

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, November 11, 1952.

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

QUESTION.**ELECTRICITY TRUST.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice)—

1. What is the total number and value of debentures issued by the Electricity Trust as at June 30, 1952?

2. What amount of interest has been paid to debenture holders since the formation of the trust?

3. What is the number of employees of the trust on—(a) the outside staff; and (b) the clerical and technical staffs?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The replies are:—

1. 10,240, to a total value of £12,969,633, in addition to which the State Treasurer has made available to the trust a total of £17,382,278.

2. Interest totals £3,427,183.

3. (a) Employees on outside staff, 3,561; (b) employees on clerical and technical staffs, 641.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CITIES).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor intimated by message his assent to the Act.

MOUNT GAMBIER CENTRAL MILL.

The President laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Mount Gambier Central Mill.

STIRLING NORTH TO BRACHINA RAILWAY (LAND AND MATERIALS) BILL.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to enable the State to grant certain lands and materials to the Commonwealth for the construction, maintenance, or working of the railway between Stirling North and Brachina.

Read a first time.

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

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill enables the Government to grant to the Commonwealth free of charge any Crown lands and any stone, soil and gravel upon Crown lands which are required by the Commonwealth for the construction, maintenance or working of the railway between Stirling North and Brachina.

The Bill has been introduced pursuant to an obligation accepted by the State in the agreement relating to the construction of the railway between Brachina and Leigh Creek North Coalfield. By clause 6 of this agreement, which is set out in the 1950 Act, it is provided that as soon as possible after notification in writing of the route recommended by the Royal Commission for the railway from Stirling North to Brachina the State would authorize the Commonwealth to do all that was necessary to enable the Commonwealth and its Railways Commissioner to construct, operate and maintain the railway on the route recommended. Among the obligations imposed by this clause was that of granting lands, stone, soil and gravel certified by the Commonwealth Commissioner to be required by the Commonwealth in connection with the construction, maintenance or working of the railway.

The Bill carries out the State's obligations in this matter. It provides that the lands required by the Commonwealth may be granted by the Governor, and that stone, soil and gravel may be granted by the Minister of Lands. Where Crown lands required by the Commonwealth are subject to a lease, the Commonwealth must acquire the interests of the lessee before the grant will be made. Similar rights have already been granted in respect of the northern half of the railway from Stirling North to Leigh Creek Coalfield, i.e., that part of the railways which is north of Brachina.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROHIBITED AREAS (APPLICATION OF STATE LAWS) BILL.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the operation of certain State laws in areas to which the entry of persons is restricted under laws of the Commonwealth or of the State, and for other purposes.

Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill deals with the application of State laws in areas, such as the Woomera Rocket Range, to which the entry of the general public is restricted. There has been considerable discussion between the State and Commonwealth authorities on the questions whether, and to what extent, State laws apply in Woomera. Some persons have suggested that State laws do not apply there because of the

large measure of Commonwealth control which is exercised. But it is now generally agreed that since Woomera is South Australian territory the general laws of South Australia do apply in Woomera except where they are overridden by valid Commonwealth Statutes, or where the language of a South Australian Act does not cover any particular act or matter arising in Woomera. A difficulty of the latter kind arises in connection with the application in Woomera of the Road Traffic, Police, and Lottery and Gaming Acts. Many provisions of these Acts regulate conduct in public streets, public reserves and other places to which the public are admitted either gratuitously or on payment of money. But in view of the stringent restrictions on the right of entry to Woomera it may seriously be doubted whether any roads, streets or places there are public. If they are not, the Acts I mentioned do not apply, with the consequence that it may be difficult to enforce public order, and the civil liabilities of persons in Woomera will be uncertain.

An appeal has been made to the Supreme Court with the object of obtaining an authoritative ruling on some of these questions, but it has not yet been heard. In the meantime the position remains doubtful and if the court decides that certain State Acts do not apply the result will be serious unless Parliament settles the matter. Furthermore, any decision which the court may give will be limited to the facts of the particular case and may not indicate a general solution of the problem. For these reasons it is desirable to settle the matter by statute and this Bill has accordingly been introduced. It applies to any prohibited areas of the Commonwealth, that is to say, Woomera and any other prohibited areas which may be created, and also to any prohibited areas which may be created under the Uranium Mining Act.

Clause 3 declares that notwithstanding the restriction on the entry of the public into prohibited areas the persons in such area shall, for the purpose of the application of State laws, be regarded as members of the public and any acts, places, matters or things in a prohibited area, which are of such a nature that if the area were not a prohibited area they would have been public, shall be deemed to be public within the meaning of State Acts and laws. Clause 4 deals with some specific instances of the general principles laid down in clause 3 and has been inserted with the object of assisting the police and justices in their duties. It declares that roads, streets,

terraces, and thoroughfares in a prohibited area, which are commonly used by such members of the public as are within the area, shall be roads within the meaning of the Road Traffic Act. Secondly, it declares that places in a prohibited area to which access is granted to such members of the public as are within the area will be public places within the meaning of the Police Act and a provision on the same lines is inserted declaring that certain places in prohibited areas will be public places within the meaning of the Lottery and Gaming Act.

There is nothing in the Bill about the application of the licensing laws in prohibited areas as there are no difficulties in connection with this subject at present. In Woomera the supply of liquor is to be controlled by the Commonwealth pursuant to Commonwealth regulations and the Solicitor-General has expressed the view that the Commonwealth has power to make such regulations. If a prohibited area should be declared at Radium Hill the supply of liquor in that area can be dealt with under the provisions of the Uranium Mining Act. For this reason the Bill does not mention licensing laws. It is, however, desirable that the legal position with respect to the other Acts mentioned should be settled without delay.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE REGULATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 1158.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—There are two main criticisms of this Bill. One is that instead of incorporating the proposed amendments in the Police Act, it will place an entirely new Act on the Statute Book to operate in conjunction with the Police Act. The tendency ought to be towards reducing the number of Acts on the same subject and towards simplifying the legislation rather than increasing the number of Acts and complicating the legislation. The Police Act is itself a consolidation of various Acts which had been passed prior to 1936 dealing with different aspects of the police force. The Minister gave no reason why another Act should be added to the Statute Book. Many of the clauses refer to the same subject matter and, indeed, re-enact practically the same provisions as are contained in the Police Act, a considerable part of which it is now proposed to repeal. Perhaps the Minister will explain why this procedure has been adopted.

