

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, August 3, 1961.

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

QUESTIONS.**ROADS ADMINISTRATION.**

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS: My reason for asking permission to make a short statement is that I do not intend that my question should imply anything in the nature of criticism of the administration or work done in outer areas by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. On the contrary, I have a full appreciation of what has been achieved, but conditions are changing and that department has to handle such matters as country water conservation and distribution, so I suggest that road problems beyond district council boundaries might well be left to the highways authorities. Can the Minister of Roads say whether: (a) following the recent personal inspection by the Minister of stock routes in the north-eastern part of the State, can his visit be taken as an indication of changed administration over our road construction and maintenance in areas outside district councils; and (b) if so, will the Minister make a similar personal inspection of areas westward of the north-south line with a view to improving the roads converging on that line from Marree to the Northern Territory boundary?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I have considerable pleasure in answering the honourable member's question because the facts are now clearly in my mind. The answer to the first part of the question, which specifically asked if my visit indicated a change of administration over road construction and maintenance in those areas is "not necessarily" but we have, within the last 12 months, taken over certain areas that were previously under the control of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the reason for that was that they were outside local government areas and the paramount need was looking after Government bores and the supply of water in those areas. As all honourable members know, duplication in administration of that nature in those sparsely populated areas can cost the taxpayer a considerable amount. Since we have taken over the Eyre Highway construction with modern methods we have already taken over the

responsibility for the majority of the roads from the Engineering and Water Supply Department in that area. That does not, at the moment, apply to the far north-west areas mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Edmonds.

Regarding the South-East, we have already taken over the road areas maintained previously by the Engineering and Water Supply Department outside council areas when the District Council of Coonalpyn was formed. They are now directly arranged between local government and the Highways Department. Regarding the north-east, which I visited recently, I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the work done by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and would say—and this has been said by me on other occasions—that the preliminary work done in the last year or two has been of an exploratory and experimental nature but now that we are going much more deeply into this question of providing suitable road transport services for cattle it may be desirable for us to take over the administration of the roads in that area. However, if we do so I would be the first person, as the Minister concerned, to accept the men who are at present doing the work of the department because they are doing a truly remarkable job. With scientific assistance I am certain that we could at a reasonable cost—certainly not an extravagant cost—considerably help production in those areas and help the transport of cattle to the South Australian market.

With regard to the second question which asked if I would make an inspection of the north-west, the answer is "Yes". I do not see myself having an opportunity before Christmas of making an inspection, but I am arranging to make a visit, possibly next year, with a view to improving the roads and possibly finding a gang to work for the Engineering and Water Supply Department or the Highways Department to improve the roads in the north-western area also.

SEACLIFF PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The Seacliff primary school, although a most spacious building recently opened, has had to use for over 12 months several prefabricated classrooms that are unfortunately situated across the road and on the corner of a main road some distance away. I have been informed that they are without toilets and running water.

Young children have to be taken several hundred yards to toilets at the main school during the recess and lunch breaks and facilities for the staff do not exist. Both children and staff are hopelessly inconvenienced because primary school children must be able to wash their hands frequently if they are going to produce clean and neat work. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Education in this Council have this situation examined and the necessary improvements effected as soon as possible?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I shall be pleased to confer with my colleague, the Minister of Education, and I am sure the matter will have his personal immediate attention.

MEAT SUBSIDY.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I refer to the payment of subsidies to producers who export fat lambs under the British Meat Agreement. There is some doubt in the minds of primary producers as to the conditions applying to this subsidy. I imagine that, if a producer exports lambs directly overseas, payment will be made but many primary producers are in some doubt as to the position if they sell to an export firm. Can the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Agriculture, supply me with some information on this problem?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I shall refer the question to the Minister of Agriculture and obtain the information sought by the honourable member.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph be appointed to the Standing Orders Committee in place of the Hon. F. J. Condon, deceased.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption, which the Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph had moved to amend.

