

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Tuesday, May 22, 1956.

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

**SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).**

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The Bill follows the usual form of Supply Bills. Authority from Parliament is sought to spend £7,000,000 to meet the expenses of the public services of the State during the financial year ending on June 30, 1957. This amount will be sufficient to carry on State services for approximately two months.

Clause 2 provides for the issue of an amount not exceeding £7,000,000. Clause 3 (1) provides that, of the moneys issued under the authority of clause 2, no payments shall be made in excess of the amounts voted for similar services on the Estimates for the year ending June 30, 1956, except that increases in salaries and wages may be paid where such increases are fixed or prescribed by any award, order or determination of an authorized wage fixing authority. Where increases in wages or salaries are made clause 3 (2) gives the Treasurer authority to pay such increases out of moneys voted by Parliament in this Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition)—Over the years it has been the usual practice to have such a Bill introduced and therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—It is the usual procedure for the Council to be asked to pass a Supply Bill of this nature and in the past I have drawn attention to the way in which the amount required has gradually risen. Two years ago we thought it was a tremendous sum when we were asked to pass a Bill for £6,000,000. We have not yet before us the printed copies of last year's Acts for the use of members in debates, but I hope that this will not be the position for much longer. I generally like to study the wording of the Bill for the previous year, but this year apparently the printing has got behind. The wording of this measure is exactly the same as previous Supply Bills and, therefore, I support the second reading.

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

**ADDRESS IN REPLY.**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from May 17. Page 116.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition)—Debate on this motion affords members the opportunity of voicing complaints concerning their districts and to submit proposals which, in their mature consideration, should be taken up by the Government. It has been said by some members that the debate is, in effect, a Cook's tour in respect of all matters pertaining to politics. I do not propose to take a ticket for a tour, but I will content myself with a few observations on one or two of the items in His Excellency's Speech and then submit some comments concerning things not mentioned in it.

It is unnecessary for members of this Chamber to traverse the whole political field in speaking to this motion because they represent Legislative Council districts which embrace as many as seven Assembly districts, and in many instances it would be mere redundancy were we to echo complaints affecting Assembly districts, because such matters are dealt with in another place by their State members. We are therefore at liberty to address ourselves to a wider sphere, not circumscribed by district matters. Firstly, I wish to compliment the mover of the motion, Sir Arthur Rymill, and the seconder Mr. Edmonds. Both gentlemen placed their views before this Council in a manner characteristic of the way in which business is conducted here. Sir Arthur delivered a thought provoking speech. The two main points which registered in my mind were his reference to automation, and a new phrase that he coined, "Do it yourself."

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—That is not new, is it?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It may not be new to the honourable member, but it was thought provoking to the extent that it calls for some observations as to the reason why that attitude exists. Mr. Edmonds dealt mainly with rural matters, which he is very competent to do, and I compliment both upon their contributions to this debate.

His Excellency's Speech consisted mainly of a review of the activities of the Government during the preceding three years. The Government claimed credit for achievements such as the expansion of the South Australian Electricity Trust, the bringing of the Murray River water to Adelaide and the establishment of new

industries and the granting of loans to industries for the purpose of expansion. However, the Government should not claim the whole of the credit for these things because all of it rests with Parliament. Members should realize that all major works projects costing more than £100,000 have first to be referred to the Public Works Committee which, after a searching inquiry, is required to submit a report to Parliament either recommending or rejecting them. Therefore, all undertakings such as waterworks, new hospitals and the like are the responsibility of Parliament in the final analysis. Then again we have a Subordinate Legislation Committee and any regulations promulgated by councils which affect the health of the community first have to run the gauntlet of an investigation by that Committee, which also is required by law to submit its report to Parliament. Last, but not least—indeed, I think it is one of our main Committees—there is the Industries Development Committee which considers applications for funds for the purpose of expanding an industry or setting up a new one. It is on this Committee's recommendation that the Government either agrees to guarantee a trading bank, or sometimes the State Bank, on a loan to the applicants, or rejects it. I mention these things to show that the Government cannot claim all the credit for the progress achieved in the last 15 or 20 years. Moreover, it could not have been done without the co-operation and goodwill engendered by work people who are members of trades unions, and who apply themselves assiduously to their work. The Government is attempting to bask in the reflected glory of the achievements of the workers on the one hand and of the various Parliamentary Committees on the other.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—But the Government initiates, does it not?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I have not attempted to deny that, but I say that an equal share of the credit which the Government claims should be given to Parliament.

Now I come to what was lacking in His Excellency's Speech. The first thing that affects the people of South Australia was the absence of any reference to long service leave in industry. No mention has been made in the Governor's Speech as to whether the Government proposes to follow the splendid example set by other States in this regard, whereby those employed in industry over a period of years shall have some reward in the form of long service leave. Every State in the Commonwealth with the exception of this

State and Western Australia has introduced legislation for this purpose. Western Australia is dealing with the proposal to submit the necessary legislation.

There was no mention made in the Governor's Speech of the restoration of marginal increases or increases in the basic wage. There has grown up over a period of years, within the ambit of this Government's administration, a tendency to allow such people as economists, who are not responsible to Parliament, to define the policy affecting the major portion of people of this State with regard to their living standards and the amount of money they receive in their "take home" pay envelope. It may be said that the economy of the State and indeed of Australia is in such a parlous condition that these retrenchments with regard to pay are absolutely essential in order to maintain the economic level whereby Australia can pull itself out of the economic chaos which the Prime Minister said we are already in. He said that in effect in his depression Budget which has been submitted in this session of the Commonwealth Parliament. We are in no different position from other parts of the world, and this talk about lowering wages in order to maintain our economic equilibrium is blown to smithereens by legislation that has been brought in in America, where as far back at 1920 they enacted the Unemployment Act, better known as the Social Security Act, which covered about 12,000,000 employees. In 1939 they increased the coverage of that Act to, I think, 39,000,000. They have now increased it still further, and they have also increased the payments which are to be made to unemployed to about 75 per cent of their normal "take home" pay envelope. The idea behind it is that if there is a pool of unemployed, whether brought about purposely or otherwise, the spending power of the community—

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—What do you mean by "purposely"?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—My friend knows that in America there are such things as combines and monopolies. We have not had the full blast in this State of the rapacious manner in which some of the combines and monopolies in America disregard their national heritage. The amount of 75 per cent which I have mentioned is paid during unemployment for a period of four to six months. The Federal Government in America allocates money to the States, and the States make up the difference. Some States even pay more than the 75 per cent under their own legislation.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—You have not told us where the money comes from?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is a pay-roll tax on industry. In the Federal Parliament of Australia, with a Government of the same political complexion as my honourable friend, all manner of taxes are imposed allegedly for some specific purpose, but we find they are not used for the purposes for which they were originally intended. In America the unemployment tax has the support of the Federal Treasurer by way of grants in order to meet exigencies as they arise..

I turn now to the "Do it yourself" campaign mentioned by Sir Arthur Rymill. There is a reason for this campaign. I quite agree that it is difficult to get a tradesman to undertake repairs, and the reason is that there are not sufficient tradesmen. That had its genesis in the depression period of the 1930's. During that period there was no employment for young people who usually entered trades and other callings in connection with various handicrafts. As a result we have lost a generation of skilled artisans. Every honourable member knows that after World War II there was such a demand for skilled labour that the Repatriation Department set up training schools where ex-members of the armed forces could learn such things as bricklaying, plumbing and carpentry, in order to create a labour force for building construction. The depression is the reason for the present paucity of skilled artisans today, and why there is this campaign of "Do it yourself."

