

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, July 30, 1958.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 29. Page 175.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1).—I am pleased to see you back in the Chair, Mr. President, and hope you have completely recovered in health. I compliment Sir Frank Perry and Sir Collier Cudmore, who occupied the Chair during your absence with the same dignity and prestige you display. I was not called to order once, which in itself speaks well. I join with other honourable members in expressing regret at the passing of Sir Wallace Sandford. I entered this Chamber in the latter part of 1951 and until his retirement in 1956 I came to know Sir Wallace Sandford as a gentleman and one who at all times was willing to assist anybody at any time. I express my condolence to his family at his untimely death.

I also regret that some honourable members have decided not to seek re-election next year. When any honourable member decides to retire from public life one feels a tinge of regret. I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion and other honourable members who have contributed to the debate. Although I do not agree with all that has been said, the speeches were excellent and since I have been a member I do not remember a finer standard of debate. I hope my small contribution will be in the same category.

However, I will criticise portion of the remarks of Sir Collier Cudmore, Mr. Story, and Mr. Anthoney which were on the border of stampede. Apparently these members sense defeat at the next State elections in March. Labor is getting too close to obtaining a majority for the peace of mind of the Government members, especially when one remembers the recent by-election at Mount Gambier. This became apparent to me because of the hostility shown on July 1 in a statement made by the Honourable H. Holt, a Federal Minister, when he attacked the A.C.T.U. and the A.L.P. for reviving the Federal Labor Advisory Committee on industrial affairs which was dissolved in 1951. No-one knows better than Mr. Holt that when the A.C.T.U. and the Labor Party get closer together it will mean the end of his Government. He and some

others feel that at all costs a wedge must be driven between the two movements. He has tried very hard to do this, as is evidenced by his statement. It was a reply to a conference which had taken place between the Federal branch of the A.L.P. and officers of the A.C.T.U. In that statement were definite threats. The statement is as follows:—

No political Party has a monopoly of support by trade unionists. The present Commonwealth Government has obviously received the votes of a considerable portion of trade unionists and their dependants throughout its period of office.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—That would be true, wouldn't it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It is true; I do not attempt to deny it. We can go back to 1949 when a promise of a couple of gallons of petrol was made, and that is when the Commonwealth Government first began to get any support from trade unionists. The Menzies Government attained power in 1949 and carried out its promise to remove petrol rationing, but the upshot was that the oil companies were immediately forced to ration petrol because supplies were not available, and we were then a lot worse off than we had been previously.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—You haven't a very good memory.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I have an excellent memory. As a trade union official I had received an allocation of 30 gallons a month under petrol rationing, but under the rationing imposed by the oil companies all I could get from my supplier was two gallons a week. Needless to say, after going to the one supplier for a number of years I changed over to where I could get a little bit more.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Thirty gallons was plenty.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—That was an issue to me because of the position I held as a trade union official doing organizing work throughout the State, and to get it I had to prove that I had a right to it and that it would be used. In fact, it often happened that I applied for an extra issue to carry me over from time to time, and I always received it. When that petrol rationing was lifted I was able to get only two gallons a week under the rationing imposed by the oil companies, and that was barely enough to get me to and from my place of employment.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Your experience as a trade unionist was that other trade unionists did not vote Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The statement that I referred to continues:—

The Australian Council of Trade Unions expects Governments to give careful and sympathetic consideration to its views at all times. It looks to Governments to encourage new settlers and others to join the trade union appropriate to their occupation. Does it expect us to build up the strength of the trade union movement in this and other ways if it declares itself committed to removing us from office?

If that is not a threat, I do not know what is. That is where the stampede started. Statements which have been made since flow from that and encourage the statements which we have heard lately. A link has been suggested between the trade union movement and the Australian Labor Party, and various references have been made along those lines in this debate. Nobody has ever heard of the suggestion that the trade union movement should be dissociated from the political movement, because it is part and parcel of the political movement in all British countries. In Great Britain, New Zealand, and any other British dominion you will find that the trade union movement and the political movement are linked.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Linked but not controlled.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It is not controlled here. The trade union movement does not control the Australian Labor Party, and proof of that is the formation of the committee to which I am referring. If the Australian Labor Party is controlled by the trade union movement, what would be the point of formulating a committee of both bodies for the purpose of a unified effort for the protection of the people those bodies claim to protect, namely, the working class people themselves. I remind members that the birth of the Australian Labor Party in Australia was from the trade union movement, and was for the specific purpose of getting political protection and the enactment of political legislation for the protection of working people. Surely it is not necessary for me to have to refresh members' memories on that point. Working people in those days worked under the old master and servant conditions, under which the servant was at all times subservient to his master. That is what brought the Australian Labor Party about, and there has been a very close liaison between the two bodies ever since. It is apparent that at least one member of the Commonwealth Parliament would divide this tomorrow and have us enact similar conditions to those obtaining in