The second main criticism is that the Minister has failed to submit reasons for several of the changes which are to be made, for example, why the penalties already provided are to be increased.

There are also a number of special points on which explanation is desirable. For instance, clauses 6 and 7 provide for the appointment of the Commissioner of Police, but there is no provision for his removal from office. It would seem that once a Commissioner is appointed, he cannot be dismissed but must hold office until he is 65. I draw members' attention to clause 8, which states that the salary of the Commissioner shall be at the rate of £2,300 a year. I have no objection to high salaries being paid to members of the Police Force or the Public Service, but I cannot understand why, in the Estimates for 1952-53, the salary of the Police Commissioner is shown as £2,050, which was agreed to by the House of Assembly, whereas under the Bill it is fixed at £2,300. I shall have more to say on this matter, probably tomorrow. I cannot understand why we should pay the Chief Secretary less than the Police Commissioner. There should be a little more levelling up in this regard.

Clause 11 is difficult to interpret. As far as subsections (1), (2), and (3) are concerned, there does not seem to be very much difference between the provisions it contains and the provisions in the Police Act. Subsection (4) provides for acting appointments, and although acting appointments are not to confer upon the appointees higher rank attaching to such appointments, they give them an advantage over other candidates when the time comes for permanent appointments. I am not clear on the purpose for having acting appointments at all. The Minister's explanation was not very convincing. He said:—

There are certain specialist positions in the Police Force which sometimes have to be given to relatively junior men and in such cases it is desirable that there should be power to make appointments without disturbing the relative seniority of the appointees in the force as a whole.

If a senior man were appointed to such a position, would he be permanently appointed, and if a junior man were appointed would he eventually be appointed permanently? Why should the classification of these specialist positions be so high as to necessitate acting appointments? I would like further information on this matter. Subclause (5) of clause 11 seems to contradict the earlier subclauses.

According to the Minister, clause 11 provides for all appointments in the detective branch and all other appointments above senior constable to be subject to the approval of the Chief Secretary, but subclause (5) provides that the provisions in subclause (3) are not to apply to appointments to the rank of inspector or above. I find it difficult to understand what is intended, as one would have thought that the higher the appointment the greater need for Ministerial approval. The whole clause is obscure. Under the Bill acting sergeants will receive a constable's rate of pay. There should be some explanation of that. No objection can be made to acting ranks provided that they carry the higher rate of pay. The ratio at present is about one sergeant to seven men.

Clause 12 provides for the appointment of medical officers. These officers are not to be members of the Police Force and they are not to be members of the Public Service. What are they to be? How are such matters as salary and superannuation to be determined? Is it desirable that the contract of employment between the Government and medical officers should be the subject of special treaty? Clause 13 provides for a probationary period not exceeding 12 months. As the probationary period may be shorter than 12 months, it might be desirable to fix a minimum period. What is the type of case in which the probationary period will be dispensed with altogether? Will it be where the applicant has had previous experience in some other similar capacity? The conditions under which the probationary period is dispensed with should be laid down either in the Act or in regulations.

Clause 14 provides for an appeal against proposed appointments as well as actual appointments. Why should it be left to the discretion of the Commissioner to determine whether he will give notice of a proposed appointment? Is there any appeal against an actual appointment? If so, the conditions prescribed for appeals differ radically from those prescribed for the Public Service, in which there is an appeal only against a proposed appointment. Conditions of appeal should be uniform throughout all the services. Clause 16 provides that a member of the Police Force need only take one oath during his service but that those already in the service will have to take another oath on their next promotions. Is there any good reason why those who have already taken the oath should have to take it again?

While we are dealing with this Bill the opportunity should be taken to make some other amendments to the Act. For example, in clause 14 (1), which deals with notice of promotion, the word "may" in line 26 allows the Commissioner to make a promotion without any regard for this section if he so desires, and I suggest that the word "shall" be substituted for "may." Clause 38 (1) (a), deals with the constitution of the board, and it is suggested in this connection that the chairman of the board should be a judge instead of a magistrate. In the States of New South Wales and Victoria the chairman of the board is a judge. A judge is not subject to direction from the Public Service Commissioner, nor is he subject to party politics. He can act without consideration for either. The whole of the recent disturbance in Queensland was brought about by the constitution of the board and the fact that in that State a magistrate was the chairman. The matter has not been settled, and unrest persists in the Police Force there. We do not want anything like that to happen here and in Committee I will endeavour to improve the Act in this direction. Members have every confidence in the Commissioner and his officers and I think we have a force in this State to be proud of, but it is our duty to make the laws which the police have to administer and we should therefore draw attention to what we think are defects in the legislation and endeavour to remedy them.

