basis of World's Y.M.C.A.'s (*vide* end of constitution).

That is the article controlling membership and it is as follows:—

"The Young Men's Christian Association seeks to unite those young men who, regarding Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour accord-

ing to the Holy Scriptures, desire to be His disciples in their doctrine and in their life and to associate their efforts for the extension of His kingdom among young men."

The letter continues:—

One task of the Y.M.C.A. is to encourage and lead young men who are not included in either of these categories towards the acceptance of this Christian basis. For this purpose it is proposed to amend the membership clause. Young men, who at the time of joining are unable to attain to full membership, would become associate members until ready and willing to undertake all that full membership implies. As associate members would not be entitled to vote on matters of policy or in the election of the board of directors, they could not influence the objects of the movement or cause it to deviate from the general policy laid down by the national committee. It is also proposed to delete the clause requiring prospective members to be nominated and seconded by active members before being accepted as members of the association. Further, it is thought necessary to define more clearly the terms "members" and "active members." In accordance with the rules as set out in the constitution regarding amendments, two regular meetings followed by a meeting of the board of directors were held and the following motion was passed and confirmed:—"That steps be taken to amend the Y.M.C.A. of Port Pirie Act (No. 1349) of 1918 by deleting the words, 'articles I., II., and VIII., are not subject to amendment' where appearing in article VIII. of the above Act."

It will be seen, therefore, that the immediate need for the amendment is to enable the association to admit to membership persons whose religious views may be indefinite, with the object, among others, of encouraging them to accept the Christian religion. This is a laudable object. The Bill can also be supported on the general ground that voluntary associations of this kind should have full power, by appropriate majorities, to frame and amend their own constitutions and should not be bound in perpetuity by rules which, though useful and necessary when originally made, may cease to meet the requirements of the association as the years go by. The Bill also makes some drafting and consequential amendments to the principal Act rendered necessary by changes in South Australian legislation since the original Act was passed. These raise no question of policy. In another House the Bill was inquired into by a Select Committee which recommended that it should be passed. I move the second reading.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS secured the adjournment of the debate.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 8. Page 1167.)

The Hon. F. T. PERRY (Central No. 2)—In common with most members I feel that the Appropriation Bill, controlling as it does a vast amount of money, should receive the attention of every member. A number of members have already spoken and I felt that I should add my contribution. We are not able to amend the Bill, but we do have to undertake the responsibility of approving it. The Bill covers the expenditure of the State for the ensuing 12 months and is based largely on the expenditure for the previous year. Because of the difficulty of understanding Government finance it has been the practice for members to discuss various subjects when discussing measures, thus serving a good purpose.

The magnitude of the appropriation provides members with food for thought. Together with the Bill already passed we are appropriating over £40,000,000 for the year. It is a staggering amount which has increased considerably in the last 12 months. It is impossible for a member to fully check the amounts but checks are instituted under our present system which can be regarded by members with some satisfaction, firstly by the Grants Commission established by the Commonwealth Government. We have to appeal to the Commonwealth for assistance and disability grants. The Commonwealth naturally does not desire to pay more than is necessary and the commission was appointed for the purpose of checking the claims. The State has been able to balance its expenditure by applying to the Commonwealth for assistance. Because of that the task of the Treasurer and the Government is made somewhat easier, and while we can continue to satisfy the commission we can expect to receive financial assistance.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—We do not satisfy them too easily.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I recognize it is a difficult job to satisfy them but because the amounts are so closely scrutinized by the commission it provides a great safeguard in the control of State finances by the Government. The Auditor-General's report is available to members and a close analysis of Government expenditure is made therein. Further, as far as I am able to judge, members and the public are satisfied that we have an honest Government which is facing the present position in the best possible way. The Premier, in another place, said that this State is reach-

ing a stage of prosperity when it can be compared with the more financial eastern States. While we are still a supplicant State requiring assistance from the Commonwealth, I cannot agree that we have reached such a stage of prosperity—at any rate not permanently. We are facing an expenditure of £40,000,000 and will incur loan expenditure totalling £34,000,000 this financial year. Mr. Anthony suggested the appointment of a public accounts committee. I have enumerated the safeguards provided by such a committee and its researches would be of great benefit to members. The expenditure of such huge sums and increasing costs warrant closer examination. Much Government expenditure is prompted by pressure groups and carried on by traditional expenditure.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—That is a serious statement to make.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I am using the words "pressure groups" in a wide sense and do not imply anything detrimental. I refer to groups which are interested in their own ideas and desire Government assistance. Much traditional expenditure runs through the Budget year after year.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Couldn't the committee only report to Parliament?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—It need not report at all. I advocate its appointment for the benefit and education of all members. There is little criticism in Parliament of public expenditure.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You could get the information from the Auditor-General's report.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—A lot of time is required to examine the Budget properly. Mr. Anthony's idea of a public accounts committee is worthy of consideration. Most people have the idea that interest on loans represents a big part of Government expenditure. Certainly it is a considerable part, but an examination of our loan accounts will show that much of the loan account of approximately £140,000,000 does not carry more than 3 per cent interest average. Between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000 is borrowed at 1 per cent, some at 1½ per cent, and other moneys at 2 per cent. I think that all future loans will bear interest at 3¾ per cent. As loans mature they must be renewed and it is not unlikely that all future loans will carry 3¾ per cent interest or more, a rate much higher than the average we have had to meet.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Won't you meet that position when we come to it?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—We are up to it now. It is a considerable increase in the interest rate and must be reflected in our accounts in coming years. Members must be startled at the great increase in the expenditure by the State for the year under review. I think costs have risen between £10,000,000 and £12,000,000. The increased expenditure in the departments of Chief Secretary and Minister of Health is £987,000, and in the Mines Department £342,000. Much of that money will be spent in the development of the radium mine at Radium Hill, for which £306,000 has been allotted. It should be noted that this expenditure is paid out of revenue. If the mine develops into a prosperous undertaking and fulfils the hopes of the Premier and those associated with him, it will become a big asset to the State. The increased expenditure of the three departments mentioned will total more than £1,250,000, and the State will need to remain prosperous to carry that additional burden.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Are you saying that South Australia is bankrupt?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—No, and the Treasurer says that the State is most prosperous. Conditions here today are good.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Thanks to Parliament and not the Treasurer.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—The money spent by this Government has to be obtained, in a large measure, from the Commonwealth Government, which is a weak position for any State Government to be in. Mr. Rowe advocated a return of the State's taxing powers, and I have heard the Treasurer say that it is possible for the State to accept this responsibility.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Wasn't it a Government of your own political complexion that brought about the arrangement?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—Yes.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Then why complain?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I am not complaining, but at present we are rather more a spending than a money-raising Government and we have not the responsibility of raising a large part of income from the public. We are reaching the stage when the increased costs of so many Government departments will complicate matters and members should be made aware of the position.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Eighteen months before the Federal Government took over taxation this Government had a surplus of £1,250,000.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—That money was used, in many cases, on capital works. The