America, where the trade union movement is aloof from any political Party and uses its combined strength as a bargaining factor when elections are drawing near; it bargains with the various political Parties, and then supports the one from which it can extract the most promises in regard to industrial legislation and conditions.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—If it is such a benign body, why do you compel people to join it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Nobody is compelled to join. The Liberal and Country League goes out of its way to point out to New Australians who have just arrived that it is a free country and that there is no compulsion on them to join any union.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—You know that is not right.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I say that it is right.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Except in New South Wales.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I have to admit that New South Wales has recently enacted legislation which makes unionism compulsory, but I am denying that the trade union movement compels people to join a union. Political action has been taken in New South Wales whereby every person must be a member of a union.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Would you advocate that here?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The policy of the Labor Party is preference to unionists, and I support that, but that is vastly different from compulsory unionism.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Oh no.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I say it is. What does preference to unionists mean?

The Hon. E. Anthoney—It means you can get a job only if you are a unionist.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It means that if two people are in competition for employment in a particular trade and one is a member of a union and the other is not, all other things being equal, preference shall be given to the unionist. That is not compulsion.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—What unions have you been associated with?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—My first union was the Liquor Trades Union which I joined at the age of 16.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Do they work on those lines?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—They work on a voluntary basis of unionism. The unionists

have no preference so far as the Liquor Trades Union is concerned. Let the honourable member give me an instance of it. If honourable members want a history of the unions of which I have been a member, I will go into it. For approximately seven years I was a member of the A.W.U., when I travelled over the northern parts of the State.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Was that compulsory?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am trying to point out that there is no compulsory unionism. If we say that persons employed here should be members of our organization because they are doing their work, that is not compulsory unionism.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—The honourable member is just playing with words.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am not. The honourable members say we have compulsory unionism here; I say we have not; there is no semblance of it. The unions would be 100 per cent better off than they are now if they did. The organization of which I was the general secretary until I entered this Chamber would have had a membership equal perhaps in this State to the present A.W.U. membership but because the membership of my organization was voluntary, it was infinitesimal in number by comparison.

It has been intimated that we have compulsory unionism in this State, but we have not. Some people think that if it were possible to drive a wedge between the two movements and split them, taking the trade union movement away from the A.L.P., then they would have achieved something. As I say, if he could have achieved his ambitions of putting us back to the American position, nobody would have been more pleased than Mr. Holt.

Our present position commenced with those statements. We have heard much about the economic position of South Australia, what a great State we are and how the Government is responsible for it. It has been claimed by the State Government that we have enjoyed great prosperity for many years, but other States too have enjoyed this so-called prosperity for some time, and there are both brands of government in those States. In Queensland, for instance, until two years ago, and in New South Wales, a Labor Government has been in power for a number of years, so the prosperity of those States, if the claim by our State Government is correct, must be due also to those Governments.

Our prosperity is due wholly to the prices obtained over practically the whole range of

the exports of primary products, especially wool. If these prices collapse, then this State will collapse because we all know that, despite the industrial progress over a number of years, we are still a primary-producing State. It is interesting to note the statistics in this regard. I will refer briefly to the last available statistics, for 1956, when Australia supplied to Western Europe 1,056,000,000 lb. of wool, and to America 42,000,000 lb. of wool. The American wool cheque to Australia for the 1956 season was 45,000,000 dollars, but the complete wool cheque which came to Australia itself would represent a vast sum from America and other countries.