I now want to deal with the women's branch of the force as considerable dissatisfaction has grown up therein. The women consider that they have not been fairly treated. In June last an award was made, retrospective to May 18, which increased the male rates by from £16 to £41 a year, and since then there have been two increases in the cost of living, but no application was made to the court on behalf of the women police and their wages have never been fixed by any tribunal. It appears that those concerned have taken advantage of this state of affairs to put the women officers back on a lower level than they have ever been since the women police were first appointed. In this connection a deputation waited upon the Chief Secretary and asked that the women should participate in cost of living and other increases, as they have done hitherto. I hope the Chief Secretary will be able to explain this for it is causing considerable dissatisfaction.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—They told me they had not approached anyone. The matter is

sub judice, and if I am to keep quiet it is only fair that everyone else should.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The matter has been before the authorities for some time and the women police have been endeavouring to arrange another conference, but they have been put off from day to day and are getting nowhere. Although I have never brought up this matter before I notice that questions have been asked and answered on more than one occasion in another place.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—They assured me they were quite happy to have their case examined on its merits, and that is what is being done.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—This matter was referred to weeks ago in another place. I have not previously expressed my views on the subject. If the Chief Secretary can bring these parties together and arrive at some finality he will do something in the interests of all concerned.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—That is exactly what is being done, but I am afraid the statements made to me have not been lived up to and that does not help me.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is over three months since I was first approached and I have not raised the matter before but apparently negotiations are being held up. If there is any failure to reach agreement the matter should be raised now.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—It is a pity that it has been introduced now.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The Chief Secretary raised no objection when it was brought before another place some time ago. The Minister seems annoyed that I have introduced this subject. Members in another place have received replies to questions from the Minister representing the Chief Secretary and if they can ask questions surely I have the right to do so here. I realize the Chief Secretary is sympathetic but somebody is holding the matter up and it is about time the parties arranged some amicable settlement. I support the second reading but in Committee I will endeavour to move amendments which will bring the suggestions I have made into operation.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—Members will sympathize with the Leader of the Opposition in his desire to reduce the number of unnecessary Bills. Many years ago there was a statesman who thought it necessary to gather statutes and set fire to them

every five years but I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition suggests we follow that practice. I do not agree that this is a new Bill. It is designed to consolidate and amend the Police Act and I do not know of any other way in which Parliament could deal with the matter. Whilst there are some clauses which require clarification the Bill will improve the present Act, and remove a lot of dead wood and measures which were introduced into the Police Act straight from English statutes of over 120 years ago which were passed to deal with special conditions which do not apply here. There is no need to retain extraneous and unnecessary measures. Until the Leader of the Opposition mentioned it I did not know that there was a discrepancy in the Police Commissioner's salary shown in this Bill as compared with the Estimates. No doubt the Chief Secretary will make some explanation because both cannot be right. Salaries have increased in some instances by 100 per cent in the last few months but the office of Commissioner of Police is important and so is the Police Force and if we are to keep law and order we must ensure that the police get a fair deal and that their standard of living is no lower than anyone else's.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—I am not complaining about the high salary—I merely mentioned a discrepancy.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, and it should be explained. Many parts of the Bill commend themselves to me. The authority of the Commissioner will be changed in some respects to the advantage of his office and the Chief Secretary will retain his power of appointing and other necessary authority. The Commissioner will have the right to make minor appointments and that is all right because the Minister should not be bothered with every minor appointment. I thought when women police were appointed in this State that it was a step in the right direction. I witnessed the work of women police in London and made inquiries about it. They render valuable services and I presume the work of our women police is somewhat similar. They undertake work of a delicate nature and assist in the maintenance of public order. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned a discrimination in the payments made to these officers. They have canvassed a number of members of Parliament although I thought that was more or less forbidden, not by Act of Parliament but by some understood regulation that public servants were not to approach

members of Parliament. I do not think it is wise that they should approach members with their grievances because there are appeal boards to deal with complaints. When public servants approach me I often tell them that they may be doing themselves some harm.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—I always thought it was a free country.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I would not remove any citizen's rights but when people have appeal boards and other organizations they should go to them to have their complaints considered.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What should they do when they have not obtained redress from those bodies?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—If their grievances have been submitted to a tribunal and the tribunal is delaying the matter the Minister should see that it is dealt with. I could not help making some comparison with the emoluments paid to our police force and those overseas. I was astounded to discover that a woman police officer in England is paid only £5 a week whereas our officers are receiving £15.

I agree that it should not be necessary to take an oath more than once but I have long advocated the necessity of all public servants taking an oath of allegiance when they enter the service of the Government. As members of Parliament we take an oath and do so willingly and it would be a simple matter for every public servant to do so. Some may suggest that it would not make much difference but it would not do any harm. While it is not necessary that an officer receiving promotion should repeat an oath I am glad that the provision is being retained that an oath must be taken. There are many matters in the Bill which do not make radical alterations to the Act but which aid its administration and I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 1150.)

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—I cannot give my support to this Bill, as it seeks to assist an opponent of the dairy industry, which has been so important and valuable not only to our own State but to the Commonwealth. Perhaps it is not generally realized that under pre-war, peacetime conditions Australia was third largest exporter of butter in the world, surpassed only by New Zealand and Denmark. The measure proposes to lend assistance to a competitor by providing a channel of distribution in a market that has been developed through the years by Australian primary producers. I congratulate Mr. Robinson for the clear and, to my mind, convincing manner in which he voiced his disapproval of the Bill last week. His personal association with rural activities permitted him to speak with authority and from experience of South Australian conditions.

The Hon. A. A. Hoare—He is not a dairy farmer but a wheatgrower.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—He is a farmer, as referred to by Mr. Condon the other day, and his statements were accepted. Objection now seems to be taken because Mr. Robinson is not a whole-time dairy farmer, but those who are associated with that activity were, I think without exception, convinced that Mr. Robinson knew what he was talking about and that he contributed in no small degree to the value of the debate. Some parts of Australia are more highly developed for butter production than others, but in all the States dairying is carried out successfully and provides an income for the farmer over the whole year. Even in South Australia, which has the unenviable record of the lowest rainfall of all the States, continuous expansion has taken place. Of the total area of South Australia only about eight per cent has a rainfall of more than 15in. and yet the factory production of butter is about 8,000 tons annually. My authority for that is the *Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics*, volume 14, No. 14. Indeed, it is not an overstatement to say that only through mixed farming has it been possible for South Australia, with its very low rainfall, to carry on and increase its rural population. Only by their thrift and careful husbandry throughout the entire history of the State have the men on the land been able to succeed.