reconstruction of the Mount Gambier-Wolsley railway line was paid for out of revenue and would be regarded as capital expenditure in some quarters. The increase in the Education vote is £883,000, not quite as much as in the Chief Secretary's department, but nevertheless it is a huge sum, amounting to almost a 25 per cent increase. This money has to be found and wisely spent. I feel that it will be wisely spent under the Minister's administration, but we are drifting into a phase of expenditure which, although most pleasant, might become somewhat irksome. Neither of those departments is an earning instrumentality, both have to supply the wants and demands of the people. We look upon their services as matters of comfort to the citizens of South Australia and therefore definitely within the functions of the Government. No-one objects to that. There is another phase of Government expenditure, however, which is in a different category, and of which the Railways Department is an example. It is generally contended—and I believe the Government subscribes to the view—that the railways provide a service to the community and consequently should be regarded as a public utility rather than as a transport authority. It must be admitted there is some justification for that contention. We are budgeting for an amount of over £5,000,000 from general revenue to make good the deficit in railway earnings, but in prosperous times such as these it should be the function of the Government instrumentalities to pay their way as far as possible, and if we are to regard the railways as a permanent institution maintained for the services of the community—as we must—the Government should collect as much as possible from the users of the railways in compensation for the services rendered. The same principle applies to water-works. The Government is rectifying the position in the city to some extent, but here again I feel it has not gone far enough.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Have not country assessments gone up too?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—Yes, but they are controlled by Acts of Parliament which the Government has not seen fit to amend, and something should be done in that regard. It is pleasing to note that the Morgan-Whyalla main is almost paying its way, but it is of interest to note that £180,000 of the £200,000 received is derived from water drawn off by other districts, so it is evidently serving the areas through which it passes more than was first expected, and the revenue derived from the terminals at Port Augusta and

Whyalla does not seem to have so much influence on revenue as was estimated when we originally considered the project.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—The time is not far distant when we will have to duplicate it.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I do not object to that, but a service should be recompensed by the industry using it, for industries do not go to these outside places unless there is some advantage in doing so.

Some time ago this Council elected me as its representative on the University Council, and I have found it a very progressive body closely watching the general expenditure of the university. It desires that the university should be equal in status with any in the Commonwealth—a very laudable desire, but one which is governed by the economics of the situation. Last year the Government made a general purpose grant of £179,000 to the university, and this year it is to be increased to £250,000, exclusive of the statutory grant of £44,000, bringing the total which the State or the Commonwealth through the State makes available to about £300,000. That represents a big change in the last decade and illustrates a dependence on Government finance, which the university council does not relish. As a member of that body I feel that here again the same principle which I have enunciated should be implemented, and that student's fees should be increased so as to be somewhat commensurate with the benefits derived. The fees have not been increased since, I think, the 1920's, and in view of the decreased value of money and the advantages which accrue to the student the fees could be increased within reason.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Some of the fees were increased last year.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—In some faculties, but I am talking of the main group of students.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Until last year they had not been increased for 25 years.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—That is so. It seems a pity that an authority with such high educational ideals should be troubled by finance. However, notwithstanding some million pounds which has been given to the university in the form of endowments, it still has to come to the Government for assistance.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—To Parliament.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—If the honourable member wants it that way—"To the people of South Australia as represented by Parlia-

ment," but the members of the council have done a lot of work which even the honourable member, I think, does not know much about; it is not the voting of the money, but in the investigations and recommendations which go forward to enable the Government to come to a decision where the credit or the blame lies. The fact that the Government recommends to Parliament and the people back the Government in providing this money is a very satisfactory thing for the university, but I deplore the fact that the university is becoming more and more under the necessity of having to go to the Government for assistance, for I feel that there is a danger that the suppliers of the money may dictate policies. I hope that never comes about, because the University Council is a very fine body and the further it can be kept away from the compulsion of having to go to the Government the better. I commend the Government on the way it has examined the accounts and the assistance it has given the university in past years and its promise for the ensuing year.

The huge governmental expenditure represented in this Bill causes many people much thought and worry, and consequently the ultimate trends must be watched very closely; the lead must come from Governments. The responsibility now is being shouldered by the Federal Government, but I hope that, in years to come, it will not be necessary to increase our budgetary expenditure to the extent we have in the last few years. The Leader, and other members who have spoken, expressed the opinion that there has been a widening in the viewpoint of Australians and have appealed for closer co-operation between the two sections of the community so divided. I do not think the widening can be confined to employer and employee: it is wider than that. There is a necessity for a closer line of thought. During the last 12 months I have been abroad and it was surprising to note the differences of opinion which existed in various countries. In England there are two sections almost directly opposed in thought and it is the same in Australia. There is surely a common ground somewhere which in the interests of everybody we should try to find. The call to the people of Australia issued by the church and judiciary seems a well-timed challenge and I support it to the full. There must be some ideal actuating people rather than some materialistic idea of profit-making and higher wages. There is something greater than that, and it should be the aim and intention

of people to find it. If the call could be accepted by a large number of people it would materially improve the position and lay the foundation for the future of Australia.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Does not the call mean the abolition of selfishness on the part of all?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I would like to see that, but I feel it is too idealistic. Selfishness could be restrained. If people responded to the call we could face future Budgets with more satisfaction. I support the Bill, but regret that the amount involved is so high, and hope the time will come when it will not be necessary to increase costs so much.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—I thank you, Mr. President, and members for the kindly welcome and congratulations expressed on my entry to this Chamber. I appreciate it and assure members that I will do my best to follow the traditions established by my predecessor, Mr. Oates. The Labor Party supports the democratic principles of government in Australia and being a member of that Party I also support those principles. Needless to say, the Labor Party does not support any foreign philosophy. I will do everything possible as a legislator to carry out the responsibilities with which I am now faced. I have listened attentively to this debate and, being a newcomer, was somewhat amazed at the amount by which the expenditure has grown over the years. There are one or two matters I propose to mention as my small contribution to the debate, and amongst them is the work of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. That hospital is rendering valuable service to the public, and when it is realized that the daily average number of patients for the year ended June 30, 1951, was 809, it gives us an idea of the enormous task facing the hospital. Last year the number of out-patients treated was 56,491 and the number of attendances 248,717. The hospital is one of the largest in the Commonwealth. New buildings have been erected in order to cope with the ever-growing demands for care and attention of the sick.