It cannot be claimed by any Government that it is responsible for our present economic position. I interjected when Mr. Anthoney yesterday was pointing these things out to us and said that surely he was not suggesting that the Government was responsible for the good seasons enjoyed by us over the past 10 years. It appeared to me that he was.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—I gave credit to Divine Providence.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yes, I believe you did. We are always told in this Chamber that there is no unemployment, that things are booming, that high wages are being paid, that there is any amount of work—in fact, that our standards of living are second to none. Mr. Anthoney referred to these things yesterday, but I queried his figures. He said that 1,366 persons were on unemployment relief in this State. I take it that he meant that 1,366 people were unemployed in South Australia. I said something about “as long as your figures are facts,” and he said these were facts.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—They were facts as far as I could ascertain them.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Let me give honourable members the true unemployment position. The registered number of unemployed in South Australia to June 30, 1958, was 3,548 males and 1,534 females, totalling 5,082—a much bigger figure than 1,366 cited by the honourable member.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—How many were on unemployment relief?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—There were 1,594 males and 673 females. From time to time Labor members in this Chamber have pointed out that they do not always get correct unemployment figures and that is borne out by my figures.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Where did you get them?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—They are the latest figures from the Commonwealth Unemployment Bureau in Currie Street of persons registered as unemployed, and I challenge any member to prove that they are not authentic. I got the information today.

The Hon. C. R. Story—Is it for the whole of South Australia?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yes.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—I referred to unemployment benefits only.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The honourable member said he intended to show the number of unemployed in South Australia.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—No, only those on relief.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The press reported that Mr. Anthoney gave this information, and readers of *Hansard* will see it, but because it was not qualified people will gain the impression that we have only 1,366 unemployed. I knew yesterday Mr. Anthoney's figures were wrong and that prompted my interjection.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Your figures may be incorrect in a week's time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—That may be so, but they have not altered between yesterday afternoon and the present.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—You should be ashamed of your statement.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I make no apology for it and if the information was available to me yesterday it was also available to the honourable member. I always try to make authentic statements and not to mislead people. When I speak I always try to give facts and correct figures. We should not make incorrect statements. The issue of the *M.T.P.A. Gazette* for Saturday, July 26, 1958, shows that, from information supplied by local courts, between July 10 and July 22, unsatisfied judgment summonses numbering 875 were taken out against people who had failed to meet their commitments. I suggest that most of the 875 would be workers whose economic position is such that their commitments cannot be met. Over the same period about 12 months ago there would not have been action against 875 people. Our economic position is not so buoyant as we are led to believe. Sir Collier Cudmore referred to our so-called prosperity and gave the credit to the Liberal and Country League Government when he said:—

All this advancement and prosperity in this State has happened in spite of a world war and, in case my honourable friends on my left overlooked it, I point out that during this

time of progress and prosperity we have enjoyed the privilege of a Liberal and Country Party Government.

I will show that we are not so prosperous as we are told. We shall soon have an election in this State and as the economic and the political positions are not so good for the Government there is much propaganda about the Government's success, which further pulls the wool over the eyes of the electors. Sir Collier tried to drag in another red herring when he mentioned the ruling that was given by the late president of the Australian Labor Party at the last conference, but he did not refer to the circumstances that led up to the giving of the ruling. Before the chair of the conference was a resolution dealing with long service legislation in South Australia. Conference had debated the matter and one delegate asked the president for a ruling on the resolution. We all know that when a ruling is sought the person occupying the chair gives it, and that was the position in this instance. It was not an instruction to members of the Labor Party but only a ruling as sought by one delegate on the meaning of the resolution. His ruling was word for word what was quoted in *Hansard*, but Sir Collier did not say that when he made his contribution to the debate. He said that perhaps Labor members in this Chamber were under instructions from the Trades Hall, and used the ruling referred to to prove his point. I suggest that it was taken out of its perspective.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—You do not suggest that you are not under instructions?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I not only suggest it, but say it. There has never been any suggestion of our being under instructions. The ruling given by the president was unanimously agreed to by every Labor member of Parliament, and at no time did any member of the Party oppose the resolution. If that is giving instructions, I do not know what the word means.

Earlier this afternoon I mentioned the apparent stampede in the Liberal Party because of the approaching State elections, and I referred to certain statements. The Premier used similar tactics at the Mount Gambier by-election and laid stress upon the great prosperity of South Australia because of his Government. In an open letter to electors in that district he said they had fully shared in that prosperity. He did not say that it entitled him to some kudos and probably a little advantage, but he did say, and

it was publicized in the local press, that the former member for Mount Gambier had always supported his Government and therefore a vote against the Liberal candidate would be a vote against the Government. The majority of electors certainly cast their vote against the Government.