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Don't you think that cost is affecting home building?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I do not know that it is, and that brings me back to the economists. The economists will make a survey and say for instance, that the cost of building has gone up by 10 or 15 per cent. I admit that the cost of building materials has increased, but that is due more to the action of some people in charging exorbitant prices for supplies. It is true that a big percentage of the people own their homes. That is no detriment to the economy of the State, but is all to the good. The increase in labour costs for buildings has been infinitesimal compared with the increase in actual building costs. It cannot be levelled against labour as being totally responsible for the increased costs.

I pay a compliment to the Housing Trust. Sir Arthur Rymill mentioned the number of houses erected in Australia, and according to this morning's press there had been a decrease

of 780 in the March period 1956 compared with that of 1955. The Housing Trust is in a singular position in that it is the principal house-building authority in South Australia, and has all its rights provided under legislation to get materials that others often cannot get. It has used these materials to a very good purpose. South Australia passed legislation permitting the Savings Bank to lend its funds to the trust at 2 per cent interest, and the actual amount loaned is well over £2,000,000. Now we find that the trust is in a dilemma because no finality has been arrived at between the State Government and the Menzies Government for a new housing agreement. I predict that the rate of interest that will be demanded under that agreement will be much higher than 2 per cent, and much higher than the 3½ per cent which the Chifley Labor Commonwealth Government included in its original housing agreement.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—There will be an immediate increase in rents.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Exactly. The trust has adopted the practice of lumping its rents to arrive at a figure to provide an equitable payment.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Will not the proposed policy further increase the cost of living?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes. Rent is one of the major items taken into account by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court and the State Industrial Court in fixing wages and, with an increase in rents but no increase in the living wage, naturally the standard of living of working people must automatically be lowered.

The question of automation was very lucidly referred to by Sir Arthur Rymill. It can be said that it is the second phase of the industrial revolution. The original industrial revolution took place in the 18th century and continued from 1730 to 1830. Then there was a marked increase in the use of coal and iron. Then from 1830 was the period of mechanical progress, marked by the coming of the railways and the utilization of iron for machinery, ships, telegraphs, and the use of steel in the place of iron. The third phase of the revolution was the age of science from 1880 to the present day. An extension of this phase has been the development of electricity, automatic machine production, the utilization of water resources, the tapping of new water resources, and an advance in scientific management. That brings us to the present position of automation. Some people refer to it as the robot revolution. In America, Britain, Russia and Western

Germany automation is not only being discussed, but is actually being established, and established very quickly. I agree with Sir Arthur Rymill that a brake upon the establishment of automation in Australia would probably be the question of the huge capital expenditure.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—And the demand.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The demand will be there when it is a question of producing a greater quantity of goods at a greater profit. All those in business have the incentive of profit-making. It is interesting to notice that in America 14 machines are making 90 per cent of the electric light globes used in that country and they produce at the rate of 1,800 a minute. A British firm has a robot which works out the weekly pay for 7,000 employees in 40 minutes, a job which previously occupied a battery of clerks for 225 hours. A clear lesson to Australia is that automation involves an industrial problem, which the captains of industry with the trades unions must solve, and it is also becoming a political question.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Why bring politics into it?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Why are we here? Automation needs political planning, together with the co-operation of those controlling industry and those employed in industry. Political planning is necessary to prevent an industrial upheaval such as we read about recently in Great Britain, where 12,000 employees at the Standard Motor Works went on strike, resenting, with justification, the introduction of automation to their plant. These changes cannot be made without proper planning and without having the employees schooled to accept the new set of conditions. It is pleasing to notice that the A.C.T.U. has set up a special committee to deal with this problem, which will affect all trades unions throughout Australia. It is also interesting to note that in considering this phase of our economic position the production and distribution of the world's economic goods and services—foodstuffs, clothing, shelter, health services, government and all the rest—are the responsibility of approximately one thousand million persons, who constitute the world's labour force. A series of studies on the composition of this force is being published by the International Labour Organization, which meets at Geneva. It was set up to review labour conditions in various countries and to enable representatives from member countries to discuss their industrial problems and bring back

resolutions to their respective Governments so that they could be translated into legislation in the interests of the workers. They have carried out an excellent programme. Some governments have ratified the resolutions and others have postponed ratification, but ultimately 95 per cent of the recommendations carried at these conferences are put into effect by the various governments. It cannot be denied that the world's labour force has increased along with the phenomenal growth in population.

The world's working population was estimated in 1950 at slightly more than 1,000,000,000 out of a total world population of a little more than 2,500,000,000. Thus the proportion of the population economically active stood at 41 per cent. When I say "economically active" I remind members that a number of people are too old to work, and in addition there are youths, women and children who are not employed.

In almost all countries the recent censuses show that adult males (aged from 20 to 64 years) continue to provide the bulk of the labour force, the proportion varying among the countries from 50 per cent in Japan to 65 per cent in the United States of America. Women's share in the labour force has tended to increase slightly, but this trend has not been universally apparent. In the United States the proportion of women in the total labour force moved up from 18 per cent in 1900 to 28 per cent in 1950. That can be answered by the fact that in the war years there was a big increase in the percentage of women employed. In France and Germany the proportion of women employed from 1900 to 1950 remained stable, and in a few countries the number declined. At present the women make up a widely varying part of the labour force—as low as 15 per cent in Egypt and Spain and as high as 40 per cent in Japan and Austria, but generally it is between 25 and 35 per cent. In all parts of the world over 90 per cent of men between the ages of 20 and 64 are economically active. In the case of women of this age-group the percentage at work has shown an upward trend in the last 25 years in a number of countries; from 1930 to 1950 it rose from 50 to 58 in Japan, from 23 to 35 in Italy and from 25 to 33 in the United States. In the industrial countries the percentage of young persons (age below 20) in the labour force has tended to decline; for example, in Great Britain it fell from 20 in 1900 to 10 in 1950 and in the United States, over the same period, from 15 to 6. Gainful employment of children under 15 has almost

disappeared in many industrial countries. Young people form a considerably larger proportion of the labour force in non-industrialized countries.

The substantial declines noted in earlier decades in the proportion of old people (aged 65 and above) at work continued through 1950; in Great Britain, for example, the percentage of older men at work declined from around 60 in 1920 to 32 in 1950, while in Germany the percentage dropped from 47 in 1925 to 27 in 1950. In the United States the more moderate decline was from 60 per cent in 1920 to 41 per cent in 1940 at which it held steady through 1950. The work participation rate of women aged 65 and above has declined to a somewhat smaller extent in most countries. The decrease in the proportion of old people who remain in the labour force has roughly offset the increasing relative number of old people in the population. In consequence, persons aged 65 or over have continued to make up about the same share of the labour force as in earlier decades—roughly 5 per cent in many countries.

Turning to the question of automation, we should realize that we are dealing, not with a few operatives in industry but with a very big human factor, and human nature cannot be changed in a day. This is a factor which must always be considered when we are faced, as we will be in the years to come, with the increasing development of automation. This is a word which has been bandied about, and to some it has become quite a mystic word. I have made some small research on it and I find that the word "automation" is reported to have been conceived independently and at about the same time by John Diebold, then a student at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and Dell Harder, vice-president in charge of manufacturing of the Ford Motor Company. Harder may have been the first to use the word in 1947 in describing improved methods for handling parts in process without the delays involved in manual operation. In contrast to this conception of automation, which lays stress on reducing the costly idle time between machining operations on high-speed production tools resulting from the manual handling of each part into and out of the machine, Diebold has emphasized from the outset that automation represents a new way of thinking about the total process of production: that it denotes both automatic operation and the process of making operations automatic, with a resultant emphasis on

self-regulation of the entire production process. To those who may ask who Diebold was, I would say that he was a graduate of the School of Business Administration of Harvard University who led a research team in developing the theoretical background of automation and in working out a model for the automatic production of automobile pistons. He embodied his findings in a treatise under the title "Making the Automatic Factor a Reality." Harder has more recently expanded this definition, stating that in his view automation was in fact "a philosophy of manufacturing" and that its meaning should be broadened to include design of parts, methods for their manufacture and production-tool control systems. Another engineer has defined it as "... the art of applying mechanical devices to manipulate work pieces into and out of equipment, turn parts between operations, remove scrap, and to perform these tasks in timed sequence with the production equipment so that the line can be wholly or partially under push-button control at strategic stations" (quoted by Ashburn Anderson in *The Developments of Automation in Metal-Working*, Paper No. 55-SA (New York, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, May 1955)).