The building of the Western districts hospital at Woodville will go far to relieve the congestion at the Adelaide Hospital. I pay a tribute to the Director of Medical Services, the Superintendent, medical, nursing, and indeed the whole staff of the Royal Adelaide Hospital for the care and attention which they have given to those who have required it. The expenditure from State revenue on hospitals and medical services for the year ended June

30, 1951, was £2,570,000, an increase of £472,000 over the previous year. Some of this increase is attributable to the trend of today, when everything, even a packet of pins, is increasing in cost. Out of the £490,000 revenue derived from State hospitals last year, £279,000 was received under the Commonwealth Government hospital and health benefit schemes. Perhaps a greater grant could be obtained not only for the purpose of maintaining necessary services, but for extending them. Subsidies to subsidized hospitals amounted to £376,000. The Government should lose no time in proceeding with the Western districts hospital, which was recommended over 2½ years ago. I support the recommendations made for a priority for this work, because the establishment of that hospital will relieve the demands upon the Royal Adelaide Hospital and will cater for people residing in the western districts. The facilities now being utilized by people from the western districts will be available to people from other districts who must have recourse to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I hope that the building will be completed in the very near future.

I turn now to the Children's Welfare & Public Relief Department. It has 1,021 children under its charge today compared with 1,096 in 1947. Today's cost is estimated at £136,357 as against £97,481 that year. The expenditure is steadily climbing. In 1946-47, public relief was granted to 2,337 adults and 3,489 children, a total of 5,826, costing £109,306. In 1950-51, 1,311 adults and 2,237 children received relief, a total of 3,548, at a cost of £108,648. It is pleasing to note that there has been a considerable reduction in the number of persons receiving relief. There has been a small saving in expenditure.

I think all members will agree that the Housing Trust has a most difficult task in allocating homes. The position has not improved to any great extent and there is nothing more heart-breaking for people than to be without homes. An enormous demand is being made on the trust, a demand that is aggravated by the Government's migration policy as, apart from our own people seeking homes, a large number of migrants are being brought to this State. Many young people who get married today cannot find any kind of accommodation. I know of one young married couple who were unable to obtain a home and were forced to live with their in-laws. Because the mother did not appreciate the worth of her daughter-in-law the young couple parted after only seven months of married life and it does not appear

that there is any likelihood of a reconciliation. It is tragic to see such things happen in such a short time. My attention was drawn in the last few weeks to another case where a home was offered for sale, with vacant possession. It was put up for auction, with a reserve. A friend of mine who was seeking a home had a little capital and made arrangements to borrow the balance. He attended the sale and bid as high as possible, until only he and a woman bidder remained. She continued to force the price to a figure which the man could not afford. The house passed the reserve price and finally was knocked down to the woman. A week later the same home was advertised in the press for sale at a price considerably higher than she paid at the first auction sale, the firm which acted in the first place acting for her.

That is an instance of how genuine home seekers are being exploited by speculators who have sufficient money to buy houses, leaving genuine home seekers without a house. There should be a stricter control over cases of this nature in order that the economy which is so necessary in Australia can be maintained. This kind of thing only adds to the inflationary trend, which must increase if this state of affairs is allowed to continue. No time should be lost in building as many houses as possible. Funds invested in housing projects to the end of June last totalled £10,931,325, which speaks volumes, but it still leaves room for improvement. I trust that 12 months hence the position will be better than it is today.

Members will agree that considerable strides have been made in workmen's compensation during recent years. However, one grave anomaly still exists in the Workmen's Compensation Act. It should be further amended to provide that weekly payments to a workman for injury shall not be deducted from any lump sum compensation. I hope that the Act will be amended in this direction in the near future.

In conclusion, I touch upon the matter mentioned forcibly by my leader when he stated that we must get closer together. I interpreted his remarks to mean that we must have greater co-operation between the various organizations within the State. Mr. Perry also dealt with this topic. Having been an industrialist for a number of years I naturally look upon this question from the worker's point of view, and the worker, I submit, is the backbone of Australia. The co-operation which is necessary is that between workers and workers' organizations and employers and employers' organizations to bring about a far

better understanding than exists today for the betterment of, not only South Australia, but Australia as a whole. I subscribe to that principle, as I have always done. For the past 10 years the organization which I had the honour to serve prior to my election never had an industrial strike which, I think, speaks volumes for at least the attempt by that organization, and by the employers with whom we came in daily contact, to maintain co-operation between the parties. However, to achieve this end I suggest it is necessary to remove the suspicion which is deeply rooted in the minds of the workers because of their bitter experiences in the depression years. They feel that there are two elements in our society—the employers on the one hand and they themselves on the other, and that co-operation is working only one way, and not to the advantage of the worker.

The agitation in some quarters for a return to a 44-hour week is aggravating the position. The reason advanced is that it is absolutely necessary to increase production in order to stem the inflationary trend. What I am about to say may not meet with the approval of all members, but I submit that a return to a standard 44-hour working week would not increase production one iota. As a result of a survey I made of the 18 industries operating in this State which are associated with my organization, I found that the standard hours worked are from 44 to 50 a week, and therefore it appears ridiculous to argue that a return to a 44-hour week would increase production. I may be dense, and the members of my organization may be in the same category, but we fail to see the force of the argument. A return to a 44-hour week would possibly reduce the cost of production by the elimination of overtime for four hours a week for every employee, but until such time as the demand for commodities is met, I suggest that a longer working week would only increase the profits of the manufacturer. Those are the things in the minds of the workers—the barriers which we must surmount before we can get that co-operation which is so vital to our economy.

I thank members for their patient hearing of my small contribution to the debate this afternoon, and hope that I have added something of value. I note the lack of interjections, and assume that it is because this is my maiden speech. I appreciate that, too, but do not expect immunity in the future; indeed, I do not desire it, but I would say that any remarks I may make in any debate

in this place, although they may at the moment appear to be of a personal nature, should not be regarded as such. I know that we cannot always see eye to eye, but I assure members that whatever may be said in this Chamber in the heat of debate will be left in it on the conclusion of the debate.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Southern)—I am delighted to be the first member to have the opportunity to compliment our new colleague on his very carefully considered contribution to this debate. It is not my intention to touch on more than one or two aspects of the Bill before us. At one stage I did not contemplate speaking, but since then two matters have shown themselves to be worthy of notice. The first is the acquisition by the Government by auction purchase of a very large property—Campbell Park Estate—in the interests of soldier settlement. It is to be hoped that, although that money will be found by the State, the Commonwealth Government will see fit to take over the property for soldier settlement and recoup the State. I have considerable knowledge of this property and I have made certain observations concerning it in the last few years. I suggest that most careful consideration be given to the resale of that part of the property known as Campbell House.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Why?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Nothing will make me feel that that portion of the estate will be suitable for soldier settlement, and I make that statement backed by the knowledge that the Land Settlement Committee and the Land Board and other departmental officers made their inspections in what is believed to be the best year in the history of that district. I am pleased that the property has been purchased, but I issue that gentle warning and constructive criticism that it may be wise to reconsider selling the difficult part of the property which, incidentally, the committee itself warned against acquiring if Campbell Park could not be acquired. The history of the adjacent settlement, bought after World War I. from the same owners, has been a most unfortunate one, and that part was of slightly better quality than the part known as Campbell House, to which I now refer. The remainder offers great possibilities for subdivision, and parts of it for irrigation.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Do you think the Government made a good purchase as a whole?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Yes. They could not purchase the part they would have preferred without taking the whole offered as one

lot. The committee pointed out that if Campbell Park could not be purchased Campbell House certainly should not be. The high ground in it is subject to drift and many other problems and the Government would be wise to consider its resale.