In further support of the allegations I have made this afternoon, I draw attention to portion of the commentary supplied by the Liberal and Country League and appearing in the *Advertiser* last Saturday. Practically the whole of the first portion goes out of the way to tell the public what a marvellous job the Government has done in decentralization, and then refers to the criticism levelled mostly by members of the Labor Party over the years against the lack of decentralization. In effect it says, "Look at the vast decentralization policy we have carried out." It mentions a few Government undertakings, such as the Leigh Creek coalfield, the Port Augusta power station, and Radium Hill, and attention is even drawn to the timber industry at Mount Gambier. Under the heading "Not Totalitarian" appears the following:—

Any projected new industry can apply for financial assistance and, provided the non-party Parliamentary Industries Assistance Committee recommends aid, will get it. Moreover, the Government, through the South Australian Housing Trust, is willing to provide houses in any country area for employees of a new industry. The L.C.L. Government is not a totalitarian Government. It believes in, and encourages, private enterprise, but it cannot order any person or company to go to a certain place and set up an industry.

Similarly, it cannot, and would not wish to, order any person to stay and work in a given area. Under the L.C.L. Government everyone is free to change his place of living and type of work as he desires.

Under a Left-wing Government, freedom would be curtailed, the individual could be pushed around at the whim of the controlling clique, enterprise would be stifled, and waste and shortages would be rampant.

And let it be remembered, Dr. Evatt, the A.L.P. leader, has bluntly declared: "We are a Left-wing party."

In effect it screams to high heaven and says "Don't vote for the Labor Party, or look out for what you will get." It is stampede in innuendo all the time.

The Lieutenant-Governor referred to a proposed loan from the State Bank for the establishment of a co-operative fruit canning works at Berri. I am pleased that at last the Government intends to assist the establishment of this industry. Mr. Story dealt

extensively with this subject, and rather lamented the fact that his Government had been slow in implementing decentralization. I felt that he spoiled a rather good speech in his attempt to ridicule those who did not support his political creed. However, I extend my compliments to the honourable member for his speech, particularly that portion relating to the establishment of an industry which he has forcibly advocated since his entry into the Chamber—the setting up of a co-operative canning works somewhere on the Murray.

He gave great praise to the Government for its decentralization policy, but at the same time condemned it because of its lack of decentralization. In reply to an interjection he said that if some politicians did not pay so much attention to election catch-cries, but concentrated their efforts on decentralization, we might get further which, to me, was an admission that this State has not got very far in this direction. I know that we have established the township of Elizabeth, and that this has been claimed as a great achievement in decentralization, but it is only 10 miles from the city. To say the least, Elizabeth is a dormitory for city workers. That is not decentralization; it is merely a very fine housing project, for which we all give full credit, because of the shortage of houses.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—General Motors-Holdens are going there.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I suppose it will be claimed that the Government persuaded General Motors-Holdens to establish works at Elizabeth. That same claim is made with regard to the vast expansion over the years at Whyalla, but I suggest that is wholly due to the efforts of the B.H.P. and not the Government.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—You seem to think the Government cannot do anything.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am saying that the Government has done very little with regard to decentralization. Judging by the claims made by some members on behalf of the State Government, one would imagine that we are establishing industries all over the State. There are many places in this State where an industry could be taken to the source of the supply of materials.

The Hon. C. R. Story—How do you take an industry anywhere without forcing it?

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Which industry do you suggest; give us a concrete example.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—There are plenty of them.

The Hon. C. R. Story—Tell us one.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—For years it was suggested that an abattoirs should be established at Wallaroo, where we had every facility, including the treatment of fat lambs for export.

The Hon. C. R. Story—Who turned that down?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The Government. In the first place it said that an abattoirs was going to be established at Wallaroo, but because no private enterprise was prepared at that stage to establish the abattoirs, the Government could not do anything about the matter. This question was brought forcibly before us yesterday by Mr. Robinson when he referred to the inadequacy of the abattoirs of this State. Surely the Government could establish more abattoirs.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Just prior to elections we were always going to have a deep sea port in the South-East.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—We were going to have lots of things. Before I ever thought of becoming a member of this Chamber the Government was telling us it was going to electrify our suburban railway lines. That was years and years ago, and they still have not been electrified. I have quoted where an industry could go because the facilities are there.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—There are no fat lambs there this year.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I suggest there are as many there this year as there have been in any other year. When this year's statistics are given, I think we will find that the lamb market will be just as great as it has been previously. I understand that a considerable number of employees have been taken on at the abattoirs to meet the demands for killings which are increasing from day to day and will further increase. Those men are still being employed as what I think the abattoirs refer to as glut hands. The season has not yet commenced, so what is the position going to be like when it gets into full swing?