The trade union movement, both nationally and internationally, does not dispute the promise of automation but is more apprehensive of the short-term consequences and has given particular consideration to the social problems raised. In the United States many union leaders are deeply concerned with the transitional problems. For example, the President of the United Automobile Workers, Walter Reuther, has declared—

Now we enter the second phase of the industrial revolution, and the impact of automation—for good or for evil—is magnified a thousand-fold. The need for enlightened social policies becomes imperative.

In the United Kingdom, the President of the Trades Union Congress stated at the 87th Annual Congress in September 1955:

We can visualise the time when there will be an abundance of consumer goods which will meet the requirements of every man, woman and child on the face of the earth. We can welcome it for this reason, or we can fear it because we may believe that it will rob us of our individuality, of our skills and perhaps of our livelihood. To fear automation would be the cowardly approach; it could arise only from a sense of weakness. If we are confident in our strength as workers and our workers' organizations—and we should be—we have no need to fear. We should immediately set ourselves to the task of controlling these developments, not restricting

them; of turning them to our advantage and not our disadvantage.

After discussion of the question, the T.U.C. adopted a resolution welcoming the opportunities for higher living standards presented by technological advances generally and, foreseeing that these opportunities would be attended by complex human, social and economic problems whose solution would depend on a larger measure of workers' participation in industry through joint consultation, urged continued study of the problems in order that the whole movement might be efficiently equipped to deal with the subject. Members know my views with regard to peace in industry. I have frequently said here that the advice of the workers should be taken more and more, in order to allow an easy change-over of methods of production and management so that industry will not be disturbed by new phases as they are being developed. However, recognition of the problems is not enough. Much has to be done to meet the problems ahead, and it is probable that attention will centre in the near future on action. Here there is an evident need for continuing and intensified co-operation on the part of those more directly concerned—co-operation that can only come about through conscious effort and thought about the more far-reaching social implications of automation. I want to make it clear that only those engaged in industry are competent to understand its various aspects. It is sometimes the outside consultant, who is not thoroughly conversant with all manufacturing processes, who throws a spanner into the works.

Above all, there is a need to keep automation in its place—that is, as a group of related concepts and technological developments offering great possibilities for the raising of levels of living and welfare—and not to assign to it an inexorable and over-riding role to which social policy must be subordinated for many years to come. In the words of one of the principal speakers at the Conference on the Automatic Factory organized by the Institution of Production Engineers in the United Kingdom, Mr. F. G. Woollard, for many years engaged in the development of flow production methods in the 'British' automobile industry—

We must always remember that automation is not a device with which to outlaw, displace or dispense with man. It is not a contrivance nor an invention to deprive man of his heritage—his right to work and to enjoy the fruits of his labours. It is a means of increasing man's stature and for extending his ability to do more and more useful work; to produce in greater

volume with less physical effort or mental strain—a means whereby he can bring to his fellows the fulfilment of their lawful desires and, to their homes, comfort and leisure. We must always remember that men were not made for machines, but that machines were made for men. Whatever device or emblem we may adopt to typify "automation" the motto must be . . . "Machines in the Service of Man."

I think all members can subscribe to that when considering the problems which we will have to face. We should not be like King Canute and attempt to stem the waves. If automation when it comes is properly considered by Governments and they legislate so as to soften the impact of this change in our economic mode of living, it will make for a contented nation, not only in Australia, and peace throughout the world.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—This debate affords members an opportunity to make observations on the activities of the past year and discuss projects for the ensuing year. I congratulate you, Mr. President, on again being elected to preside over this Council and I feel sure that as long as you are able to occupy your high office you will have the unanimous support of all members of this Council. We miss the faces of Sir Wallace Sandford and Mr. Hoare from this Chamber. Sir Wallace Sandford gave splendid service to Parliament for many years, and I have no doubt that his work in Parliament and on various committees was very highly regarded by the public. Mr. Hoare, through a disability for some considerable time, was unable to carry out the duties as he would have done with his full health and strength. We also miss the Hon. Frank Condon this session, but I hope that we will soon see him restored to health and occupying his position as Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber.

I join with others in their references to our deceased colleagues in another place. The Hon. A. W. Christian was a personal friend of mine, and I think a friend of everyone that he knew. He was a school teacher at Haslam on the far West Coast before World War I from where he enlisted, and when discharged from the services he was allotted a block of land at Yaninee under the soldier settlement scheme. Soon afterwards he survived a very severe depression and low prices for produce. The manner in which he worked on that property is well known to everyone on Eyre Peninsula. He even built his own house. He carried on his wonderful work until the time of his death. We did not expect to see Mr. Don Michael pass away so early after deciding on medical advice not to contest the last elections. He was an excellent member, who gave great service to

his country both in peace and war. A fact not widely known, even by people who knew him, is that he was decorated in France for bravery. These gentlemen will be missed tremendously from the South Australian Parliament.

His Excellency's Speech was similar to other speeches we have heard on the opening of Parliament. Sir Robert and Lady George have become very popular in this State, and country people appreciate the many visits in which they make personal contact with the people who normally have not the opportunity of meeting them. We are to be fortunate in having another visit from the Duke of Edinburgh, who is to open the Olympic Games in Melbourne, and a right royal welcome will no doubt await him. His visit in 1953 served as a wonderful introduction to the people of Australia, and everyone will be looking forward to his return visit.

Sir Arthur Rymill, who moved the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply, made an excellent speech. I took the opportunity this morning of reading that speech, and one has to read it to fully realize its value. Sir Arthur gave excellent service to South Australia during his period as Lord Mayor of Adelaide, and before that as councillor and alderman, and he naturally is very fitted to make an excellent legislator because of his legal training. We heartily welcome him to this Chamber. I have known Mr. Shard for a considerable time. He has had previous experience in the House of Assembly and therefore Parliament is not new to him. Since he was a member of that House he has occupied most important positions in the Labor Party, and he will no doubt be a great asset and help to his colleagues in the Legislative Council.

There is no doubt a busy time ahead for Ministers and members in implementing all the matters to which His Excellency referred. A great deal of work is to be done in country areas, which is a grand thing. The Government is alive to the importance of country districts, and it is also fully aware of the necessity of expanding services to the highest possible standard. Big waterworks were mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, including the Adelaide water supply and the South Para supply to Elizabeth, and I was particularly pleased to hear of the proposed reticulation of River Murray water from Jamestown to Peterborough. People at Peterborough and Terowie have been asking for water for a very long time, and when this water is extended to these important parts of the northern district I feel sure it will not only give satisfaction to the people who

live there but will greatly increase the productivity of those areas. Reference was also made to the duplication of a large portion of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. It is amazing to me how that pipeline has coped with such a huge demand. I am of the opinion that the whole of that main will have to be duplicated, at least as far as Port Augusta.