The other matter to which I wish to refer is one which I am afraid members will have thrust upon them very forcibly in the next few months. I refer to the appropriation for emergency fire services. I have a very high opinion of the way in which they have been conducted, and great respect for Mr. Kerr, the director, who is doing a wonderful job. Possibly I should preface my remarks with a brief history of the movement. I remind members that this service was started as the result of a disastrous fire in 1940-41, when we awoke too late, and all we could do was to discuss what compensation could be made to deal with the disastrous losses. That must not happen again. This Government's policy has been to build up certain nuclei to provide a spearhead of attack against fires in various districts, and I have no complaint with that whatever. I am one who has objected to the Government providing fire fighting equipment where people are not providing it for themselves to some extent. I want to be correctly construed on that point. I am not criticizing the Government for not spending money on materials. The policy of the Government has been to handle the fire menace, to which we are more subject than other States and particularly as we have far less good land, by a voluntary system of fire fighting, notwithstanding that in other States, New Zealand, and in America the voluntary system seems to have had its day. The Government, probably from investigating the financial aspect, has decided that it has certain attributes. While the power under the Bush Fires Act is vested in the local government bodies I point out that there are times when the effectiveness of those bodies is not always as great as it should be and it calls for co-operation and leadership. Last year we spent £3,503 for the emergency fire services, including wages, general expenses, and £2,000 for equipment. This year it is anticipated we will spend £5,300, which includes wages to two additional officers—making the personnel for the whole State three—£2,000 for equipment and £1,100 for general expenses.

The Government found it advisable in 1942 to establish a Bush Fires Advisory Committee and the expenditure attributed to that committee was £25 per annum. I do not know

what we can expect for that amount although the committee has done good work from time to time, but I wonder whether the Government feels the committee's services are too costly. There is an item to cover refreshments for people fighting hills fires and I do not object to that. One thousand pounds is provided to compensate an unfortunate person who lent his utility to the Police Department for use in the fires and had it burnt. The amount of £577 is provided as subsidies to district councils for the whole State. That seems a most meagre amount but this year we propose subsidizing to the extent of £750. But the total amount spent for publicity was £79 last year, with an estimate of £100. The Victorian country fire authority, after spending nearly £2,000,000 following the fires of 1941, in 1949-50 expended £44,000, in 1950-51 £50,200, with an additional £667 for wages for fire fighters and for 1951-52 expects to spend £73,000. New Zealand, which has a much colder climate and has valuable forests, in 1950-51 set aside £10,000 for fire prevention and educational publicity. Any member who has travelled New Zealand knows that in their Government and private forests there are notices every half mile drawing attention to the value of the forests to the public and asking them to take precautions. In the South-East of this State where there are miles of forests the only notices are those which were erected about 30 years ago or which have been erected by the association of which I am president. There are a few notices in other districts but far more must be done.

Last year I endeavoured to have an amendment made to the Bush Fires Act empowering the Minister to proclaim total prohibition of burning on certain fire hazard days. My amendment was rejected but we got the thin edge of the wedge in permitting the Minister to advocate that no fires were to be lit. I am frightened that before the end of this season the Minister will be seeking powers to proclaim total prohibition. Only observation of the vast bulk of feed arising in the last 10 days, south of the Murray, will show people the dangers ahead of us in that area alone. I am not crying "wolf" but "danger." It might be necessary for the Government to seek powers this year to proclaim total prohibition for several reasons. We have a tremendous number of foreigners from cold countries spread about the country who are not aware of the danger and who may be the innocent starters of fires. Whenever these dangers are mentioned all we hear is, "What about

breaks?" No breaks would have been worthwhile for the fire in last Monday's gale. Had it been January that fire would have nearly jumped Lake Alexandrina.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—That is the exceptional case which would prove the rule.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—It is the exceptional case which will eventually burn South Australia. The exceptional cases were in 1939 and in 1941 and we do not want an exceptional case to prove the rule this year. There has never been as much growth as there is this year. Top-dressing has reached an all-time high and so has fresh land brought into production. I ask members to put all the pressure they can upon the Government to take action of a co-operative nature wherever possible straight away—not after Christmas when we have had some fires. I want the Government to give a lead by way of publicity.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Why don't you take the initiative?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I think I have in my own district but I cannot be everywhere and one district council cannot do the lot. That is why it is necessary for the Government to take steps. The Bush Fires Advisory Committee should be called together immediately to consider what steps can be taken and to recommend to the Government accordingly. The Railways Department co-operates in certain districts in the matter of burning off but I do not believe ordinary measures will suffice this year. The Commissioner should call for meetings with the various councils in the danger areas and arrange for burning in a big way with tractors and graders and with fire equipment in attendance. It is no good expecting a small gang of men to efficiently burn off 20 to 30 miles of line, when some of the growth is green and some tinder-like. I am pleased that the Railways Commissioner has decided to put an oil-burning engine on the South-East passenger train this summer. That is a measure of co-operation which the South-Eastern people greatly appreciate.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—I am not antagonistic toward you but I would not like anything you have said to cause people to be less careful in burning breaks.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—What I meant to imply was that it was no use merely barking in the press that we do not see any breaks. People on the spot are the best judges of where breaks should be but on a dangerous

day a set break is often useless because you cannot burn against it. A mobile break made by a grader or plough which goes to the job at 10 miles an hour is better than a set break. On an ordinary day, people in my district have little or no fear of what might happen with an ordinary fire, but we have not enough manpower to handle an extraordinary fire, therefore we must take every possible step to prevent fires starting. There is, unfortunately, always a chance hazard which some people call an "act of God." Generally speaking fires start from six causes. I have already dealt with one—railway engines. It might even be necessary for the Railways Commissioner to curtail services on such days as I have mentioned. Then there are the casual fire lighters, such as picnickers, who depart leaving ashes alight. That could be dealt with by publicity along roads, and through the press and radio at comparatively small cost.