I am greatly surprised when dairying is being discussed to hear the query raised as to why we buy butter from the eastern States. If anybody refers to the *Year Book of Australia* and studies the summary of rainfall figures he can obtain that information and I shall be surprised if anybody can feel other than very pleased with what the State has done. During his opening remarks the other day Mr. Condon was asked by Mr. Anthony how many men were employed in the manufacture of margarine and he replied that he did not know. Mr. Robinson could have told him because, as most members recall, when the Prices Bill was being discussed here two or three weeks ago he said that two margarine factories were operating in South Australia, employing about 16 people. I do not know whether the 16 employees are full-time employees, as we have been told that the industry has been temporarily closed down for it has reached the limit of its year's quota.

When referring to the manufacture of margarine Mr. Condon quoted statements of some Ministers of Agriculture in other States and said, in support of the value of their statements, that they were farmers. He did not say whether they were wheatfarmers or woolgrowers or what type of farming they specialized in. As the measures were evidently Government measures one would naturally presume that the personal views expressed would have to be subordinated to Government policy.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Are you opposing the Bill because I introduced it as a private measure?

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—No. The honourable member quoted Dr. J. G. Hislop, a member of the Western Australian Legislative Council, as saying:—

He believed that the time would come when margarine would be used more and more in the household and scientists would find means of making it spread like butter.

A few minutes later, however, he said that it was not his intention to do anything detrimental to the dairy industry. He contended that the only effect of the Bill would be to take away some of the local butter market. Then we were told that this legislation cannot hurt South Australia as similar legislation has had no effect in other States where the quotas have been extended, but I am informed that even there the factories have not yet been enlarged, and if that is so it is only a paper quota which they have

been given. I have not yet been able to check this but I have been very credibly informed that that is the case.

There is another point to which the Leader of the Opposition did not accord much significance, namely, the dairy subsidy. Members will recall that when discussing the Prices Bill recently it was mentioned that for the 12 months from July last until June next between £14,000,000 and £15,000,000 will be distributed as a subsidy to the butter section of the dairy industry. This subsidy is calculated on output, and every pound of table butter displaced by margarine will diminish the subsidy received by the dairy industry. It will be seen, therefore, that this legislation is aimed directly at the dairy industry and, instead of thriving, it will languish until its export trade has gone and all the benefits it has gained for us are lost. Once that market is gone it will not be an easy matter to regain it, and there will not be much point in being sorry after the event, as we will not be given another chance.

At the end of March last there were 4,810,000 dairy cattle in Australia, and even in South Australia, with its relatively low rainfall, there are 243,000. Consider the capital involved in this industry. Even at the very conservative figure of £10 a head it means that the dairy cattle in the Commonwealth are worth over £48,000,000 and in South Australia nearly £2,500,000, apart altogether from the land values and not including dairy machinery, buildings, plants and factories, to which I do not think it necessary to refer in detail. However, the few figures I have submitted show at a glance that a great deal of money has been put into this industry which may reasonably expect to receive assistance rather than interference. As I have said, the Commonwealth Government proposes to distribute by way of subsidy between July last and June next nearly £15,000,000 to the butter section of the dairy industry, and it is useless pushing up with one hand and pulling down with the other. Every ton of margarine sold displaces a ton of butter. This means that every ton of butter not absorbed by the local market has to be exported, and butter exported does not qualify for the subsidy. Every ton of local trade lost to margarine is therefore a direct loss to the butter producer. I hope that the arguments submitted in this debate will induce members who were not aware of it before to realize the real danger of the attack on this valuable industry that lies in this Bill.

Before concluding I draw attention to several paragraphs of the Tenth Report of the Rural

Reconstruction Commission submitted to the Hon. J. J. Dedman, Minister for Post-war Reconstruction, under date August 7, 1946. Mr. Dedman is a gentleman well known to some of the supporters of the margarine industry as evidenced by their addresses in this Chamber. In paragraph 2440 the following appears:—

The competition of margarine with butter in European countries has been one of increasing severity in the last 30 years . . . The historic preference of the people for butter will be the chief factor in favour of its future consumption; the extent to which that preference results in butter maintaining its level of consumption will be largely a question of its price in relation to margarine.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Why quote Mr. Dedman?

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—I thought that of all people I could rely on to secure a sympathetic hearing it would be that gentleman.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Why not quote what you said the last time?

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—I have already quoted the honourable member so I thought I would quote another authority. Paragraph 2440 goes on:—

It is noteworthy that during the depression, when butter was sold at low prices in Britain, its consumption increased while that of margarine declined, and later when the price of butter rose the trend was reversed.

Now I shall quote paragraph 2441, and if the honourable member did not like the preceding one I am sure he will like this one less. It reads:—

Other aspects of this competition deserve consideration. Before the war British margarine was derived from whale oil and from oils obtained from various vegetable seeds and nuts, most of which were tropical in origin.

Now tropical seeds and nuts come from outside Australia and therefore goods produced abroad by foreigners are to be brought into Australia and sold in competition with this very valuable farm product. This paragraph continues:—

The vegetable oils are in a different category; they are mainly produced in tropical countries by native labour and many of them reach Britain from Crown colonies. The competition between butter and margarine is therefore to a considerable extent a struggle between dairy farmers on one standard of living and coloured native labourers on a very different standard. In recent years, the social development of the latter has been the cause of grave misgiving, while the agriculture of their countries has, in some cases, been the subject of inquiry. The British Government has found it necessary to appoint several Royal Commissions on these matters. It is

understood that these inquiries reveal an unsatisfactory state of affairs and a great need for improved social services.

Finally, in paragraph 2444 the commission sums up its conclusions—

(f) . . . A world economy in which there is a free interchange of goods requires the steady reduction of differences between standards in various countries. It is most important that such differences should be removed by raising the levels of the lower groups rather than by depressing those of the higher.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Why don't you say that that was the report which stabilized the dairy industry under the Labor Government?