Another criticism I would like to level against Mr. Story's speech is in connection with his reference to the Snowy Waters Agreement. He spoilt a very good effort with his remarks on that subject. He gave praise, and quite rightly so, to the Premier for his actions and concern for the people of this State. Had it not been for his intervention, I think we can all appreciate the position this State would have been in with regard to the Murray waters. To be quite frank, the only thing I regretted was the time lag between

that intervention and the final settlement, and even today we do not know the exact position.

The Hon. E. Anthony—That was no fault of the Premier's.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It may not have been. That is the only fault I can find. Mr. Story said that the actions of the Labor Senators at Canberra constituted an example of jumping on the political bandwagon. I say that that action was forced on them by the Commonwealth Liberal Government's action in attempting to introduce an agreement between two other States and the Commonwealth and by-passing this State.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Your members said that it was a phoney argument between the Premier and the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It was a pretty good political stunt; that has been proved. I give full marks to the Premier for his actions, but I would like these things in their true perspective. As I understand the position, a Senator represents the whole State, whether he be a member of the Liberal or Labor Party, and the South Australian Senators represent the whole of South Australia. All Liberal members of the Federal Government, when the legislation was introduced, accepted an assurance by the Prime Minister that the interests of South Australia were adequately safeguarded. They supported the legislation despite representations made by the Liberal Government of this State pointing out the true position as they saw it.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The Federal Liberal Senators abdicated, like their Leader.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—They were quite prepared to accept the assurance which they were given.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Your Labor Senators never voted against the Bill; they voted for the amendment.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—As I understand it, an amendment is against a resolution, and an amendment to the Bill would be against the original Bill. The Labor members would not support the Bill but were prepared to support the amendment. The amendment is a vastly different thing from the Bill which Federal Liberal members of this State were prepared to accept, even after the Premier attempted to point out the true position. We know perfectly well that the Murray is one of the State's lifelines, and any curtailment of Murray water, especially in dry times, would mean the end of a vast industry in this State. I commend the honourable member for making that point. There was no jumping on any

political band wagon. These things have to be altered from time to time in the progress of reconstruction but, if the original plans had been carried out as first laid down by the Chifley Government, this argument would never have been adduced; it would not have occurred because there would have been no reason for it. Even after saying that agreement had been entered into, it never had been tabled in the Federal sphere. Our South Australian Liberal Senators had not seen it and did not know its contents, yet they were prepared to accept and support it. As far as jumping on the political band wagon was concerned, the boot was on the other foot. Any condemnation should be levelled against the South Australian Liberal members of the Commonwealth Parliament.

His Excellency drew attention to the vast strides made in the timber industry in the South-East. I have some knowledge of that and its growth, and now we are seeing the results of the enormous amount of money laid out there. It is coming back now in the form of annual profit from our milling industry. It is gratifying to us all to observe such progress. In fact there have been many inquiries, inspections and seekings of information from other States about this industry, with a view to their trying to establish something similar.

The Hon. E. Anthony—That is complimentary.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I feel that to be so, because it is warranted. When the timber industry was inaugurated in the South-East, many difficulties were encountered. Timber has its peculiarities. If it is not kiln dried it gets black mould quickly, it warps and twists and will turn round and look at you. Even in stacks of dry timber where there is a great weight on it it will still warp and twist. The advancement of the industry is due largely to these problems being eliminated by kiln drying. After it is milled it is put into kilns and dried. All the problems of mould, buckling and twisting have been overcome by kiln drying.

A good example of what can be done with this timber can be seen in the Architect-in-Chief's Department where furniture made from it can be seen. It is polished and is a remarkable job. We have had inquiries from other States about just how we go about it. Recently a new mill has been installed at Mount Gambier, and is in operation. It will deal with timbers as far away as the Victorian border. I have heard that perhaps it would

have been better to establish the mill nearer to the timber, at the forest, but an analysis of the position shows that it would be highly dangerous. A four or five mile haul today is infinitesimal compared with the risk of forest fires if the mill is near the timber. Imagine what would happen if the mill were situated in or at the edge of the forest itself. It is better for the mill to be in a safe position where it can handle all timbers brought to it. This mill will add greatly to the assets of the State and, by reason of the additional milling, increase revenue.

I have a criticism to make about the Government employees in these mills. In the last three years representations have been made to the department about improving the amenities in the mills, especially the drinking water in summertime. In cool weather, of course, it is all right but in the summer it is impossible to drink the water because of its condition, due to the heat generated in the pipes. Apparently it is impossible to improve the position because of the water supply. It has been suggested by the union often over the last three years that consideration should be given to the installation of refrigeration connected to the water pipe itself. The departmental answer to the union was that it was impracticable, it could not be done, that it would mean the use of bore water. Ever since the mill at Mount Burr was established, bore water has always been used. I appeal to the Government, even if it is only in one or two places in the mills, to consider the installation of water pipe refrigeration (it is not expensive) to ensure cold drinking water, especially in the summer. That is a worthwhile amenity to which the employees are entitled. I hope that the Government will consider that.