The next factor is the tractor. Today there are hundreds on farms where previously there were tens. During the last few years Parliament has seen fit to add several clauses to the Bush Fires Act regarding the use of tractors in harvesting work in paddocks, providing that they should carry knapsack sprays and shovels. If that is the law, this is the year when it "must" be policed, and not "should be." I said that I did not expect the Government to spend more money on equipment for use in such an emergency. I do suggest that additional men should be appointed to go around and check up, in the course of their duties, on the hundreds of tractors which are used for clover harvesting. A few years ago I broadcast an address on what I considered were the moral duties of fire control officers. Several councils wrote to the Government and asked what I meant. They asked "Does Mr. Jude mean that they have to 'pimp' and police the whole of the district under the fire regulations?" The matter was referred to the Parliamentary Draftsman, Mr. Bean, who gave it as his opinion that I referred only to the moral duties of fire control officers. Unfortunately, I was told a little later to mind my own business. I shall have no hesitation in recommending the same advice this year to fire control officers. If a man accepts a job as a fire control officer it is his duty, with commendable tact, to police the Act, not only in the interests of himself as a landholder, but in the interests of his neighbours. My fourth point is domestic inefficiency, such as the copper being lit on a windy day and left

alight. There is also the garden fire, or the ashes, taken from the grate in the morning and not the night before. They are left lying about outside and are dispersed by the wind in long grass around the house, when the grass could so easily be cleared away. All these things could be handled, very largely, by good publicity, and the only one who can handle it properly is the Government. That is constructive criticism.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Why do you need publicity to tell people to clear long grass from around their houses? Wouldn't they do it for their own protection?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—No. I draw the Government's attention to another difficulty which will be referred to, I understand, in another place—the problem of burning sawdust at sawmills. We have had one fire at Mount Gambier this year through smouldering sawdust. This is a thing that has to be policed. It must not be done at private mills and it should not be done at Government mills. I press for the firmest action to be taken at these mills before somebody's home is burnt to the ground or lives are lost. Members have read the papers of Saturday and Sunday and have seen where fires have caused a £10,000,000 loss in New South Wales. Can we afford to lose those millions in South Australia? I hope I will not have to address the House on this question, as a matter of urgency, before the session adjourns. I firmly believe that it is not the Government's duty to protect landholders from fire by providing equipment, but it is the Government's moral duty to protect its own establishments, such as forestry undertakings, soldier settlement land and railways. If the Government will give a lead people will be only too willing to co-operate. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE (Central No. 1)—I congratulate Mr. Bevan, the new member for Central No. 1 district, on his able maiden speech in this Parliament. It does him great credit. What he said he said well, keeping well within Standing Orders. I wish him all of the best. He mentioned the work being done at Royal Adelaide Hospital and spoke in glowing terms of its treatment of patients generally. No hospital in the Commonwealth treats its patients more kindly or considerately. I have been through the mill and know what I am talking about. If a person paid £30,000 a minute he could not receive better treatment elsewhere. It does not matter whether a person is poor or rich, he is treated in exactly

the same manner as other patients. I cannot find words to sufficiently express my thoughts for the work done at Royal Adelaide Hospital and the particular interest that the nursing staff and doctors take in the inmates. Doctors there knew I was a member of Parliament, but it did not make any difference to the treatment I received. Every patient got exactly the same.

Mr. Perry said that the Railways and Waterworks Departments did not pay. They should be made to pay and at least balance their budgets at the end of each financial year. A few weeks ago a letter appeared in the press suggesting that if the tramways were handed over to private enterprise they would be made to pay. Of course they would, and show a dividend as well. The Government has always been bluffed to increase railway freights and fares, especially in country districts, but this year has decided to increase them throughout the State. That should have been done years ago, irrespective of any fear of election results. These undertakings should not be allowed to make deficits year after year merely because they are controlled by the Government.

Mr. Anthony referred to the 40-hour week and pointed out where and why it was a menace to Australia. What would be the result if we abolished the 40-hour week and returned to 60 hours? In a short time the wheels of industry would stop, because we would have a huge unemployed pool and the purchasing power of the people would be taken away. Reference was made to the days of Wilberforce when efforts were made to reduce the hours of child labour in the cotton mills from 16 to 10 a day. It was claimed that it would have a detrimental effect on England and that the cotton mills would have to close their doors. However, Wilberforce got the hours reduced from 16 to 10 and still the mills continued their operations.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Isn't the question of the 40-hour week merely a red herring drawn across the track by some people?

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—Yes. Machinery, instead of being a blessing, is a curse to mankind because every piece of it displaces labour to some extent. Machinery has thrown hundreds of men on to the unemployed scrap heap. Instead of creating prosperity, it has built up poverty, misery and despair. I recall the time when efforts were made to reduce the hours in the Port Adelaide flour mills from 12 a day to eight. Employers said that they would be ruined. They are still working and

providing profits for the mill owners. We have some proof of what it has done internationally for it has been well tried in different parts of the world. A case in point is the Kellogg Company of U.S.A., which is a manufacturer of cereal foods well known in Australia. The experiment was made at Battle Creek, Michigan, and the daily rates under the old 8-hour system were maintained, the marginal rate per hour being increased by 12½ per cent. After 2½ years the company reported decrease in fatigue, decrease of 20 per cent in time lost through sickness, 32 per cent decrease in the number of lost-time accidents, with a 39 per cent drop in accident severity. Increased efficiency gave 15 per cent lower labour cost per unit, and overhead costs fell by 13 per cent. As a result, Kellogg Co. sold corn flakes 10 per cent cheaper, while paying 10 to 15 per cent higher wages. In 1933 there were 27 per cent more employees than in 1929. In November, 1935, the company adopted the 6-hour day (36-hour week) on a permanent basis at the rate of pay prevailing under the 8-hour day before December, 1930. Announcing the continuance on a permanent basis of the 6-hour day, Mr. Kellogg said the experience of his company, together with the failure of other methods, had convinced him that the shorter working day without cuts in pay was the solution of the unemployment problem. He estimated that it should increase employment in plants adopting it by at least 20 per cent, and that the solution of the unemployment problem in the U.S.A. lay in spreading employment among workers, without decreasing their purchasing power through decreased wages. By wages he meant the amount in the pay envelope, not the hourly rate. That is a practical illustration of what can be accomplished by fewer hours of labour. If we wish to go on developing Australia we must ensure that an increased population and a reduction of hours go hand in hand, for otherwise a big body of unemployed will be created, and we know from experience what a bad thing that is. People are beginning to wonder whether we can continue to feed our own people, plus the immigrants coming in, and still supply England with foodstuffs. The Australian population is increasing at the rate of 3.5 per cent per annum and experts have stated that no community can safely absorb a greater population increase than 2 per cent. At the present rate of increase it is expected that the Australian population will reach 11,000,000 by 1960 and to feed this number we will have to increase our beef production by 40 per cent, mutton