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—I was a report on farming generally. I gather from interjections and attempts to induce me to sit down that some things I have said in the last few minutes have not altogether pleased some of my hearers. I only hope that some of the seed will have fallen on fertile soil and that this Chamber will do what I intend to do, namely, oppose the second reading.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN (Southern)—I oppose this Bill in every detail. Firstly, on the ground that any increase in the manufacture of margarine for consumption in this State would be detrimental to the interests of the dairy industry. Secondly, that I have not yet heard any evidence that the present amount of margarine is not sufficient to supply the requirements of those who wish to purchase it. Dairymen throughout Australia are very concerned about the tremendous increases in quotas of margarine permitted in two of the eastern States, and to support my remarks I will read two resolutions carried at important meetings recently. One was a meeting of the Australian Dairy Farmers Federation held in Sydney on July 21 and the following resolution was unanimously passed:—

That this federation is opposed to any increase in the present quota of table margarine because they believe it is not in the best interests of the community that table margarine should compete with genuine dairy products.

That federation represents 65,000 dairymen throughout the various States. Subsequently a meeting of the South Australian Dairymen's Association was held on July 29 and the resolution passed was:—

That this association does not approve any increase in the quota of table margarine in South Australia.

I have not seen any evidence that the present quota of margarine is insufficient for the State's requirements. I have inquired at various grocers stores in the country and been told that I can buy margarine. I have tried at various city stores and at one in Hindley Street I was informed that it could supply a dozen pounds to any customer who wanted it. There is no control whatever on the manufacture of cooking margarine. A South Australian firm placed cooking margarine on the market but finally found it unsaleable as the public would not buy it, notwithstanding that the article was of excellent quality. The latest figures of this firm show that whereas it sold 1,380 lb. in July, 1951, it sold only 22 lb. in January and then discontinued its manufacture. There is apparently no demand for cooking margarine here at present. Mr. Condon mentioned that the present quota for this 12 months had already been produced and that the factories had closed down and the 16 employees had gone to other occupations. He may have been correct, but I suggest that this position was probably deliberately created in order to make out a case for a further increase in the quota.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—It is unfair to suggest that.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—I have grounds for saying that. I understand that people in the country were offered margarine and were told that they should purchase it while it was available because it would become scarce. The manufacture of margarine could have gone on for the whole year and the employees could have been retained in the business, but a big quantity was put on the market to clear the factories.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—That is one of the most unfair statements I have heard.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—I have stated my grounds for saying so. Mr. Condon also said that it is impossible for a number of people to purchase butter because the cost is too high for their means. I can hardly follow that statement because we all know that the basic wage, which is adjusted every quarter, allows for a family purchasing a quantity of butter. I have yet to have proof that it is beyond the means of any working man on the basic wage—and not many are on that wage—to purchase butter because he has not the means. Mr. Condon also emphasized that the Liberal Government in Western Australia recently increased that State's quota and mentioned

statements made by the Minister who introduced the Bill. I believe that the Western Australian quota has been increased from 364 tons to 800 tons but not one more pound of margarine is being produced there at present. The Government has not issued a licence for any additional manufacture and I understand it does not intend to.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Then why has it passed legislation?

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—Probably because it feared that a quantity of margarine would be admitted to Western Australia from other States where quotas had been increased and in order to combat that position it passed legislation whereby it could issue licences for the manufacture of more margarine. Mr. Condon underestimated the quantity permitted to be manufactured in Queensland because I believe a further increase of 1,000 tons has been permitted and the quota today is 5,340 tons. The Queensland Government has licensed the manufacture of 2,996 tons leaving 2,344 tons yet to be licensed. The impact of this considerable increase has not and will not be felt for some time but I understand there are not sufficient factories there to manufacture the amount approved by the Government. In order to protect our dairy industry I feel I must oppose this Bill in every detail particularly as our dairymen are being asked to compete with a product that is largely produced by coloured labour in the islands north of Australia.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY (Central No. 2)—This Bill has evidently excited some interest not only in this House but outside. The Bill seeks to increase the quota of margarine to be manufactured from 312 tons to 624 tons, and 312 tons represents 4 per cent of the butter produced in this country. If the quota is doubled 8 per cent of the fats used by the people will be margarine and the remainder butter. It seems to me that the members who have spoken on the Bill, do so in the interests of their constituents and margarine-producing firms. I am somewhat surprised that the arguments for the production of margarine should be on the basis of that industry employing 16 men. That does not matter at all because those men go from one employment to another and are employed casually. The price of butter is such that many people are compelled to use a substitute. Pensioners and others through conditions of life are not receiving the basic wage but even the man on the basic wage has the right to use a substitute if he desires. Those

we should consider are the consumers and I have not heard anything to indicate that margarine is not fit for human consumption. According to Mr. Robinson it does not line up with butter but in many cases it is not far off and it is not fair that people who cannot afford butter should be forced to go without margarine. The retail price of butter is 4s. 1½d. a lb. as compared with 2s. 6d. for margarine and the difference represents a definite saving to a person with a limited income. I feel that the dairy industry, in seeking to protect itself from a limited and definitely controlled consumption of margarine, is being frightened without cause.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—The dairy industry has had experience of very low prices.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—In the last few years attempts have been made to bolster the price of foodstuffs and to hold them at a figure by way of subsidy. Approximately £15,000,000 a year is provided to make it possible for many people to use butter. Costs are reaching such a point that not only pensioners and basic wage earners but the community generally will have to take account of the high cost of food. It seems to me that the general cry throughout the world is for more fats. Apparently some members are considering the matter from the point of view of pounds, shillings and pence and consider that if a few pounds of butter are sold overseas, dairy farmers will not obtain the same price as if it were sold locally. There is nothing wrong with margarine as a food and a large number of our people are entitled to some consideration. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE (Central No. 1)—I support the Bill and was surprised at some of the arguments put forward. Mr. Cowan said that the workers had not complained, but it is evident he does not get out amongst them or he would soon discover that they have every reason to complain. Workers living in my neighbourhood have told me that they cannot get margarine or lard for cake making and cannot afford to buy butter at 4s. 1½d. a lb. for the purpose, their children thus being deprived of home-made cake. There are two sides to every question and we should endeavour to be fair to both dairy farmers and consumers. Surely we can meet on common ground on this question. Sir Wallace Sandford quoted prices, but never mentioned anything about condensed or dried milk robbing dairy farmers.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—He didn't say anything about butter concentrate, either.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—No. The price of butter does not affect politicians in the same way as pensioners and people on the basic wage. Politicians can manage to buy butter at 4s. 1½d., but workers on the basic wage cannot.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—What restriction is there on cooking margarine?