The Government is also aware of the strains and stresses involved in the heavy commitments with regard to the carrying out of these schemes, and the money is not readily available. His Excellency referred to the difficult loan position. Interest rates have been increased to make loans attractive to investors, but the money is not forthcoming, and therefore there is the greatest difficulty in finding finance to carry out Government loan works. The population of this State has grown tremendously since the second world war; the percentage increase is second only to that in Western Australia. Last census showed that our population was 797,000, and it is estimated by Mr. Bowden, the Government Statist, that by 1969 it will be 1,000,000. It is also forecast that in 50 years' time, if the world's population continues to rise at the present rate, it will be difficult to feed the people. However, I feel sure that the increase of population will be accompanied by increased production.

It is necessary that agriculture must be boosted. I pay a tribute to the selection of the Hon. G. G. Pearson as Minister of Agriculture. Wonderful work was done by Sir George Jenkins, who was followed by our late colleague, the Hon. A. W. Christian. With their departure there was a position available to the best men offering, and as that portfolio is no doubt due to the other place I claim that the selection of Mr. Pearson was a very wise one. I have known him all his life. He has had a wonderful career, and his services on the Barley Board proved his worth in agriculture to all primary producers. I feel that the Department of Agriculture is going to lose nothing, and will probably gain under the leadership of our new Minister. The Agriculture Department is one of the greatest assets in any country, and particularly in South Australia that department is very active indeed. Agricultural bureaux are the greatest producers' organizations in the world.

His Excellency also made it clear in his speech that primary production is the backbone of our economy. Last season 30,000,000 bushels of wheat were harvested at an average

yield of 18 bushels per acre; 25,000,000 bushels of barley at an average of 25 bushels an acre; and oats, another profitable cereal, also increased in yield. It is well known now that the wheat acreage this year is going to be much less than in previous years. That information is provided by the grader which grades most of the wheat grown in South Australia. The amount graded has not been near the usual amount, which signifies there will be less acreage than usual. The silos are termed "wheat silos" but they should be termed "grain silos" because I feel sure they will be used more for barley than for wheat.

The cereal crops I have referred to have increased, but the fruit crop, to which probably Mr. Story will refer, has been smaller, particularly grapes. I believe that apples, pears and prunes have been up to past years' production, but that there has been a considerable drop in other fruits. The output of lambs and beef has been maintained, and there is a reason for that. The threat of grasshoppers at one stage indicated that most of our feed would be destroyed by the pest, but the manner in which our late Minister of Agriculture attacked this menace is something which should never be forgotten. It cost £150,000 to combat the grasshoppers and prevent the threatened destruction, but that money has been repaid many times. I have never known such a threat to this State as there was last year. The scientists and others who were responsible for the stemming of the destruction are deserving of some recognition.

I was very pleased to note that some effort is to be made to control footrot in sheep. Such a thing is not usually mentioned in a speech at the opening of Parliament. This is one of our worst diseases and one of the most contagious; if it is introduced on to one's farm it remains, and directly sheep are brought in from unaffected areas they become affected by footrot. I believe that this will be overcome in the same way as other diseases have been eradicated. At least producers can rest assured that the Government is tackling these problems honestly and realistically.

There has been much controversy in the press recently regarding the transport of meat from Eyre Peninsula to Adelaide. The lower part of the Peninsula particularly is highly productive of stock. In the past producers have had to produce according to the limited market available to them at the Port Lincoln freezing works. Legislation was passed last year under which a quota was

provided for the metropolitan area demand. Ministerial agreement has been given for a quota of 1,000 carcasses a week and the Transport Control Board has given permission for that number to be carried overland. However, another problem has arisen. The Metropolitan Abattoirs vans are unable to deliver this meat to butchers. The chairman has said that the board is bound to deliver only meat slaughtered at its abattoirs. A Melbourne firm has agreed to undertake the transport of the carcasses right to Melbourne by road if permission is granted. Therefore, it would appear that Eyre Peninsula will have a better market for its stock.

Brief reference was made in the Governor's Speech to the war service land settlement scheme. There are now between 250 and 350 applicants still waiting for land. It was disappointing to me to hear a reply to a question in the House of Assembly that land in the Hundred of Lyrup recommended by the Land Settlement Committee for settlement, and approved by the State Government, was not acceptable to the Commonwealth Government. The ridiculous reply was that the future of markets could not be foreseen and therefore this country could not be developed. The men awaiting allotment were promised land on their return from active service, and it would appear that the Commonwealth departments concerned are not pulling their weight when they refuse to accept for allotment land recommended by a State committee because of what they think the future markets will be. It is to be hoped that the State Government will step in, as it has done in other instances, purchase this land and develop it for the benefit of applicants still awaiting allotment.

In his speech His Excellency mentioned the development of 17,000 acres on Yorke Peninsula and 15,000 acres on Eyre Peninsula. There is some very good land in both these areas, and with their good rainfall I am amazed that they have not been developed before. Practically all settlements under the war service land settlement scheme are successful, but the one at Eight Mile Creek, near Port MacDonnell, is causing some concern. This country is pure peat, and without the higher land allotted on the Chomley estate very few settlers would be left there today. There is no doubt about its future production, but until that land is consolidated it will not produce as other settlements are so soon after allotment.

I am pleased that the Minister of Roads and Railways is to make a visit to Eyre Peninsula



shortly, and I am hoping he will have a good look at the railways as well as the roads during his tour. During his speech Mr. Edmonds referred to a national road policy. I consider that great progress has been made in road construction in South Australia. One often hears it stated by people that they have the worst roads in the State and that nothing has been done for many years, but I have travelled the country and I maintain that wonderful progress has been made. However, some roads were not built for the type of speedy and heavy vehicles now using them.

People engaged in the voluntary fire fighting services are doing a wonderful job, and are to be commended not only for their work, but for meeting many of their out-of-pocket expenses. Many fires were prevented from spreading last year because of their prompt action and because the Government has equipped them to help combat fires. At the last Royal Show many of these men looked forward to demonstrating to the public what they are capable of doing, but their item was the last for the night, ending the show, and practically everyone had left the grounds. Their efforts were hardly recognized. If we are to expect people to volunteer for these services our leading show society should give them better recognition.

The Housing Trust has had another wonderful year of achievement. When speaking to a land owner at Salisbury recently I was amazed to hear him say that he had sold 160 acres for £300 an acre for house building, although I believe some of this land will be occupied by industry. It gives some idea of the importance of this part of the State. The Government is doing an excellent job in keeping pace with the needs of the increasing population. There is not quite such a good picture of the war service homes scheme, because of the lack of finance. Even an approved applicant for a home under this scheme has to wait 15 months before he is given any further consideration. It is to be hoped that more money will be made available by the Commonwealth Government to enable the lag to be caught up. By and large the State Government has done a very good job in providing houses

Tree planting is not very often mentioned during debates in this House, but I desire to refer to the excellent work in this direction being achieved by the Director of the Botanic Gardens (Mr. Lothian). He went with me to Port Lincoln last year to advise a local committee on the planting of trees on an estate. The information he gave was followed and it is paying handsome dividends. He is at Eight

Mile Creek at present investigating whether it is possible for any type of trees to grow there successfully. South Australia has 130,000 acres under afforestation, and this is one of the best wealth-producing schemes in the State. Forests at Jamestown and Bundaleer are making excellent progress. There is no better project for future generations than the planting of trees, particularly in good rainfall areas. The bulk handling authorities are having a terrific task in providing wheat silos.

The Hon K. E. J. Bardolph—The Opposition told you that would happen when the Bill was before the House.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I think everyone knew what the organization was faced with. It is now making good progress, but the Government must provide improved harbour and wharf facilities. The scheme is proving much more costly than was expected.