(For wording of amendment see page 121.)

(Continued from August 2. Page 202.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I listened to the majority of speeches delivered during this debate, and

read the reports of those I did not hear, and although I do not want to reiterate many of the statements made, some reiteration will be necessary to enable me to put my point of view on certain matters. I take this opportunity to extend a welcome to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, and Lady Bastyan. It is a pleasure to have such a distinguished couple in our midst. On the few occasions I have had the pleasure to meet them and to hear Sir Edric speak, I have been most impressed, particularly with Sir Edric's speeches. He impressed me as being sincere, that he has something to say, and is prepared to say it and let everyone hear it. That is very good. With my colleagues, I hope that Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan will have a very enjoyable stay in South Australia that will be fruitful to them and of benefit to the whole State.

I join with other honourable members in expressing my sincere regret at the untimely passing of Viscount Dunrossil. I met him on only two occasions and was impressed that in him Australia would have had a very fine Governor-General, but, unfortunately, he was not with us long. I express my personal sorrow at his passing. I also regret the death of the Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh, who was a very kindly gentleman and a helpful and capable Minister of the Crown. In my short time in the House of Assembly he was always helpful to me and gave me valuable assistance. He looked after me in many ways, even seeing that on occasions I was taken to my home. Such actions make one's experience as a member of Parliament enjoyable. I also associate myself with the remarks concerning the passing of Mr. Michael O'Halloran and my late colleague and teammate, the Hon. F. J. Condon. One could not have had better or more helpful friends. They were ever ready to help with a kindly word and with advice, which most of us so badly need on some occasions. I thank all other honourable members for their kindly references to our two colleagues. I think that the three gentlemen who have died since the last Address in Reply debate represented a distinctive stage in our history. They were representatives of a group of which there are so few left. They had so much in common that one feels that there has been a break between their era and ours. To the families of the three gentlemen, I express my personal sympathy.

One would have thought that, after hearing the fine remarks during this debate concerning the ability and character of the late Mr.

O'Halloran and Mr. Condon, during their lifetime the Liberal Party would have given some credit for the assistance they had rendered to the Government. I would remind honourable members that but for the action of our two departed comrades and other members of the Labor Party two very important Bills, concerning Leigh Creek development and the Electricity Trust, would not have been passed. Although members of the Government Party may not have given credit in that regard, many people outside, including prominent members of the Liberal Party, were prepared to acknowledge that the Labor Party had been helpful in assisting in the passing of this beneficial legislation. If the Bill dealing with the establishment of the Electricity Trust had not been passed, the benefits of which honourable members opposite have spoken during the debate could not have been achieved. This applies particularly to people living in the country. Water conservation and other benefits that have been received by country people could not have been undertaken had these measures not been passed.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Hons. E. H. Edmonds and C. R. Story on their worthy speeches in moving and seconding the motion. In this, his last Address in Reply speech, Mr. Edmonds delivered an excellent speech, and if I can do as well when I reach his age I shall certainly be very pleased. Since I have been a member of this Chamber, Mr. President, you have been most kind and helpful to me. You have also been very considerate to members of my Party when they got close to breaking the rules of debate, and as this will be your last session, on behalf of my colleagues I express the wish that your retirement will be long and pleasant.

I thank members of Parliament and people outside for their congratulations on my recent appointment as the Leader of the Opposition in this place. I congratulate Mr. C. D. Hutchens on being selected to represent this Parliament at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting in London next month, and I couple Mr. Ivor Ball, Clerk of this Council, with those congratulations. We all know what he has done for us. Parliament is fortunate in having two people of such standing to represent it at the meeting. They will not only benefit themselves from the experience gained, but the State generally and this Parliament in particular.