I now have a criticism to level against State legislation. The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech contained little reference, if any, to the enactment of any industrial legislation this year. As Mr. Condon has said, we are lagging behind other States in this respect. I feel we should at least be equal to them. We can name much industrial legislation deserving of overhaul. Amendments of the Workmen's Compensation Act were referred to and we will await them and have every opportunity of criticism.

One of our main industrial enactments which has been crying out for overhaul for some time is the antiquated Industrial Code. It is claimed that it covers all workers under the Industrial Code, but that is not so. It has

been referred to here from time to time but still it is the same old code that we have had for years, except for one or two minor amendments. This code should apply to all employees. There should be no eliminations for some reason or another. An employee is at least entitled to industrial protection as regards conditions of employment and wages.

Under this code many people have not the protection they should have. It is not adequate to deal with amenities. I do not mean ordinary amenities such as drinking facilities, but dining-rooms and lockers for employees. It does not seem to be much but it is not covered by the code. There is a passage in it about lavatory accommodation and the establishment of urinals. It is remarkable that in one instance there is a section about shops and warehouses altogether different from the preceding section dealing with factories. In one instance the section says that they "shall provide privies or." As long as one or the other is there, the Act is being complied with. There are instances where we have attempted to force an employer to supply both adequately. He has obtained information from the department that he is complying with the Act and nobody can force him to do any more. These things need overhaul.

The Public Service Act refers to annual leave. There have been many deputations from the Trade Union movement to the Premier in an attempt to get conditions for Government employees similar to those operating with the private employer. We have our State awards and determinations and Federal awards operating for those employees under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, which make the question of *pro rata* annual leave mandatory. A case has been referred to me in the last two days dealing with a young lady of about 25 years of age. She was employed on the switchboard at Foy's Building and was dismissed not because of inefficiency but because responsible officers thought that what she did outside working hours was not in accordance with their ideas. What she did in her own time was her business.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—What did she do?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It was admitted that she did nothing to warrant police action, because there was no suggestion of crime. Those in authority thought that in a moral sense they had something on her. It all came about through a report given to them by a woman. After 11 months' service she was

dismissed and was told that because she had not completed 12 months in the department she was not entitled to annual leave.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—She has the right of appeal.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The Act says that 12 months' service must be completed. Surely what is done in an employee's private life cannot be regarded as something done in the employer's time. If that were the position, the man who went into a hotel in his own time and had one or two drinks too many could be dismissed by his employer. I appeal to the Government to consider what I have said and make the position similar to that in private industry. Any employee who has served less than 12 months should be entitled to *pro rata* annual leave, provided the dismissal was not due to misconduct at work. From the time of the commencement of the service the annual leave entitlement should begin to accrue. I hope these suggestions will be considered and adopted by the Government so that all Government employees will be on the same basis as employees in private industry. I support the motion.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—Although a member can choose when he speaks in the Address in Reply debate I realize that when he comes in towards the end he is at a disadvantage, for although the range of subjects for discussion is practically unlimited he feels that the matters in which he is peculiarly interested have been dealt with by previous speakers. My task this afternoon will be to avoid tiresome repetition so I will elaborate on only those matters that are of peculiar interest to me. I associate myself with the sentiments expressed towards you, Mr. President, following your return to your accustomed place in this Chamber. I trust that your health will continue to be satisfactory. I also support the remarks made in recognition of the excellent service rendered by the Lieutenant-Governor, not only in the Vice-Regal capacity, but also in connection with his many other important duties.

I congratulate Sir Collier Cudmore on having a high honour conferred upon him by Her Majesty the Queen. We all feel that it is an honour fully merited and justly deserved. I thank Sir Collier for the interesting speech he delivered in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. During the time that I have been here I have always appreciated having the opportunity to listen to his speeches. Although we do not always agree

with his opinions we all realize that he gives full consideration to the matters introduced. At the termination of this session when he leaves his usual place he will be sadly missed. The Lieutenant-Governor's Opening Speech followed the usual pattern and it can be said that it dealt with the past, the present and the future. The statements about the past and the present were ample evidence of the results achieved following the progressive policy pursued by Liberal and Country League Governments. Despite the gloomy utterances of Mr. Condon and Mr. Bevan, the Government and the people can be justly proud of their achievements and can look forward with the fullest confidence to the future.