Sir Arthur Rymill in his speech referred to the difficulty confronting the State's electricity programme because of the proposed increased railway freights of the Commonwealth Government from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta. At one stage it looked as if the future of Leigh Creek was not very bright, but now the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to impose a reasonable freight, and there should be no set-back. Electricity is a particularly valuable amenity to those living in the country, and the number of consumers in these areas was increased by 4,000 this year. Many things can be done with electricity. I was at Hawker and Quorn recently where the people are very disturbed because it is proposed to build a road alongside the railway line to avoid the steep hills, but I hope it does not eventuate. A fair road is already provided from Stirling to Brachina *via* Quorn and Hawker. It is a beautiful drive, and if we are to keep the people in that part of the country satisfied it would be a good idea to give them a better road that way rather than to build a new road alongside the railway.

So far I have confined my remarks mainly to matters concerning my own district, but now I propose to go a little outside it and take the Tramways Trust to task. When the new bus routes were proposed, without any warning the people in some of the northern suburbs who have had a service for 30 years and built their homes around it—and they include many totally and permanently disabled servicemen, pensioners and other aged people with no other means of transport—found themselves stranded. It now costs them 11s. by taxi

to come to Adelaide whereas formerly they could do so for 2s. No service should be taken away from people like that without giving them something in its place. Two petitions have been signed; the first contained about 640 signatures, and a more recent one, which has been presented in another place by the member for Prospect, was signed by over 1,000 people.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—By 1,150.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—People do not sign petitions like that without some reason, and I hope that the trust will see fit to restore some service to them. The paltry excuse given by Mr. Keynes was that the new route is giving satisfaction. It is wrong to leave people stranded without any service. With reference to traffic matters, I have noticed that there have been many prosecutions for driving above the speed limit past schools, but it is not always the fault of the motorist because many of the National Safety Council flags, which are supposed to be red, have faded to a dirty pink. It would be wise to renew the flags more frequently. Moreover, near some schools the flag is displayed on one approach but not on the other. Motorists, particularly those who are strangers to the city, have difficulty in recognizing the flags because they are in such a faded condition, and I put forward the suggestion for their renewal in a constructive way. The *News* and *Mail* lights are a very good thing, but here again there have been complaints that they are not turned off when they should be.

The Savings Bank of South Australia has furnished a wonderful report which conveys to everyone the degree of prosperity of this State. This year deposits have reached the £100,000,000 mark and there are 739,000 people with accounts in the bank, leaving only 60,000 without an account there. That is a wonderful tribute and shows that the people have confidence in the country.

Finally I wish to refer to the question of superphosphate supplies on Eyre Peninsula. There has been little trouble on the mainland to get sufficient, but on Eyre Peninsula many farmers have had to freight superphosphate across the gulf from Wallaroo. I hope that the Cresco Fertilizer Works at Port Lincoln will soon increase, as it has promised to do, its sulphuric acid production. That part of South Australia requires 100,000 tons of superphosphate annually and production is about 63,000 tons only, so it is to be hoped that the sulphuric acid shortage will be overcome on Eyre Peninsula as it has been on the mainland through the establishment of plant at Birkenhead and Port Pirie.

As I said earlier, the primary industries of our State have done exceedingly well with good prices and a series of good seasons. Only 5½ per cent of our population are engaged in primary production and their production is worth £112,500,000 compared with 11 per cent of the people working in industry who produce goods to the value of £100,200,000. That supports the main theme of my debate, namely, that primary production is the very backbone of this country, and I am pleased to be a representative of a primary-producing constituency. I also appreciate the progress made in secondary industries, but the cost of production is so great that I cannot imagine that our manufacturers will be able to compete very favourably with other parts of the world. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Central No. 1)—I am fully conscious and deeply appreciative of the actions of those people who support the Labor Party and who were responsible for returning me to this Chamber. I thank you, Sir, for your very kind welcome back to Parliament House and thank all members of this Chamber who made my return so pleasant. May I add also my thanks to members of another place. I associate myself with the remarks of other members concerning the untimely deaths of Mr. Arthur Christian and Mr. Don Michael. I knew both gentlemen when I was a member of another place and, although our politics were naturally often very wide apart, I grew to respect their views. The State has lost two gentlemen who did a remarkable amount of good for the community. The tragic circumstances in connection with the death of Mr. Christian bring home to one the fact that one can do in an honorary capacity a great deal to one's own detriment with little appreciation by the community. I too offer my sympathies to the bereaved families.

If I have had one disappointment on my return to Parliament it is that my beloved friend and colleague, Frank Condon, has not been with us to enjoy the opening of this session. His absence has been a great loss to me because I have grown to respect his wisdom and advice so freely given. I trust that he will be speedily restored to good health, and take his place with us once again.

I do not have to go past the fourth paragraph of His Excellency's Speech to find a theme for my remarks this afternoon. Paragraph 3 says:—

During the present financial year the economic position of South Australia has remained sound and we have been less affected by the inflation of recent times than Australia as a whole. Since August 1953, the rise in the

cost of living in this State, as indicated by the C series index, has been about 16 per cent less than the rise throughout Australia.

Paragraph 4 commences:—"Notwithstanding the prosperity enjoyed by our citizens." Nowhere in the speech do we find reference to the people who are mainly carrying the burden of this alleged prosperity. Since August, 1953, when the automatic cost of living adjustments were suspended, there has been gradually but assuredly, a decrease in the standard of living of the community, and I hope this afternoon to prove conclusively that the workers in industry are carrying more than their fair share of the burden in order to bring about that stability for which the Government claims the total credit. It is interesting to note just how long there have been automatic adjustments in this country. I am quoting from the Labor Report of 1953. What was known as the A series index, covering food, groceries and house rents, was first compiled in 1912 with the year 1911 as the base. It was discontinued from 1938, but from 1913 to 1933 this index was used for wage adjustment purposes by the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. The "C" Series index, which included food and groceries, rent of a four- or five-roomed house, clothing, household drapery, fuel, lighting, fares, tobacco, and some miscellaneous items, was first compiled in 1921 and published at quarterly intervals from June, 1922. It was used by the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration for the purposes of quarterly adjustments from May, 1934, to August, 1953, so that we can say we have had some "C" Series index and adjustments from 1913 to 1953, a period of 40 years. Then, by a stroke of the pen, the Arbitration Court suspended the quarterly adjustments of the basic wage. I say that they did it quite deliberately in accordance with the Federal Government's policy of keeping wages at a given level. At the time wages were pegged it was said that prices would remain stationary, but despite that they have continued to rise.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Would the increase in margins have some bearing on that?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—It may have, but irrespective of the increase in margins the cost of living has continued to rise, and the automatic increases which the people of the Commonwealth had enjoyed for approximately 40 years have been denied them. I have made some research into what this is costing the

community, and if we have a look at the Commonwealth as a whole the figures are very interesting. I have made a schedule showing the "C" Series in five columns under the headings of Federal pegged basic wage of 1953, "C" Series Index March 31, 1956, the amount below "C" Series figures at March 31, 1956, the State living wage in the various States, and the amount employees under State awards receive weekly over the pegged Federal basic wage. In the case of Sydney, the pegged basic wage is £12 3s. Had increases been continued it would have been £12 16s. at March 31 this year, which means that the people of New South Wales, and Sydney in particular, are 13s. a week down on their cost of living benefits. Melbourne is £11 15s. in 1953, and £12 16s. would have been the figure if adjustments had been continued. That means they are £1 1s. below what they should be. Brisbane has a pegged basic wage of £10 18s., and £11 13s. would have been the figure at March this year, so they are 15s. below. The Adelaide pegged figure is £11 11s. The "C" Series Index figure at March this year would have been £12 6s., so Adelaide is 15s. a week below. In Perth and Fremantle the pegged basic wage is £11 16s. The figure would have been £13 8s. at March of this year, so they are £1 12s. below. The Hobart pegged wage is £12 2s., and the "C" Series Index figure at March of this year would have been £13 8s., so they are £1 6s. below.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Have you any figures showing the people who are receiving that basic wage?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Yes, and I will give them later. People under State awards in New South Wales at the end of March this year were receiving £12 15s., or 12s. a week more than people under Federal awards, and were only 1s. down on the correct wage. I believe it takes a little time to be corrected, and it would be logical to assume that it is now equal. The Melbourne State living wage is £12 11s., so they are 16s. better off than people under the Federal basic wage. There again I think it takes a little time to get to the proper level, and that would make it £1 1s. Brisbane State living wage is £11 9s., which means that employees under State awards are 11s. above those under Federal awards. The State living wage in South Australia is £11 11s., and the benefit to State employees over Federal employees is nil. Perth and Fremantle have a State living wage of £12 13s. 8d., so that the advantage to State employees over Federal employees is 17s. 8d. The State living wage in Hobart

is £12 19s., and the State employees have an advantage of 17s. over those under Federal awards.