Notwithstanding Sir Arthur Rymill's statement that he thought it was not worth-while

making suggestions in this debate, I intend to make one, and to say to him that if he has not been successful so far he should continue making suggestions in the hope that one day the Government will see the light. Over the years I have had some of my suggestions accepted. I think it would be wise for the Government each year to send a Minister and a member of each main Party in this Parliament to countries overseas in order to further their education by getting to know conditions overseas better. If this were done they could give a better service to the community. I have had two trips overseas and I think that as a result I have a greater appreciation of what is happening in other countries. The value of sending people overseas can be seen from Mr. Veale, Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide, being sent overseas. Sir Arthur Rymill has already referred to the results of Mr. Veale's trip, but I do not think he made mention of King William Street. I think that is an ideal street and I do not say that only now that the work on it has just been finished, because when I returned from a world tour in 1958 I said, when speaking on the Road Traffic Bill, what I thought the street should be like. With one or two exceptions it is similar to what I visualized.

I do not altogether favour the U turns for traffic between intersections. As traffic becomes more dense the position will have to be reviewed. I disagree with the placing of trees in tubs. I think it would be much better to have an illuminated fountain between each intersection. This would give the street a better appearance and create more enthusiasm amongst the public generally. The Adelaide City Council has obtained real results from Mr. Veale's tour. Whatever its cost, it has been returned ten-fold. I have personally congratulated him on his work and I am one citizen in Adelaide who appreciates very much what he is doing, not only for the city rate-payers but for all people in South Australia. I hope the Government will give serious thought to my suggestion.

I now want to speak about the bread industry in which I have served practically all my life and which has given me practically all that I have. I have noticed that bread seems to be the Aunt Sally of everybody. People talk about the industry without knowing the facts. I want to put things right. On November 17 last year Mr. McKee (member for Port Pirie) asked the Premier the following question, as recorded on page 1935 of *Hansard*:

I have received the following letter from the Port Pirie Trades and Labor Council:

At the November meeting of the above body it was decided to protest to the Prices Commissioner regarding the delivery price of bread where more than one loaf is delivered to a household. As you know 2d. is charged on each delivered loaf, and where more than one loaf is delivered we maintain that 2d. overall should be the delivery price charged, and not 4d. or 6d., depending upon whether two or three loaves are carried into the household.

I also consider that this is an excessive price for the delivery of bread and people are justified in protesting. An overall charge of 2d. would be reasonable. Apparently large families and bigger customers pay more for the bread that is delivered to them. In view of this unfairness, will the Premier take up this matter with the Prices Commissioner to see whether some reasonable charge cannot be arrived at?

The Premier replied:

The cost of delivering commodities to houses is causing the Government great concern. Since the war many services that were previously available to the housewife have been curtailed or the cost made much steeper. For instance, the delivery of meat in the metropolitan area has been virtually discontinued, except in special cases. An application by the union, which was supported, I believe, by the bakers, provided for a relatively costly employee to deliver bread. As far as I know, there is no logical reason why such an employee should deliver bread instead of a man under 21 years. The Arbitration Court award governing the type of person who may be used for delivering bread is one of the reasons for the high cost, particularly when a distance is involved. I will refer the matter to the Prices Commissioner, who will see whether any adjustment can be made in favour of the community. The basic trouble, in my opinion, is that the award adds unnecessarily to the cost of delivery.

Let us consider the reply in two sections. The point that bread can be delivered continually by people under 21 years of age is the most illogical answer I have heard. This would mean that the carter would be employed from the time he left school until he was 21 at a junior rate and then would be sacked and would not be able to get a job, particularly at present. People do not realize that good bread carters are scarce. A bread carter must, first of all, be of good appearance, he must be honest, and above all his morals must be above suspicion. The Hon. Mr. Potter said we were dealing with human beings, and that is just what the bread carter has to do.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Is that why he has to be good looking?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: He has to be that, too. The lady of the house does not want a disfigured or an odd-looking person delivering

bread at her house, and there have been dismissals before today for that reason. It is obvious that because of the large amount of money collected the bread carter has to be honest. If some members knew some of the things that I know about employers losing large amounts of money, they would be astonished. There are men who by choice and by reason of their health have to work outside, and this week a man rang me to ask me what he could do, as he had reached the retiring age and was doing some casual work. He had been a bread carter since he was 15 years of age. I think the Premier answered that question without giving it any thought. There are bread distributing yards and bakeries in the metropolitan area which do not have one junior bread carter on their staff, and do not want them because they are too costly.