58 per cent, pig meats 78 per cent, eggs 31 per cent, sugar 28 per cent, citrus fruits 61 per cent, and wheat 7 per cent.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Shorter hours on farms will not accomplish that.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—Farm hours were shortened many years ago by the farmers themselves. Once they worked from daylight to dark and anyone who wished to go to a football or cricket match was thought to be crazy. Professor Copland stated that it requires a capital investment of £1,000 for every migrant brought to Australia. Thus, to finance the Government's migration scheme, which contemplates bringing 180,000 people to Australia annually, will require a capital investment of £180,000,000. If we continue on these lines how are we to feed our own people and find surplus supplies for England? Already we have millions fewer sheep than we had about 60 years ago.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—We cannot get potatoes today.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—No, and many other things are in short supply already. The Menzies Government is building up a huge army, but what is the use of huge armies without adequate food supplies? There are many instances in history where armies overreached themselves through outrunning their supplies, so we should be thinking about improving our supply line so as to be able to feed our increasing population as well as our army. I do not know how we can increase our stock numbers. Australia is very much dependent upon seasonal conditions; there may be floods in one season and droughts the next so we are never certain of reaping a harvest or even getting a good wool clip. We complain about people flocking from the farms to the city, but the mechanization of the farms is displacing much labour. There are not nearly so many farm employees now as there were 40 years ago, but how to prevent the drift to the city is a difficult problem to solve, for the cities offer amenities which do not exist in the country. In conversation with a man from Western Australia he told me that he appeared to have solved the labour problem on his farm by advertising for a married couple with children and providing them with a home. In this way he had found a suitable employee who had remained with him for two years. That is possibly one way to ease the situation.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—The reason why they come to the city is because they cannot get the same working conditions in the country.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—That is true. We talk about wanting more beef, but what are we doing to increase the numbers of cattle? If people were offered better railway facilities they could get their stock to market and I am sure the numbers would then increase. The new Brachina-Port Augusta line is now being investigated, but whichever route is adopted stock will have to be transhipped from one train to another. Why not lay a third rail from Port Pirie to Adelaide, as was done on the Wolseley-Naracoorte section, where it appeared to operate successfully? If the Commonwealth Government wants to increase the production of beef and mutton every encouragement should be given to those who raise cattle and sheep. In the wayback country of Western Australia cattle are being killed and flown to the freezing works at Wyndham. One man has three trucks operating between his station and the freezing works. Years ago when I was in Federal politics Sir William Glasgow applied for a contract to supply many tons of tinned beef to England. He was hopeful of getting the contract, but I asked whether he would be able to compete with the Argentine. He said he had cut his prices to the bone and should get the contract. I pointed out that approximately £400,000,000 of British capital was involved in the Argentine cattle ranches and that the Argentine cattle reached maturity at three years as against four years here. When tenders closed he said that he had no chance of getting the contract, although he cut prices still lower. The British men who had invested money in the Argentine pulled strings for their own benefit. Cows are spayed when they have had their fourth or fifth calf because they then carry more beef. People outback are doing their best to supply Australia and England with beef and should be encouraged.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I compliment Mr. Bevan on the admirable manner in which he has dealt with his subjects in his maiden speech and look forward to valuable contributions from him to matters which come before Parliament. I also compliment the heads of Government departments, whose responsibility it is to prepare data for the Budget. Mr. Drew, the Under Treasurer, and his officers have a tremendous task in compiling the figures. This Budget has for its purpose the expenditure of £42,000,000. In 1941-42 the revenue was £15,000,000 and the expenditure £13,832,000. In 1946-47 revenue

amounted to £17,193,000 and expenditure £17,253,000. For 1951-52 the revenue, including £230,000 surplus brought forward from last year, is estimated at £42,308,000 and expenditure at £42,293,000. These figures indicate how State commitments have grown during the last 10 years. I do not propose to make an analytical survey of the expenditure other than to say that the increase can be attributed to the spate of progress that has been made in both the industrial and primary spheres. We should take a more hopeful view of the increased expenditure this year, because it is not being wasted—as implied by some members—but is necessary for the development of this State.

Under the Loan Act wherever a surplus occurs the Treasurer may credit it to some account in debit in order to wipe it off. That has always been the practice, but this year the Treasurer has seen fit to include the surplus of £230,000 which could have been credited to some account in debit, and some explanation is needed from the Government in this regard. The appointment of a public accounts committee as suggested by Mr. Anthony and supported by Mr. Perry would be a duplication of the Auditor-General's Department. I do not deny Mr. Anthony the right to advocate that proposal but such a committee would in effect be an educational committee without statutory authority to incur the expenditure of money. We are safeguarded in having an Auditor-General whose appointment is made by Parliament. All the protection necessary already obtains because the Auditor-General is in the same category as judges of the Supreme Court who are appointed by Parliament and only a majority of both Houses can remove them from office. When the occasion arises the Auditor-General does not balk in criticizing expenditure and that is his duty irrespective of the political complexion of the Government in power. The Auditor-General's Department consists of trained men and they are in a better position to supervise Government expenditure than a committee of both Houses unless that committee is clothed with statutory powers.

Mr. Perry bewailed the fact that the rate of interest is increasing. The financial resources of this country are controlled by the Commonwealth Bank and the Treasurer of the day has legislative authority to supersede the policy laid down by the Commonwealth Bank. The question of financing the State goes back to 1926 when the financial agreement was submitted and the Loan Council was established. The

States ceded their right of individual borrowing and allowed the Loan Council to be the central pool of borrowing under the financial agreement. By that agreement we gave away the right of the State to be an independent borrower. That has its merits and demerits but it is the primary reason why the State cannot borrow independently. Our railways are not a paying proposition but members should realize that railways should be looked upon as a developmental project because they carry the commerce of the State and no section of the community could be expected to provide their own transport. Consequently, whatever loss is made on railways is made up by benefits to the State and should be written off in the interests of the State. Primary producers have always had the benefit of concessions granted by the railways for the purpose of bringing their produce to market. I do not say they have no right to them. The railways should be looked upon by both the Government and primary producers as a developmental undertaking.

I do not want my observations about the Electricity Trust of South Australia to be taken as a criticism of that organization, but the time has arrived when there should be an overall report on its activities. For some time charges to the consumers have risen alarmingly yet today we see a greater fleet of motor cars belonging to the trust than are operated by the various taxi cab companies in Adelaide. These things have to be paid for. When the Adelaide Electric Supply Co. was taken over the trust received the benefit of £100,000 paid by the old company in taxation, but that has now been absorbed. According to a statement by Mr. R. H. M. Lea, the trust's general manager, on October 31, it was costing the undertaking £150,000 a year for the payment of stone in Newcastle coal. Before the war it cost between £10,000 and £15,000 a year. Frequent appeals have been made to the New South Wales Coal Board for some form of screening so that the trust will not have to pay for this useless stone and the loss in weight of coal.

Another point is the value of New South Wales coal. Before 1939 the ash content was 7 per cent; Mr. Lea states that it is now practically double that. This position not only applies to South Australia, but other States. The South Australian Gas Company has also to be considered. I presume that it receives a large percentage of stone in its New South Wales coal. The latest reports from Victoria indicate that the Gas Company there is paying

for more than 50,000 tons of useless stone each year. There should be some ethics in business and if one public utility is charged £150,000 a year for goods not received, other States might be paying colossal sums. Some direct approach should be made by the Government, on behalf of the trust, to see that these things are rectified. Mr. Perry referred to a statement which appeared in the press designated "A call to the people of Australia." I fully subscribe to the contents of the statement, together with one by the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament, Dr. Evatt, who said:—

Surely it is the British tradition which is the essential feature of our democracy, safeguarded so superbly by those honoured dead whom we now commemorate. That tradition includes personal allegiance to the King, a democratically elected Parliament, the British rule of law, the right of free criticism, and, above all, an independent and fearless judiciary sworn to protect our constitutional system against any possible subversion by extremists of either the right or the left. Australians must preserve for ever this British tradition. On this day especially all of us should highly resolve that our dead shall not have died in vain and that our nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.