When we consider those figures it is easy to see why conditions in this State have remained somewhat stationary. It is obvious that the workers are carrying the burden, and that is one of the reasons why the increase in the cost of living, as claimed in the Governor's Speech, has risen so slightly compared with other States. In the bulletin issued by the Department of Labour and National Service for March 1956 there is an article which shows the percentage of people in each State under Federal and State awards. According to the bulletin there are 161,700 males employed in South Australia. Of that total 13.1 per cent are not covered by any awards, 57.1 per cent are covered by Commonwealth awards, and 29.8 per cent by State awards. The bulletin also shows that there are 47,400 females employed in South Australia. Of that total 13.8 per cent are not covered by any awards, 31.9 per cent are covered by Commonwealth awards and 54.3 per cent by State awards.

The figures disclose that the employees of this State are being denied their just rights through the Government's decision to abolish State basic wage increases. If my figures are correct, and I believe they are, there are 48,000 male employees under State awards who are being denied 15s. a week cost of living increases, which would total £37,500 a week. There are 24,000 female employees under State awards or determinations who are being denied 11s. 3d. a week, which would total £13,500 per week. Adding the two amounts together we find that the employees under State awards are losing, through cost of living increases being denied them, a total of £51,000 a week.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Does that apply only to this State?

The Hon A. J. SHARD—Yes, in the main. It amounts to a total of £2,652,000 a year. If anybody is carrying more than a fair share of the burden of the alleged stability in this State I say quite candidly it is the employee in industry. Those figures are indisputable. They are prepared by the Statistical Department of the Commonwealth of Australia, and we accept them. I have never been wholly satisfied with the C series Index. The system should be overhauled, and there should be less secrecy about it. I say that because I have been unable, in my inquiries, to find out exactly what constitutes the C Series Index. I am not a believer in anything which is secret.

The figures show that about 30 per cent of the population of South Australia are working under State awards, and they are losing more than £2,000,000 each year. If we add to that the 57 per cent of the people in this State working under Federal awards the total figure the workers are being denied would be about £7,500,000 a year. Is it any wonder that business in this city is not what it used to be? If we continue in this way with the cost of living going up and the basic wage remaining the same, we cannot do anything else but stagnate and go down instead of making the progress we should make.

Employers in this State have an advantage over employers in other States. We would not be at any great disadvantage compared with other States, because our percentage of male employees under State awards is 29.8 per cent, which compares very favourably with other States. In New South Wales there are 45.4 per cent of their total male employees under State awards; in Victoria there are 27.4 per cent, in Queensland 73.5 per cent, in Western Australia 77.1 per cent and in Tasmania 31.7 per cent. That means that South Australia has the second lowest percentage of people under State awards. We would not be at any disadvantage compared with the other States if the Government's policy was, as in the other States, to adopt a State living wage which was somewhere near the vicinity of the actual cost of living. Many members in this House and business people are quite happy at having the basic wage pegged, but they are loud in their condemnation of price control. If it is fair that the producers of goods should have their wages pegged it is equally fair that the price of the products they produce should be pegged. Business people should not be allowed to get more than their fair share of profits. I cannot understand how any honourable member or any business man can agree with his conscience if he says that the basic wage should be pegged while at the same time he should be entitled to get what he wants in the way of profits. I am not opposed to the application of supply and demand as regards wages and profits, but if it is correct on the one hand, let us have it on the other hand. When labour is short the worker should have the right to get from industry as much as he desires, and if he is not entitled to that Parliament should say to businessmen, "You are not entitled to take more than your fair share as a result of the efforts of the workers."

A decision will be given in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court on Friday on the

recent application of the A.C.T.U. for a review of the basic wage, restoration of quarterly automatic adjustments under the C series index, and something in addition as a prosperity allowance. I will not attempt to tell members what I think the decision will be, but if there is any essence of fairness and justice left in the court its decision should be an increase of no less than 15s. a week in the South Australian basic wage, in accordance with the increase in the C series index figures, and in addition there should be an increase to equate the loss that employees have suffered since wages were pegged in August, 1953. If the decision takes the line of decisions of the State Industrial Court when fixing a living wage, an additional figure should be added in anticipation of further increases in the cost of living. One can but await the Federal Court's decision.

I have been associated with State industrial tribunals in South Australia for about 20 years, and consider that our wages board system is the best in the Commonwealth. It is free and easy and separated from any legal entanglements. Representatives of employers and employees meet around the table with an independent chairman and iron out their difficulties. The union with which I am associated has over the past 20 years had vast improvements made in working conditions and rates of pay as a result of wages board decisions. There have been various chairmen over that period and, with one exception, the same chairman has been re-appointed each time he has been available. We had a difference of opinion on the last occasion, not because of anything the chairman had done, but because a previous chairman, in the employees' opinion, had the right to his old job which he vacated on leaving for a world tour. The employers were quite happy with the chairman who was substituted. I cannot see that because one chairman leaves to make a world tour, on this occasion mainly for health reasons, that he should be denied the right to his old position when he returns. The chairman we disagreed about was not re-appointed. He made a personal call on me and said had he known the position he would not have been an applicant for the job. The chairman who was deposed had made only one decision on our board, and I was not dissatisfied with it. On closer examination, I think we gained 2s. 6d. a week more than we were possibly entitled to. I have no quarrel on that score. I have known the chairmen of a number of wages boards. They do a remarkable job. The trades union movement has complete faith in the chairmen of the various

wages boards, and there are very few occasions on which a union desires to have a chairman's decision changed. They do these duties outside their ordinary business hours, and often at great inconvenience.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Supposing it had gone the other way.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Over the 20 years my union has never appealed against the chairman's decision. Quite early in my experience as a union secretary I realized that we had much more hope of getting a fairer and more humane deal from the chairman than from the President of the Industrial Court. Had the decision for a 2s. 6d. a week increase gone against us, we would have filed a requisition for another meeting of the board, and in our logical way would have pointed out to the chairman that he had made a mistake and the chairman in his honesty of purpose would have corrected his decision and that has often been done.

It has been my experience with the other wing of our industrial movement—the State Industrial Court—that its prestige and standing with the trade union movement have consistently and slowly deteriorated over the last 20 years. We do not think it is properly constituted. It is not right for any one individual, irrespective of who it is, to be in the position of where he hears an application for an award and makes a decision which cannot be appealed against in some other place. The Industrial Court over the years has made one or two very obvious wrong decisions, and there has been no way of correcting them other than by an appeal from Caesar to Caesar in the form of a new application, which has not always been successful. One case in which an obvious wrong was done was a decision on the application for an award for female clerks. Notwithstanding that at the time the Commonwealth Court had decided that females under its jurisdiction should receive 75 per cent of the male basic wage, plus 75 per cent of the margin, the Industrial Court on this occasion fixed the percentages at 60 per cent. The only way that an attempt could be made to correct that was by a fresh application by the union, and the only reason that could be done at that time was we had a deputy President as well as a President of the court. A further application was made to what was called the Full Court, constituted of the President and the Deputy President. Let it be said to the credit of the person who made the wrong decision that when the case was re-heard at the request of

the United Trades and Labour Council, acting on behalf of the whole trade union movement, the error was corrected; but as the court is constituted today I have very grave doubts that such a procedure would prove successful. The court should be constituted as a commission with the President as chairman and a layman representative of the employers and another of employees, somewhat similar to the constitution of the Board of Industry. I think that then the possibilities of obvious mistakes being made would be considerably lessened.