To correct the Premier on the wages question, I shall give honourable members some details. I became secretary of the union on May 12, 1936, and our margin was then 11s. Until 1952 we did not receive any great increases in wages with the employers' consent. I often appeared before the wages board and obtained increases of 1s., 2s., 3s. or 4s. I was paid a compliment recently by the chairman of a wages board, in a story told to me by a person holding a high position in a public department, who is also a member of a board. In one case a union representative would not accept the amount offered by the Government, and the chairman of the board told him that he had better have a talk with Bert Shard, because, as he said, during his long experience Shard never refused any offer by the employer. I always took whatever was offered, but, within a short period, returned to the board with another application. In 1952 our margin was 52s., which was equivalent to that of a fitter and turner, and most of those increases were obtained during the war when they were difficult to obtain, because at that time we not only had to prove our case but had to prove an anomaly existed under the existing conditions between the wage received and the wage requested. The amount the Premier referred to was obtained as a result of an Arbitration Court decision. This amount was arrived at by a formula introduced in 1954, and calculated on wages in 1938 (with some adjustments), but as a result we lost 7s. 6d. a week. Our margin had been equivalent to that of a fitter and turner, but it was reduced by 7s. 6d. by this decision. The bread industry accepted the decision of the Arbitration Court.

The position became worse in 1959, as a result of another Arbitration Court decision, when the marginal increases were adjusted. The margin for the fitter and turner increased by 21s. a week, which was a 28 per cent increase, and naturally we asked for a similar increase. We did not receive the 21s. a week because of the 7s. 6d. we had lost previously, and received only 19s., a further loss of 2s. a week. If this is what the Premier is referring to I say that he cannot have it both ways. It is in the interests of the community to have a wages board where employer and employee can confer and accept the Arbitration Court's decision, and include it in the determination. There was no quarrel about that and the facts were stated in the court and we were successful. Is it to be expected that if somebody else gets an increase we will not want it?

I refer now to the decision that was given when the Country Breadcarters' Award was made in 1938 by the Industrial Court, when the late Sir Raymond Kelly (then Mr. President Kelly) presided. Wages and conditions of bread carters in the country areas of South Australia at that time were, to say the least, shocking, for bread carters were not receiving 50 per cent of the basic wage. A case was stated and the employers argued that they could not afford to pay the amount sought. The case went on for several days and then Mr. President Kelly called the parties together and told the employers what he intended to award. He said that the hours would not be more than the recognized standard working week and that the wage would not be much more than the basic wage. When the employers said that they could not afford to pay that amount the President told them that, if the community wanted bread or any other commodity and a claim was made that employees were not entitled to the basic wage when working the ordinary number of hours because the price charged for the commodity was insufficient, the price must be increased. I do not think that anyone could argue against that.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Does the 2d. a loaf delivery charge cover the cost of delivery?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. I now intend to deal with the price of bread, and in doing so I say that I am as concerned with the cost of living as anyone else. I have tried to take the fairest measuring stick that I can in arguing this matter and I believe that the facts which I shall give members will enlighten all.