In contra-distinction is a statement in this morning's *Advertiser* regarding a dispute at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. It is a complete negation of the sentiments expressed in that call to the nation. I do not uphold all strikes, but I want to place on record a statement by the secretary of the Meat Industry Employees Union, Mr. W. W. Pirie, who said:—

The abattoirs management had objected to the wages board hearing any claims by the union "in view of the attitude of the men on the job." This objection by the management had left Mr. Ziesing no alternative, under the regulations, but to uphold the management's objection. I accuse the abattoirs management of deliberately trying by this move to force the men to go out on strike. But I don't think that at the stopwork meeting in the morning the men will fall into the management's trap and go on strike.

That is a strong statement and I am sure Mr. Pirie would not have made it without justification. If there is to be a call to the Nation, and the full purport of the call shows it applies to every individual, a public utility like the abattoirs should be the first to put it into operation. I was appointed by this House as a member of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Joint Select Committee of 1944, and it was on the committee's recommendation that an employees' representative was placed on the Abattoirs Board. There

have been few industrial disputes during the years that he has represented the union on the board. Fewer stoppages of work and less dislocation of industry generally have resulted since his appointment and it is a sorry state of affairs to find the abattoirs management attempting to force the men out on strike. It is usually the other way about—union men in industry are generally flagellated by L.C.L. members and others opposed to Labor, who claim that upheavals are the work of a few extremists, but now the tables have been turned and apparently the abattoirs management wants to create a strike.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—I think you should wait until you have heard both sides.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I have a statement published in the *Advertiser*, which I shall read. Mr. Pirie is a most honoured member in the trades union movement.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—It applies to all members. Why pick him out?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—He is the one involved in this dispute. I would not bring Mr. Melrose into a question like this because he is, a primary producer and unconnected with the dispute. Mr. F. H. Stevens, chairman of the Abattoirs Board, replying to the union, said:—

Naturally, there is no trap of any sort. The men, by irritation tactics, have attempted to force the Abattoirs Board to run counter to the decision of the Wages Board.

Mr. Stevens' statement does not reflect the true position. The men want to return to the Wages Board, and the fact that Abattoirs Board representatives are not attending the meetings of the board might mean that the men will be forced to go on strike through the action of the management. If we are to have a general approach to the problem let us first put our precepts into practice. The Abattoirs Board, a public utility, provides a necessary commodity for the people. It is a monopoly; butchers cannot kill their cattle or sheep, the slaughtering of which must be done by the board.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—They act as agents for the abattoirs.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—That is something new to me. As I said earlier, I wholeheartedly agree with the call to the Nation and we should see that our public utilities put the call into full operation, setting an example for others to follow.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—Because of the late stage the debate has reached I will not detain members long, but I want to make a few remarks. I congratulate the new member for Central No. 1 district, Mr. Bevan, on his maiden speech. The silence with which it is customary to listen to these maiden speeches was today rewarded and I had great pleasure in listening to him. I found his voice very easy to listen to, but I hope he will not take that as a precedent to over exercise it when we become more used to him. I think he will find, after he has been with us a short time, that our tradition in this Council is to make our speeches short and to the point. I am sure from the way he marshalled his facts he will find it easy to fall in with that method of conducting Council business. If I use the expression "I support the Bill" I want members to take it more as a figure of speech than real fact because I am afraid that, after reading through the estimates of revenue and expenditure, I feel far from supporting them. It is rather horrifying, in a time of almost unbounded prosperity, bounded only by human effort and not restricted by the force of Nature, to find the whole of the State absolutely teeming with prosperity and production and a record revenue of about £42,000,000 and a budgeted expenditure which will lead to a saving of only £15,000. I draw members' attention to the fact that that represents a possible saving of £1 in every £2,800. If any individual estimated at the beginning of a year that he would have a gross income of £2,800 and proceeded to so manage his affairs that he could, with a great deal of self-satisfaction, know at the end of the year that he was £1 better off, he would not be held up as a great financial genius or a prudent man. If he managed to do that in times of great depression he would be congratulated, but today in times of extraordinary prosperity if we do not put something more than that by we will have to tighten up our belts before many years. I realize that the State cannot put money away in the same way as an individual and the best means of the State banking its savings is by sound development of industry and other avenues which will ensure a higher and more stable income over the years to come. In so far as State expenditure follows those lines I support it, but I have a feeling that, as a State, we have, during these days of very great development—for which we are thankful to our Government—come very close, if not actually to the point

of biting off more than we can chew. We have developed so many new industries that not one has been able to get into full swing owing to lack of manpower. This is not a sound proposition and, with national income dropping, we may find ourselves in the position of having a lot of irons in the fire and none of them getting hot enough to do anything worth-while. I would be far happier had many of these developments taken place a little more slowly and each one brought to fruition before a fresh advance was made. The immediate trouble I see is that we have already reached the point where the wool income, which has produced some £600,000,000 for Australia, is showing signs of a big regression. I have just received the return for the wool I had in the first sale this year. Last year it brought £200 a bale and last week £125, and I take it that will be the relative proportion of the reduction in our national primary income. So many people other than what I may term the legitimate wool producers have dipped into this quick and easy return and disregarded primary products such as milk, eggs and pig meat that I fear a good many more fingers will be burnt than would have been the case had they stuck to their own lines of production. This fall in our income will not necessarily be followed by a proportionate drop in our responsibilities, for we know all too well that the very heavy income tax imposed this year will have to be paid out of reduced incomes, and I very much fear that when this year's assessments are rendered there will be a danger at least of a serious recession in employment and in confidence in the wool industry, if not in other primary industries.