I had the honour and privilege to be a member of the Board of Industry for about six years. On this board there are two representatives of employers and two of employees, with the President of the Industrial Court as chairman. I have heard cases put forward by the President, and despite the fact that what he said might be quite contrary to what one party thought at the beginning, on numerous occasions the board arrived at a unanimous decision by discussion as a group instead of one person being in complete control and arriving at a decision. If the Industrial Court was so constituted it would give improved service, create a better feeling and help to keep peace within industry.

The Minister of Industry has already heard my views on wages boards. I think that the chairmen of these boards are considerably underpaid. In 1955, with Mr. Bevan and the president of the Trades and Labor Council, I waited on the Minister with a request that the rates of pay of members of boards and the chairmen should be increased. The fees were increased from 15s. to £1 a sitting for members and from £1 to £1 5s. for chairmen. I have no great quarrel with the fees paid to members of the board, although I think they are underpaid. The fee is quite all right for the trade union secretary who is a member of the board because he works in the city, but for his colleagues who sometimes have to lose work and take a taxi to attend the meetings £1 is not sufficient. The chairman's fee of £1 5s. will not bear investigation. A regulation was published on March 6, 1952 reaffirming the regulation of November 25, 1948, fixing the rate of the chairman's pay in these terms:—

4. (1) The chairman of each industrial board shall be paid—

- (a) a retaining fee at the rate of £10 per annum payable quarterly; and
- (b) an attendance fee of £1 for each meeting of the board at which he attends.

(2) At the end of each financial year the total amount paid or payable to the chairman for retaining fee and attendance fees during

that financial year shall be ascertained and shall be divided by the number of meetings attended by him. If the product of such division is less than £2 2s. then the chairman shall be paid such additional sum as will be sufficient, when added to the retaining fee and attendance fees paid or payable, to produce when divided as aforesaid a product of £2 2s. If the same person is chairman of more than one industrial board then the calculation and adjustment provided for in this subparagraph shall be made upon the total sum received by him during the financial year for retaining fees and attendance fees in respect of all the boards of which he is chairman.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—How long do these boards usually sit?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Some sit for an hour, some an hour and a half and some for three hours. I think the Minister will agree that the majority of members, because of the small fee, refuse to sit more than one hour or thereabouts. I have been at meetings that have lasted from 5 o'clock until 7.45 p.m. On the other hand, I have attended some that began at 5 and finished at 5.15 p.m. I believe that the Abattoirs Board averaged sittings of 2½ hours for about 33 meetings. Men who have to give up two or three evenings a week should be adequately paid. I suggest that, taking present day money values alone, if a retaining fee of £10 was right in 1948 it should be £20 today, and the two guineas should be raised to three. As the determinations of the Wages Boards affect, in round figures, at least one-third of the population, I contend that the chairman of the board is doing a magnificent job on behalf of the community and he should not be underpaid. I trust that my words will not fall on deaf ears and that the Government will examine this question again.

My remarks apply somewhat to the members of the Board of Industry. The board recently made a request for an increase in fees—a situation which should never have been allowed to come about. The president of the board brought the matter forward; members discussed it, and they thought that three guineas for a half-day sitting would be a fair remuneration, but the Minister and Cabinet decided on two and a half guineas. The board wrote a second letter to the Minister and again met with a refusal. I hope that I am not giving away secrets, but I know that each member of the Board of Industry was disappointed, and the president said that we were not being adequately paid. The representatives of the employers said that they would not ask an officer of their association to undertake duties in their office with the

same responsibility as that of members of the board for the same fee. If people are asked to do this work in the interests of the community—and in the main they are doing a satisfactory job—they should be adequately paid.

I conclude on the industrial situation by touching on the industrial relationship between employer and employee. That between the trade union movement and the employers is, in the main, on a very good level, and the relationship between the trade union movement and the Chamber of Manufactures is on the highest plane. Quite contrary to the belief of many people—and I hope that members here have a different view—the task of the Trades and Labor Council Disputes Committee is to settle industrial disputes and not create them. Members would be surprised if a record could be given of the number of industrial disputes that are prevented by the parties getting together for discussions before actual disputes take place. However, there are some disputes which should never happen, and unfortunately there are faults on both sides. What I want to mention mainly is the tragedy that the same set of circumstances do not exist in respect of Government departments and semi-governmental institutions. We have only to consider the dispute at the Metropolitan Abattoirs last year. That was brought about in our opinion—and I am firmly convinced of it—by a direction given by one of two, or both, Cabinet Ministers to the Abattoirs Board. After the dispute had been in progress for some time the two men who issued the first ultimatum withdrew their direction to the board.

If there were a complaint about the actions of the employees would it not have been better to get around the table and discuss it before giving a direction which became the cause of the dispute. Again, there was the dispute in December last at the Nangwarry timber mills which should never have occurred. The secretary of the union concerned saw an officer of the Department of Industry in mid-October and put all his cards on the table. He was informed that the points at issue would be investigated and that he would be given a decision. However, nothing more was heard during October or the whole of November. The secretary got in touch with the officer in early December and informed him that if the men did not get a decision by Wednesday, December 7, they would stop work, and he asked whether the officer would visit Nangwarry before that date and make

a decision on the spot. He was told quite frankly by the officer concerned that under no circumstances could he visit Nangwarry until December 15 or 16. The dispute was then placed in the hands of the Disputes Committee of the Trades and Labor Council, and I asked the officer concerned whether the facts as related to me were correct. He said they were, and I informed him that the men had stopped work despite the fact that he had said they would never have the courage to do so. I told him that I realized he could not go to Nangwarry on December 8, but that there was nothing more important in his job that could prevent his going on Friday December 9. I knew that he was committed to another industrial inquiry in another country town on the Thursday, but I told him that if he was not prepared to go down on the Friday we would have another look at the question and if we made a public statement somebody would get into trouble. He told me that he would discuss the matter with his superior officer and telephone me. He did so and said that if the men went back to work he would go down on the Friday. I told him that he could take it that we would direct the men to go back and they commenced work on the Thursday. We flew down on the Friday and had discussions with the men's representatives. Three points were at issue and two were settled around the table. On the third there was a difference of opinion on which I was not competent to express any views. I suggested that they should have a private arbitrator who would make an inspection and give a decision. The two points already agreed on favoured the union, and the private arbitrator gave a decision in favour of the union on the third. My point is that if the officer had not neglected to do anything for six or seven weeks, that dispute, which caused a lot of inconvenience to the people at Nangwarry—and was responsible for 300 members of another union unnecessarily losing a day's work and pay—would not have occurred. It caused hardship, because perishable goods had to be transported from Nangwarry to Mount Gambier in order to save them. Those things had to be done, and it is not good enough for Government departments to adopt attitudes such as that.