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—None at present because there is not any to buy. The Chifley Government subsidized dairy farmers to a large extent, but the Government which Mr. Cowan supports took it away, the burden being cast on the bottom dog.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—There is still 10½d. a lb. subsidy on butter.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—Yes, but it was greater than that under the Chifley Government. Sir Wallace Sandford painted a most woeful picture, even going as far away as Japan, but did not say anything about our importing £10,000,000 worth of textiles from that country when people in the textile industry in Australia are unemployed.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—I do not remember saying that.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—I know something about dairying and the conditions associated with it and on many occasions have walked about in the rain and slush carrying a hurricane lantern. In those days storekeepers paid dairy farmers 3½d. a pound for butter, but today consumers are called upon to pay 4s. 1½d. I give Mr. Condon every credit for introducing the Bill. He went to a lot of trouble to furnish valuable information for members. In his second reading speech he said:—

It is interesting to note that the Ministers of Agriculture who introduced similar legislation in the four States I have mentioned are all farmers representing country districts and it is not likely that they would do anything detrimental to the interests of the dairy industry. This month the Western Australian Minister for Lands (Mr. Thorn), who is probably one of the largest men connected with the dairy industry in that State, in introducing the Bill said he would do nothing to injure the dairy industry. In the Legislative Council on October 18, the Minister for Agriculture (Sir Charles Latham), said that the drift in the dairy industry was away from butter production. One of the big South-West dairy co-operative firms had written to him asking for a permit to produce margarine. Although the shareholders of that firm would be dairy farmers, members were trying to tell the House that the dairy industry did not want an increased margarine production.

Ministers in Western Australia are not one-eyed; they take a broadminded view of the position. The Government could alter the margarine manufacturing quota at any time,

and if the Bill is found to work detrimentally to the dairy industry it could be amended. It seems that many people are to be punished unnecessarily.

The Hon. J. L. Cowan—There is an unlimited supply of cooking margarine on the market.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—People cannot use butter for cake making at 4s. 1½d. a pound. Mr. Cowan, who is bitterly opposed to the Bill, should be prepared to give it a trial.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—There is little I want to say on the Bill because the arguments both for and against it seem to have turned a molehill into a mountain. From inquiries I find that the demand that is supposed to exist for margarine is not as big and widespread as Mr. Condon would have members believe. My country inquiries tend to support Mr. Cowan's statements that margarine was offered for sale early this year in country areas where it had not been previously offered. The logical conclusion seems to be that an attempt was made to dispose of margarine in areas when there has not been any real demand for it. I visited four shops in various parts of the metropolitan area during the past five days. In two I was able to buy a pound of margarine, if desired, and in the third a pound was available, but the proprietor said that he had to more or less ration it, having inquiries for more than was supplied to him. In the fourth shop none was available. Therefore it seems to me that the supposed demand is certainly not as extensive as we are led to believe. On the other hand it is important that our people have adequate supplies of the food they require, and if it can be shown that there are people who are going short of butter or its substitute because they cannot afford butter it would be reasonable to allow them to get some quantity of margarine. For that reason I am inclined to support the second reading, but subject to certain reservations. The manufacture of this commodity is an involved process demanding considerable technical skill. Therefore it would seem to me that, as a protection to the public, if there is to be an increase in the quota of margarine we should also make certain that there will be competition in its manufacture to ensure that its quality will be kept up to the highest level.

I believe that there are people other than the present manufacturers who would be interested in going into this industry; people with the necessary qualifications to ensure their making a high quality product, and therefore

their own resources. It has been necessary, therefore, for the Government, in order to assist with meeting the increased and increasing costs of Government services, to give consideration to raising some further revenues by taxation and by charges for services.

In estimating revenue from State taxation at £5,274,000, which is £481,000 more than last year, the Government has in mind certain proposals to effect some small increases in State taxation. A Bill to amend the Land Tax Act will be introduced which will provide for the State entering portion of the field recently vacated by the Commonwealth Government. It is estimated that this will mean an additional £205,000 to consolidated revenue this financial year. The increase in rates for which this Bill will provide will apply, however, only to taxpayers owning land with a total assessed unimproved value in excess of £10,000. Taxpayers whose land holdings are assessed at less than £10,000 will pay less tax than formerly because of the release from Commonwealth land tax, and because it is not proposed that they should pay any higher tax to the State than hitherto. In regard to taxpayers holding land assessed in excess of £10,000 unimproved values, the tax will not be as severe as applied under the previous dual taxing by Federal and State Governments. In the first place, State valuations, which are not as high as their Federal counterparts, will be used; and in the second place, the tax to be applied will be approximately 30 per cent lower than the previous combined Federal and State taxes. In all, only about 850 taxpayers will be affected, and by far the greater part of the additional tax yield, namely £191,000, will be derived from urban properties.

It is proposed to amend the Stamp Duties Act to provide for an increase in duty payable on cheque forms from 1½d. to 2d. All other States except Tasmania, which has recently raised its duty on cheque forms to 2½d., impose a duty of 2d. on cheque forms, and the proposed measure will bring South Australia into line with common Australian practice. The operation of this revised charge will bring an additional £20,000 of revenue for the balance of this year. A Bill will also be introduced to amend the Succession Duties Act. This Bill will have a three-fold purpose:—

(a) It will remove a cause of hardship which occurs in many cases where a widow or dependent children are left a house and very little else. Under the present scale such a bequest is dutiable because the present exemption limit is £500, and in many cases the payment of this duty represents a considerable hardship

to such widows or dependent children. The Government now proposes to raise this exemption limit to £2,800.