One other reason why I wished to speak was to say a few words about the Royal Institution for the Blind. The management of that institution, with which I am associated, is sometimes held up in rather a bad light by the propaganda of the Blind Workers Union. I do not wish to say anything unkind about them, but I think the public may sometimes be given the idea that the institution is a rather grinding body which tries to keep the workers down to the lowest level of income, whereas such is far from the case. This institution is a mixture of philanthropy and industry. Much publicity has been given to a new movement in the interests of the blind and I must say that a great deal of the propaganda has been ill-founded. In South Australia we have not a great number of blind

people who come within the scope of this institution; there are about 70 blind workers there, and although the management offers every opportunity for them to leave and find employment elsewhere if they feel they would be happier, only a few leave, and therefore the institution has to carry on in the interests of those who remain. The point which should be perfectly clear to the public is that, with the best of intentions and the highest of skill, the output of the blind worker is only about 50 per cent of that of the sighted worker. As the institution has not a monopoly of brush making it has to sell its products in competition, not only with those of the sighted workers of South Australia, but with imported goods. The fact that the quality of the goods manufactured at the institution is the highest in Australia helps a great deal and justifies the assistance which the institution receives from various Government departments. I have said that the actual production of the very best blind worker is about 50 per cent of the output of a sighted worker. That is to say that whereas the wage under the Brush-makers' Determination is £12 a week, on an equal footing the blind brushmaker can turn out about 40 per cent of that value. The payment the workers receive is made up to £8 a week, in addition to which they receive their pension of £3 a week. A very careful estimate of the position of the institution made by Government officers shows that the estimated deficit is nearly £7,000 despite the Government grant of £3,050, which brings the total deficit to about £10,000, the amount which the institution sought for its annual grant. However, despite that investigation, according to the figures before us, the grant is to be only £7,500, and apparently the board of management has to juggle the extra £2,500 out of thin air. We are consequently faced with the position that if we continue to manufacture goods and sell them at a loss we will go bankrupt—

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Was not the grant given on the condition that the men received a certain increase?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—They were given an increase to £8, which was the amount they sought.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Is it not linked with something from the Federal Government?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—They get £3 a week pension, if that is what the honourable member means, but at present there is an application under the amended social service

legislation for the £8 to be raised to £10, and this would mean an additional expenditure of £8,000 a year for the institution.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Was the increased subsidy granted on the grounds that they would have their wages increased from £8 to £10?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—Not that I know of. The institution applied for an increased grant from £3,050 to £10,000, and so far as I know the only notification has been that the grant has been increased to £7,500. In view of those figures the institution is faced with an impossible situation. If we continue to sell our products at a loss the institution must go bankrupt. If, on the other hand, we try to raise the price of the products the public will not buy them, as it is considered that the selling price has now reached its peak. There is already a considerable buyer's resistance, and the fact that there is on the market plenty of rubbish in the shape of coir doormats and runner matting will rather cause the public to buy the cheaper article, although they know it is not nearly so good. I had a twofold motive in speaking about this subject. The first was to clear up any misapprehension there may be in the minds of the public or members about the management of the institution. I assure members that there would be no limit to which the board of management would go in wages and bonuses if it had the money.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Are not the workers on piece work rates?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—Yes, but they would not earn their living on piece work. In addition they receive bonuses, through a complicated system which has grown up over the years applied to the different callings, which brings their total up to £8 a week, on top of which they receive a pension of £3.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Their argument is that the increased grant was made because they were going to get £10 a week.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—If they receive an increase to £10 a week it will cost the institution another £8,000 a year. The investigation by the Government officers revealed that, without taking into consideration any grants, the loss on the year's trading would be roughly £10,000. Add £8,000 to that and it brings the total to £18,000. If the grant of £7,500 is deducted it will be seen that the institution has to watch its P's and Q's very carefully and refrain from spending as freely as it would like. Consequently it has to keep up a pretty strong resistance to the demands of

the union simply because it has not the money to accede to the requests. I want to impress those figures upon the Minister so that he will see that this very admirable institution will need a great deal more assistance from the Government if it is to be kept going. So long as costs keep going up so must these grants. It is a little heartbreaking to the board members, all of whom act in honorary capacities, that they should have to worry over the management of a big institution and at the same time be accused of being cheese-paring. I hope the Minister will remember two things. One is to urge the Federal Government to mitigate the load that falls upon everybody for tax, and in that connection I recommend that it be suggested to the Federal tax gatherers that some formula be applied, in view of what I fear is coming, so that income tax less provisional tax already paid plus the new provisional tax should leave 2s. or 2s. 6d. in the pound income. At present, as far as one can see, it will be a long way over 20s. in the pound, and for every £3 income some people will pay £4 tax. I want the Minister to tell his friends in Canberra who are at the back of this thing that no industry, and no human heart, can stand it. The other matter I ask him to bear in mind about the Blind Institution is that its demands upon the Government are not made lightly and the money it seeks is sadly needed to carry on as it has since its inception.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Midland—Attorney-General)—I thank members for the attention they have given this measure. There have been some excellent speeches covering a tremendous range—a range that makes it quite impossible for me to reply in detail. I assure members that what has been said will be given serious consideration by the departments concerned. I add my congratulations to Mr. Bevan on his maiden speech of which he can be proud. I think every member realizes that he will make an important and valuable addition to the debating strength of this house.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—“Appropriation of general revenue.”

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I listened attentively to Mr. Melrose's plea for the Blind Institution of South Australia. He is to be

commended for rendering honorary service to the community on the board. I intended mentioning this matter in my second reading speech but because of the absence of the Chief Secretary I refrained. I was waited on by a deputation of employees from that institution who said they were not getting fair treatment. I would like some clarification as to whether, when this increased subsidy was granted, any arrangement was made as to the future. I do not want the institution to be placed in an invidious position if, because of some mistake, the grant was not as expected. Members go to considerable trouble in preparing speeches on the Estimates and when matters are raised—whether by the Opposition or by Government supporters—they should be considered and placed before responsible officers. I asked the Minister whether he would ascertain if milk vendors had the right to divide certain districts and supply whom they liked. If the Attorney-General assures me that the matters I have raised are being investigated I will be satisfied. We are entitled to replies to the questions we raise and departmental officers should not be permitted to ignore anything a member submits.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—During the debate I referred to the duplication of the Brighton-Marino line. To my knowledge during the last 30 years there has been no improvement to that line. People are looking forward to an improved service in the coming summer. Hundreds of new homes have been erected and there has been an increase in the population of the district, but the present service cannot cope with the increased traffic. Part of the line has been duplicated, but if it had been taken to Edwardstown it would have been of some service. Is there any intention of completing that line within a reasonable time?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Northern—Chief Secretary)—Mr. Condon referred to the increase of £4,450 in the grant to the Royal Institution for the Blind. I have not been present during the debate, but had I known the honourable member had wanted detailed information on this matter I would have made it available. The only recollection I have is that the position of the institution was brought before the Government and as a result of investigations of the institution's finances the increase was made. The itemized expenditure of that amount is a matter for the institution itself. It is an over-all grant to enable the institution to function and carry out its obligations. I have

some recollection of Mr. Anthony asking a question concerning the Brighton-Marino line, to which a reply was given that when labour was available the work would be proceeded with. During the last 18 months I have seen what is happening in other States, and their position is similar to ours. We rely on 80 per cent imported labour. At one work I saw in progress 80 per cent of the labourers were new Australians who had remained on the job for four years. I know that those concerned would like the duplication to go to Edwardstown, but I would like to see it com-

pleted to Brighton. It is only a matter of obtaining the necessary labour and materials and the work will proceed.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 7) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment and Committee's report adopted. Read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.35 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 14, at 2 p.m.