The ever-increasing Government and semi-Government expenditure is often mentioned but that is a contributing factor to the progress of the State. All the works in hand require financing and unless we had this ever-increasing volume of expenditure we could not have the development that we see in all parts of the State. I include everybody, Parliament, the Government and the people, as contributing towards this desirable state of affairs, with Parliament as the supreme authority. Frequently we hear references to the Government doing this and that, and I take no kudos from the Administration, but it is the Parliament that gives the authority for the Government to carry out public works. This matter was referred to by Sir Collier Cudmore. When I talk about the Government I mean all members of the Cabinet, right down from the Premier to the newest appointee. They are all contributing their full share to the State's stability and prosperity. The people who put capital into industry and all the employees, from the highest executive to the lowest paid man, are all playing a most important part in the continued well-being of the State.

We have heard inside and outside Parliament much talk about decentralization of industry. I have yet to hear someone give a constructive outline of what he thinks should be done to bring about this decentralization. We have just heard a speech by Mr. Bevan, but, with all due deference to him, after listening carefully to his remarks I most reluctantly concluded that it was one of the most negative and disruptive speeches I have heard him deliver here. He made numerous complaints why certain things were not done, but not once did he offer any suggestion of how the position should be remedied. I have always contended that if an honourable member is prepared to pull down an edifice erected by

someone else, he should submit something better in its place. That is exactly the position as I see it as to decentralization.

The honourable member made an unfortunate mention of the efforts to establish an abattoirs at Wallaroo, but did not say why they were not established. To my knowledge this was not done because the people who were prepared to provide the money did not regard it as a profitable proposition, and that is the whole story. To my mind decentralization is being used as nothing more nor less than a political catch-ery, something approaching the standard of the oratory heard at the Botanic Park on Sunday afternoons. Let us have something constructive. Mr. Robinson gave full details of some of the aspects of what had been achieved, and there are others. There are certain fundamental requirements before an industry can be established. We must remember the truth of the old adage that the man who pays the piper has the right to call the tune.

It is not only a matter of someone coming along, perhaps an overseas interest, and saying, "We should like to establish an industry in your State. We have hundreds of thousands of pounds to invest," and the Government replying "That is very nice. We will do what we can to help, but demand that you shall establish that industry at, say, Peterborough, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln or in some other district." To that they would retort "We will examine the conditions." They must consider the availability of raw materials, transport and a hundred and one other things. Does anyone think that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company was not influenced by the wonderful iron ore deposits on Eyre Peninsula when it decided to establish its industry there, or that the company which is developing the pyrites deposits at Nairne went there just because it wanted a place in the hills? It was only because the raw materials were there. The same applies to the barytes industry at Quorn. The company did not go there because it wanted to help the people of Quorn. That was not the first consideration, although it was contributory to the result. The company went there because the raw materials were available. All those things I have mentioned must be considered. It is not just a question of standing on a soap box and saying, "We must have decentralization." I am 100 per cent behind the objective. I want to see the State progress but at the same time try to keep my feet on the ground and not indulge in a

lot of airy platitudes. I endeavour to point out the ways and means by which these things can be achieved.

Over the years I have always listened with interest to Mr. Condon when he has favoured the House with his opinions of the flour milling industry. We all agree that perhaps no-one in the Commonwealth has a better appreciation of its ramifications than our very respected friend. However, I am still waiting for him to tell us why the existing conditions have been brought about and suggest how the unfortunate position can be remedied. It is well within my memory when we had quite a number of prosperous flour mills throughout the State, but at present many are closed. I understand that only two are operating fully in country districts.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—What was the reason for their closing down?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—That is what I am waiting to hear. I know that competition has resulted in under-selling us in overseas markets. Mr. Condon gave some rather startling figures in this regard. Countries which had previously been quite good Australian customers have considerably reduced their demand for Australian flour. He mentioned that Ceylon had reduced its imports from Australia by 96 per cent, Indonesia by 85 per cent, Malaya by 26 per cent and that whereas in 1956-57 Great Britain had imported 72,718 tons that figure was reduced to 28,000 tons the following year. Something is wrong somewhere, and I want to know what it is. The technique of flour milling, which is of particular interest to me, has advanced to the stage where millers demand an even quality grain. Over a long term of years we have marketed wheat on an f.a.q. basis. Evidently, we will have to change over to the grading of our wheat. It has been put to me that with the modern technique the miller puts his wheat in at one end of the mill and unless it is an even grade he cannot expect a uniform grade at the other end.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—He can mill only what the Australian Wheat Board will sell him.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—We will have to change, and I am all in favour of that. As one who has been interested in agricultural production all my life, I have long advocated that wheat should be sold on grade and not on the hit and miss f.a.q. principle. I have heard people say that so long as wheat is f.a.q. it is all right. Provided you can get