(b) This Bill will increase rates of duty payable by widowers, ancestors and descendants by 20-25 per cent, by other blood relations by 25-30 per cent, and by strangers in blood by 35-40 per cent, and the net result over-all will be to make the severity of estate duties in this State comparable with, but not higher than those obtaining in the larger States.

(c) It is also proposed to amend the schedule to the Succession Duties Act so that the rates will increase progressively from lower to higher tax groups. Under the present legislation the rates are "stepped" and, arising from such "stepping," several anomalies occur. The amended schedule will provide for a smooth progression from one rate to another and at the same time it has been constructed to ensure that it will not be unduly difficult in its administration.

Similarly, in order to meet increased costs of railway operation further increases in charges have been made to operate as from July 1, 1952, and total revenue from all public utilities is expected to exceed last year's receipts by £2,181,000, despite an estimated reduction in Harbors Board revenue which will be affected by import restrictions which have very materially reduced the volume of shipping passing through Port Adelaide. This year the State will receive £11,600,000 from the Commonwealth under the tax reimbursement arrangement as compared with £10,200,000 last year, and the special grant payable on the recommendation of the Commonwealth Grants Commission will be £6,343,000 in 1952-53 as compared with £4,558,000 last year.

Expenditure.—The estimated expenditures of the various departments are set out in the Schedule to this Bill and total £39,969,877 which, with £9,107,414 already appropriated by special legislation, makes up a total of £49,077,291 estimated to be expended this financial year. Provision has been included in these amounts to meet the basic wage increase of 13s. operating from August 1, and, in addition, a further amount of £540,000 has been apportioned to departments to provide for prospective wage adjustments for the balance of this year. The main items and increases over last year's expenditure to be authorized by the Bill are as follows:—

Police Department, £1,302,589, an increase of £237,848. Of the total provided £960,280 is required to pay salaries and wages for the year.

Hospitals Department, £2,894,617, an increase of £434,733. Of this increase £281,590 is required to meet additional salaries and wages

payable to hospital staff. The remainder of the increase will be required to meet increased costs of food, drugs, medicines, and other equipment required during the year for the operation of Government hospitals.

Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous, £913,267:— This provision exceeds actual expenditure for last year by £220,455, and is required to meet grants and subsidies to various subsidized hospitals, health organizations, and sundry institutions. The principal payments to be made under this appropriation are as follows:—

	£
Adelaide Children's Hospital	207,900
Ashford Hospital	7,000
Home for Incurables	35,000
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science	84,706
Mothers and Babies' Health Association	38,300
Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital	98,000
Whyalla Hospital	9,500
District and Bush Nursing Society	10,000
Kalyra Sanatorium	66,300
Northcote Home Preventorium	11,450
Burra Hospital	13,373
Cleve Hospital	4,829
Gawler Hospital	8,013
Mount Barker Hospital	10,238
Renmark Hospital	9,350
Waikerie Hospital	13,441
Ambulance Services	5,000
Contributions to St. John's Ambulance for S.A. Public Appeal Fund	5,000
Poliomyelitis Research and Ambulance Fees, Rail Fares, etc.	6,179
Royal Institution for the Blind	7,500
S.A. Institution for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb	3,000
Rail Fares for Blind Persons	4,000
Grant to the South Australian Symphony Orchestra	10,000
Rail Fares of Blind and Incapacitated Soldiers	32,000
Grant to S.A. Fire Brigades Board (This amount is in addition to £11,880 payable to the Board pursuant to the Fire Brigades Act)	33,120

Treasurer—Miscellaneous, £5,606,963, an increase of £322,202. The principal items for which provision is made within this heading are:—

Advances for Homes, Cost of Administration recouped to State Bank, £44,070. Prior to 1951-52 the Government paid a commission to the State Bank for administering the Advances for Homes scheme. The maximum commission fixed under the Advances for Homes Act was 10s. per cent on the amount of advances outstanding, and of recent years it has been found that this commission only partly recouped the bank for the expenses of administration. The

Advances for Homes Act was amended during the last session of Parliament to provide for recouping to the State Bank, from revenue, the total costs of administering the Advances for Homes scheme, and this is the first year in which payment will be made to the State Bank in accordance with the amended legislation.

	£
Expenses of management in connection with inscription of stock	28,000
Interest on trust funds and on temporary deposits	80,000
Administration of rent control	25,960
Administration of temporary housing schemes	38,420
Transfer duty on inscribed stock	16,000
Transfer to railway revenue towards net increase in working costs not covered by increases in freights and fares	4,050,000
Contributions towards working expenses of the Municipal Tramways Trust	500,000

The last of these two call for some comment. The Municipal Tramways Trust Amendment Act has already been debated in this Chamber and there is no need for me to further indicate to members the purposes for which additional finance is required by the trust. In accordance with that legislation, which has been approved by Parliament, an amount of £500,000 has been provided in the Appropriation Act for this year. Last year, when a similar Appropriation Bill was before this House, it was explained that the practice in most of the railway systems in Australia is for the Government to relieve the railway accounts of some of the capital costs. In this State an assessment is made each year by the Treasurer of the amount required to place the railway finances in a position where the difference between income and expenditure is reduced to manageable proportions. Last year the amount provided was £5,050,000. This year it is expected that the increases in the cost of railway operation will be met from increased railway revenues, which will arise not only from increases in charges made for freights and fares, but also from the increased traffic which our railway system is now handling. I am therefore extremely gratified to be able to report to this House that the contribution from the Treasury to the railways will, this year, be £200,000 less than the amount found necessary last year.

It is very pleasing to be able to report, too, that it was not necessary for the Government last year to make any subsidy to the Leigh Creek Coal Fund. The economies associated with higher regular output from the field, and

the method of fixing a sale price based on the heating value of Leigh Creek coal as compared with the heating value of Newcastle coal, have rendered the operation of the field such that the field has been able to meet its working expenses from its own coal sales, and, in fact, show a surplus. The benefits of this more economic operation are being passed on to consumers in the form of a reduction in the price of Leigh Creek coal and, notwithstanding this reduction in price, it is expected that the field will more than cover its working expenses this financial year.