The price of a 2 lb. sandwich loaf of bread in August 1933 was 4d., and the price varied as follows: In December 1933 it was 5d.; in June 1934 it was 4d.; in August 1934 it was 4½d.; in November 1934 it was 4d.; and the measuring stick for the price was the basic wage. That wage was £3 3s. a week from August 1927 to October 1935, but today it is £14 3s. 6d., and it is simple arithmetic to ascertain that the basic wage today is 4½ times what it was in 1933. Actually, that figure multiplied by 4½ gives £14 6s. 6d.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: The basic wage is not £14?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The State living wage is £14 3s. and I was referring to that. The case for the bread industry is so strong that I do not care which figure is used. Any of the prices I have used can be taken, but for convenience I have taken the 4½d. figure as that is half way between the 4d. and 5d. charged during that period. If we multiply 4½d. by 4½ we get 1s. 8½d. for a 2 lb. loaf of bread. I do not think there is a fairer way of measuring what should be paid. Now, if that is fair—and I think it is—the price of bread should be 1s. 8½d., but it is only 1s. 5d. In addition to that, the industry has absorbed the added costs of the difference between the operative baker's margin in 1933 of 22s. compared with 96s. today, and in the case of the breadcarter 11s. in 1933 compared with 86s. 6d. today. In other words, one employer who employs one bread carter and one baker has absorbed an additional £8 1s. 6d. a week. That position has been brought about by a variety of reasons, but, if we consider it from the employers' point of view, they would be entitled to make a case for the price of bread to be increased to 1s. 8½d. People who criticize the price of bread should examine the facts.

Not only has the baker had to absorb higher wages, but other costs have been absorbed. Flour prices have increased and other incidental expenses have risen, but they have been absorbed and people are still getting bread based on early basic wage figures. Our bakers have built large and magnificent bakeries and the hygiene is, in the main, something to be marvelled at. Without fear of contradiction I say that five or six of the larger bakeries in the metropolitan area surpass any others in Australia, and I even use the words of other people, namely, that there is nothing better anywhere else in the world.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Is our bread the best in the world?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am glad the honourable member asked that question. We have a Bread Baking Council and the report from that council states that the quality of our bread is the highest in Australia. I cannot comment on that because I am not an expert.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It is very different from the bread in overseas countries?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but the honourable member could find bread in Adelaide similar to that procurable overseas and it would be equal in quality to the overseas bread. If the honourable member asks me afterwards I will tell him about it. The vehicles in which our bread is now delivered are of a different standard from those used in 1933, and they are a credit to anyone. I get a small bouquet every Eight Hours Day. Apparently our vehicles are not wanted in the procession, but I get a thrill out of seeing

them in the procession, because they are a credit to the employers, the stablemen and the men who drive them. There is nothing in Australia to surpass the type of delivery vans here and the service that is given. I submit a comparison between costs in Melbourne and Adelaide. In Melbourne flour costs £40 a ton and in Adelaide £40 4s.; operative bakers in Melbourne receive £20 3s. a week and in Adelaide £18 19s.; in Melbourne carters receive £18 8s. a week, plus 5s. for coat allowance, and in Adelaide the minimum wage is £18 9s. 6d. There is not much difference in those three costs, but in Melbourne the price of bread is 1s. 6½d. to 1s. 7¾d. a 2 lb. loaf, and in Adelaide it is 1s. 5d., which makes it between 1½d. and 2½d. cheaper than it is in Melbourne. I ask that a table I have before me be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

STATE COMPARISONS FOR JULY, 1961.

	Sydney.	Melbourne.	Brisbane.	Adelaide.	Perth.	Hobart.
Flour, net ..	£42 15 0	£40 0 0	£40 0 0	£40 4 0	£40 2 6(j)	£39 14 0
Bread—						
Bread, 2 lb (a)—						
Shop	1/5½-1/6	1/6½-1/7½	1/3¼	1/3½	1/5½	1/5
Carters . . .	1/6½-1/7	1/6½-1/7½	1/4½	1/4½	1/5½	1/5½
Wages (b)—						
Operatives ..	£23 2 0	£20 3 0(d)*	£20 1 0	£18 19 0	£20 18 7	£19 4 6
Carters . . .	£19 0 0	£18 8 0(g)	£17 7 6	£18 9 6	£16 8 7(k)	£16 18 0
Hours—						
Operatives ..	40	40	40	40	40	40
Carters . . .	40	40	40	40	40	40
Starting Times—						
Ordinary day	5.30 a.m.	5 a.m.*	3 a.m.(h)	5 a.m.(i)	5 a.m.	9 a.m.
Double or treble day	See (c)	Midnight(f)	3 a.m.(h)	3 a.m.(n)	8 p.m.	6 p.m.(m)
Pastry—						
Wages (b)—						
Pastrycooks .	£19 5 0	£18 3 6(o)	£17 8 6	£18 19 0	£16 8 7	
Carters . . .	£17 1 0	£15 18 0	£17 4 6	£18 9 6	£17 3 7	£16 18 0