With regard to the recent dispute at Port Augusta, a meeting of the men was held on April 26 when they complained about allowances for dirty work. They had another meeting on Friday, May 4. After the meeting in April they contacted the trust, and trust officials made an inspection and said that it would

have to be referred to a meeting of the trust. The men said that if they did not get an answer by May 4, they would stop work. When it was ascertained that the meeting of the trust's board would not be held until May 7, the unions agreed to order the men to continue until Thursday, May 9. At the meeting of the trust on May 7, the board adjourned discussion on the question, and did not arrive at a decision despite what the men had told them. The board said that they would discuss it again and reach a decision on May 21. A *prima facie* case was made out in favour of the men before they stopped work, and I want to know who the trust think they are, that they can politely adjourn for a fortnight without reaching a decision on a question which affects the whole community? A statement appeared in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday, May 16, as follows:—

The general manager of the Electricity Trust (Mr. C. R. S. Colyer) said yesterday that the trust had reached a decision on a claim for dirt money payments at the Port Augusta powerhouse. The decision would be conveyed to the men when they returned to work.

The men were on strike. Has the community to await the convenience of the Electricity Trust, who are paid with public money and working in the interests of the community, until their usual meeting date, to bring about a settlement in a dispute?

The dispute was referred to the Trades and Labour Council last Wednesday. Let it be said to the credit of the Disputes Committee that within 48 hours they had the dispute at least partially settled, and the men returned to work. Yet the trust has the audacity to make a public statement that they will wait a fortnight before they will announce their decision. These semi-governmental bodies and officers of industrial departments should realize it is 1956 and act accordingly, and not remain in the horse and buggy days. Men in industry today have their labour to sell, and if there are any complaints they have the right to bring them to the notice of employers forthwith. It is the duty of the people in control to examine the dispute as quickly as possible and reach a decision with a view to keeping industry going.

I want to touch briefly on our Industrial Code, which has outlived its usefulness. It has been in operation, in the main, since 1920, but it is not in keeping with current times. Copies of regulations under the Code cannot be secured, and it would be a work of art for any person, except possibly people in the Minister of Industry's Department, to make it readable

and produce all the regulations. It needs some corrections, and one which readily comes to mind is in connection with appointments to wages boards. An obvious error was made a year or two ago in the appointment of a member to the Pharmaceutical Chemists Board. A deputation met the Premier, who was then Minister of Industry, and it was felt that the Premier realized that an obvious mistake had been made. He pointed out, however, that under section 147a(2) he had no alternative other than to appoint the person concerned. That section reads:—

(2) The Minister shall, upon receipt of the said notice, publish in the *Gazette* a notice setting out the names and addresses of the additional members, and upon publication of the notice the members shall be deemed to be duly appointed to the board.

I submit, with the greatest respect, that the word "shall" should be altered to "may," so that we have an opportunity of at least correcting an obvious error. It was obvious to all concerned that that person should not have been appointed at that time.

There are other just as obvious amendments necessary to bring the Industrial Code up to the standard which it should be, in keeping with the industrial relations between employer and employee. The Chamber of Manufactures has suggested that a combined committee of their people and the trade union movement could be appointed to see whether unanimity could be reached on some amendments. The chamber feels, as I do, that it is time the Code had a serious overhaul. I suggest that the Minister should consider what I have said, and perhaps a committee of Government officials or members of Parliament could be formed with the idea of giving effect to the wishes of employers and employees to bring the Code into line with present-day conditions.

I come to the question of long service leave, which is another benefit enjoyed by the vast majority of employees in Australia but not by employees in this State. Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania have made the way possible, through legislation, for employees in industry to have the benefits of long service leave. The Western Australian Parliament, if it is not doing so already, will be dealing with it in the very near future. South Australia will then be the only State in the Commonwealth where employees do not receive long service leave. The position is aggravated by the fact that over the years the Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Industry, has always given the assurance that he would not have his employees



in South Australia at any disadvantage compared with the majority of employees in other States. Indeed, on more than one occasion when we supplied facts and figures to prove that employees in various departments were at a disadvantage compared with other States, the Premier, to his credit, readily granted our requests; but when we come to the big items such as the basic wage and long service leave he turns a deaf ear to our requests. It does not add to the prestige of the Government or the Premier himself, as a leading personality in public life, if he is not prepared to give effect to his word to representatives of the employees.

I add a little to what Mr. Wilson said in connection with the tramways' bus service to Broadview. There has been a bus service on the Broadview route for 30 years, to my knowledge, and it was originally carried on by a private operator. It must have become a good paying route, because it was one of the first taken over by the Tramways Trust. Quite a number of people chose that locality and bought homes there because of a bus service being in close proximity. Suddenly, without any warning, the bus route was changed. If it could have been changed without undue inconvenience to residents they would have had nothing to complain about, but the only new ground the bus now covers consists of two stops. It could have been continued along the old route, connecting up with the Walkerville tramline at the Buckingham Arms Hotel, and it would have caused no inconvenience to people along the two new bus stops. Actually only one stop is affected. The stop north of the North-East Road in Galway Avenue is one stop short of the section. The vast majority nearby walk to the stop to save the fare for an additional section. Other people further along Galway Avenue could quite easily walk to Collingrove Avenue and not be inconvenienced. Despite the requests of citizens in that area the trust refuses to listen. Without any great effort people behind this proposal received 1,125 signatures to a petition requesting the trust to reconsider its decision. I hope it will be more humane in its attitude and give the residents some relief.

If the traffic position in King William Road and King William Street was not so dangerous and serious it would be almost funny. From Waymouth Street to North Terrace in peak periods motorists are not permitted to make a right hand turn at intersections, and with this I agree, and yet they are permitted to make a U turn between intersections, which is decidedly wrong. I do not know whether

this Parliament or the Adelaide City Council is responsible, but if it is Parliament's duty to correct that wrong I hope it will do so at the first opportunity.

Then there is the turning by motorists against the red light in King William Street. If the law relating to the turning against red lights was given effect to, as it was intended to be used, there would be nothing wrong with it, but unfortunately some motorists, and they are not all taxi drivers, make the turn against the red lights to the great discomfiture of pedestrians crossing with the green light. I have seen policemen view these incidents without taking any action. I am not criticizing them, because I have the highest respect for our police, who do a magnificent job. If there were one or two prosecutions against those who deliberately force their way through pedestrian traffic, the position would possibly be as intended.

Just outside Parliament House on King William Road buses are allowed to make a U turn; that should not be allowed. Last Tuesday night on leaving the House I noticed a policeman at the northern end of the building directing the traffic to enable a bus to complete the U turn. The traffic travelling north and south was held up. That is wrong. What happens in North Terrace opposite the railway station is also wrong. If it could be arranged for buses to continue straight through, the position would be improved. If it could not be arranged for buses to travel direct through the main streets from one route to another I suggest that the buses travelling from Glenelg should turn into either Waymouth, Grote or Gouger Street from West Terrace and on the return trip they would then have left turns into King William Street and North Terrace back to Glenelg. They would not cross any traffic except with the right hand turn into the three streets mentioned.

If it is not possible to arrange for through traffic as suggested, for buses from the northern suburbs, a far better procedure would be for them to continue south along King William Street to Victoria Square, encircle the square and travel back through King William Street. Some might say that this would overcrowd our main thoroughfare. Possibly it might under present conditions, but sooner or later, irrespective of what business people think of how it might affect them, parking in King William Street, particularly during the peak periods, will have to be prohibited. Then there could be a proper flow of traffic. I have already told the Adelaide City Council at a deputation to its traffic committee my views

on this question. It would not be any great hardship on the business people, because what I have suggested is done in Swanston Street, Melbourne. A person is permitted to stop only sufficiently long to pick up or drop passengers. No parking of vehicles is permitted, except before 9 a.m. for unloading goods. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WALLAROO BULK WHEAT BIN.

The PRESIDENT laid on the Table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Wallaroo bulk wheat bin, together with minutes of evidence.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, May 23, at 2 p.m.