Lands Department, £507,426, an increase of £104,530. This increase is due, in large measure, to the increased salaries and wages rates which will operate this year as compared with last year, and to the increased cost of materials for the operation of this department, but, in addition, an amount of £30,000 has been provided as this State's estimated contribution towards excess costs of placing settlers on irrigation lands in accordance with the War Service Land Settlement Agreement.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, £1,739,720, an increase of £302,782. The increase is due, in large measure, to increased salaries and wages £208,892, and to the increased costs of materials and other supplies used by the department in its various activities.

Public Works, £759,850, an increase of £214,761. Provision is made under this heading for maintenance of all Government buildings and grounds, and for sundry furniture and equipment for Government departments. The greatly expanded works programmes which have ruled of recent years have added materially to the number and size of Government buildings and have accordingly increased the Government's commitments for furnishing, for equipping, and for painting and miscellaneous annual maintenance. The policy of providing prefabricated and wooden buildings has been forced on the Government by the urgency of requirements and the shortage of materials and labour necessary for buildings of more durable construction. However attractive these buildings have been made in their appearance, and however admirably they have met the urgency of the situation, it is a fact that maintenance costs with these types of buildings are considerably higher than with buildings of brick construction, and we may expect for a number of years that our annual maintenance costs, under this particular heading, will remain at a fairly high figure.

Education Department, £4,370,326, an increase of £665,791. Over £600,000 of this

increase is required to meet salaries and wages of teachers and staff, and pay-roll tax thereon.

Minister of Education, Miscellaneous £672,855, an increase of £217,131. In accordance with the Commonwealth Universities arrangement the Commonwealth Government makes grants to the State for university purposes. These grants are credited to general revenue and a corresponding grant made to the University, supplemented of course by a grant from purely State funds. Each year, in accordance with the University of Adelaide Act, a grant of £44,000 is made to the University and, in addition to this amount, the grant to be made to the University for 1952-53 is £433,000 as compared with £260,000 last year. This year the Government has carefully scrutinized a budget of expenses which has been submitted by the School of Mines and Industries, and included in the amount provided under this heading is an amount of £140,840 for that school. This is £25,840 more than was paid to the School of Mines last year. A grant of £74,504 will be made to the Kindergarten Union of South Australia.

Irrigation Department, £445,741, an increase of £96,260. This increase is brought about by the same factors as affect all other departments, namely, increases in salaries and wages and cost of materials for operation and maintenance, but in addition it has been necessary for the department to carry out extraordinary maintenance of embankments necessitated by the recent very high river levels.

Mines Department, £504,586, a decrease of £197,641. Last year much of the exploratory and developmental expenditure at Radium Hill was charged against revenue, but these expenditures are now being met from the Loan Fund and the proceeds of the special overseas loan, when available, will be paid into the Loan Fund to meet the expenditure on the uranium project. The figure shown in the Bill, £504,586, provides for all the activities of the Mines Department other than operations at Radium Hill.

Harbors Board, £1,183,356, an increase of £208,989. Provision has been made this year for catching up on maintenance work deferred from earlier years because of the shortage of manpower and materials. Because of import restrictions our ports have not been as busy of recent months as was the case during the early months of last financial year, and the opportunity is being taken by the Harbors Board to carry out deferred maintenance to the fullest extent possible consistent with finance available.

Railways, £15,019,841, an increase of £2,125,560. The amount provided in this Bill will be sufficient not only to finance the considerably increased traffic which is available, and which is due in some measure to the more continuous operation and heavier freight loads which are made possible by the use of the diesel locomotives, but also to enable the Railways Department to carry out a large programme of permanent way and rolling stock maintenance. In the permanent way section in particular the department has been quite unable of recent years to carry out sleeper replacement to the extent which it has considered desirable. Practically all sleepers obtained were diverted for the gauge widening project. Now that sleepers are more readily available, however, they will be used, on receipt from the West Indies, from Western Australia, Tasmania, Western Victoria, and the South-East of this State, for replacement purposes, and provision for a large amount of permanent way maintenance is included in the amount provided in this Bill.

I have now commented on the main items of revenue and expenditure. Nearly all lines provided in this Bill are higher than lines provided for corresponding services last year because of the increase in salaries and wages and in the cost of materials generally. Turning to the various clauses of the Bill. Clause 2 provides for the further issue of £23,469,877. The remainder of the amount required to finance the various departments set out in the Bill is £16,500,000, which amount was appropriated by Parliament in Supply Acts Nos. 1, 2, and 3 of 1952. Clause 3 (1) provides for the appropriation of £39,969,877, and sets out the various departments and projects on which the amount is

estimated to be expended for the year. Sub-clause (2) of this clause provides that, to the extent to which increases in salaries and wages are not provided for on the Estimates, if they become payable by the State pursuant to an order made by any wage fixing tribunal the Governor may appropriate the amount required to pay the increases out of the general revenue of the State. The amount of money which is required to pay the increases not provided for in the Estimates shall be added to the total of the Governor's Appropriation Fund.

Clause 5 gives power to issue money from the Loan Fund, or other public funds held by the Treasurer, to make good any revenue deficiency. Clause 6 provides for payment out of the appropriations made in this Bill in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1952, or at a rate in excess of that set down by the Public Service Board or the Railways Commissioner. Clause 7 provides for payments appropriated by this Bill to be in addition to any amounts which may have been appropriated by other Acts. Clause 8 provides for payment to public servants for the use of their private cars on Government business at rates prescribed in regulations to the Public Service Act and authorizes payment at these rates retrospective to January 1, 1952. So that members could be informed on the estimated revenue and expenditure for the year I have endeavoured to give some details of the Government's proposals. I commend the Bill to the favourable consideration of members.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.56 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 12, at 2 p.m.