past the buyer it is all right, but the present method of marketing is having a boomerang effect in the reduction of our flour trade.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Some overseas countries are paying a subsidy of £4 and even £8 a ton on flour.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—How that is to be overcome must be considered. As a selling country we must supply the article required, and if a higher standard is demanded we must endeavour to reach it. Those who buy will call the tune, and if we do not supply the standard required we will miss out.

I was pleased to read in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech the following paragraph:—

Much benefit has been derived from the researches carried out by the Government as to the materials, methods and designs used in roadmaking. The information obtained has led to greater economy, improved materials, and more durable roads.

I take it that the paragraph refers largely to the new method of cement stabilization in road surfacing, and understand that a certain degree of success has been achieved with this method. It will result in economies and enable longer lengths of roads to be surfaced. I hope the Minister of Roads will do all he can to further an investigation along those lines so that we can hasten the urgent attention required to many of our main and arterial roads and main district roads. Many difficulties have been encountered in our road construction programme but commendable action has been taken to meet them.

I have thought for some time that we should consider developing what are termed national roads to an all-weather standard, the responsibility for which should be undertaken largely by the Commonwealth Government with Commonwealth funds. It is impossible for local governing bodies to do that, and, so far as I can see within the range of my vision, quite outside the resources of the State to hasten up or to increase to any great extent our road construction programme. I therefore think it is a matter which will have to be undertaken with Commonwealth financial assistance.

Local governing bodies can do it so long as they get the funds. I have a very vivid recollection of the early days of the last war when this country was facing the threat of invasion. Word went out to the councils on Eyre Peninsula that it was desirable to make a trafficable road from the areas outside local government districts on Eyre Peninsula to the Western Australian border and on to Kalgoorlie, and those bodies, having regard

to the urgency of the matter and wishing to play their part in every shape and form in the prosecution of the war, readily made their plant, machinery and men available and completed that road. Admittedly, it was only a graded dirt road, but it was made possible because it was a dire necessity, and it served the purpose. We may not have as much time in the future to measure up to our defence obligations, and I say that arterial roads such as the road from Port Augusta right through to Darwin and the east-west road from Port Augusta right through to Perth should receive consideration as part of our defence programme. That will bring into the picture the question of the Commonwealth accepting some financial responsibility for those roads.

We have heard of the necessity to increase water supplies to Whyalla because of the new industries to be established there. There has been a regular added agitation for reticulation of the Murray waters through many of our country districts, particularly in the north. One at first glance is inclined to ask how it is that so many towns and districts got along so well with the water available locally, and query whether it has merely become fashionable to suggest that every area should be served with reticulated water from the Murray pipeline. Whilst one may take that view, one has to appreciate that there has been a great increase in production, and a great improvement in the technique of land usage which in itself is contributing towards increased production. There is also an appreciation by landholders of the value of the technical and expert advice that is available in connection with land, stock, and fodder treatment, and all this has been taken advantage of and is contributing to the higher productive capacity

of our country lands, and it is going to further increase. Some lands which previously have been considered to be normally of very low productive capacity are gradually coming in as higher productive capacity lands, and in consequence facilities for water supplies must be made available.

I am not going to suggest how that should be done. In some cases I think investigation has been sufficiently encouraging to show that supplies may be available from underground sources. It was very pleasing to note some time ago that extensive areas of underground water supplies had been discovered in the Upper South-East. As time goes on, underground supplies may possibly be discovered elsewhere, but in the meantime we have to realize that provision must be made to meet that increased productive capacity of the land by the provision of these extra water supplies. It is a matter which must have very urgent and very necessary consideration.

Many other matters I could have spoken on have already been dealt with by previous speakers, and I will not indulge in repetition. I have made my contribution and voiced one or two opinions which I hold. I am content to think that the State will get along as it has done over the post-war years, steadily marching along to increased development and prosperity in every shape and form. I think we can look with every confidence to the future. I support the motion.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.08 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 31, at 2.15 p.m.