(a) Bread prices quoted are the "official" rates for cash. (b) Wages quoted are for the lowest classification of adult employees. (c) 4.30 a.m. start Monday; 4 a.m. Friday. Early starts at penalty rates: Monday, 3.30 a.m.; Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, 4.30 a.m.; Friday, 2 a.m. loading. (d) Plus 6s. 6d. per week laundry allowance. (e) Plus 4s. per week coat allowance. (f) 10 p.m. on Good Friday. (g) Plus 5s. laundry allowance. (h) With permission to work midnight to 3 a.m. at penalty rates. (i) Friday, 3 a.m. no Saturday work. (j) Less 5s. discount for cash. (k) Plus 6s. per week when they collect accounts. (l) Double day, 3 a.m. (m) Carters, usually 7 a.m. (n) 4 a.m. on Monday morning or Tuesday following a Monday holiday. (o) Plus 7s. 6d. laundry allowance.

* Metropolitan area: doughmakers and operative bakers, plus 20s. weekly for 4 a.m. start Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The South Australian Prices Commissioner has done a very good job in fixing the price of bread from the community's point of view, to such an extent

that only efficient bakeries can survive. His actions resulted in forcing one of the nicest businesses in this State to close. I refer to Linn's Bakery, which was a credit to the Linn

family and also to the community. Because of the harsh actions of the Prices Commissioner and his unrealistic view that bakery had to close.

The Hon. L. H. Densley: Did you support the price-fixing legislation?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but the Prices Commissioner should be realistic. I believe that honourable members in this Chamber and in the House of Assembly will agree that a man is entitled to receive a fair price for his product. One could not wish to see a better bakery than that of Linn's, or to meet a nicer team of men. However, in this case the stable door was closed after the horse had bolted.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Can we get good bread now?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Minister should know that there is a bread panel constituted of employers, employees and representatives of the Metropolitan County Board and the yeast people. Representatives of this organization take samples of bread that are numbered and these are judged and criticized by the panel, and it has been repeatedly stated that in most cases the quality of the bread is the best in Australia.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I am asking your opinion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think that the bread you can buy in Adelaide is equal to anything you want. In the 1930's the industry was in a somewhat deplorable condition. When the manpower control regulations were in operation in 1942 there were more than 140 bakeries registered in and around the metropolitan area, but today there are only 29, two of which I am reliably informed are insolvent. Each time there is a legitimate increase in the price of bread there is an outcry by the public, but if the people would only stop to consider what such an increase meant to the average family I do not think there would be such an outcry. The average customer today does not take a 2 lb. loaf of bread a day. I ask honourable members to consider the increases in the prices of other commodities that are taken into account in fixing the basic wage, and to see whether they would affect the average household by not more than 3d. a week.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Is the community eating less bread today than it was 10 or 15 years ago?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If you said 20 years ago, the answer would be yes. I have a married friend with three children. He said, in complaining about the increase in the price of

bread, that he had gone into the question of costs and he gave me these figures: the average weekly expenditure on food for his family was—eight loaves of bread at 1s. 5d., 11s. 4d.; 24 pints of milk at 10d., £1; meat, £1 15s.; fruit and vegetables, £1 15s.; and groceries, £3 10s., making a total of £8 11s. 4d. From the above figures, the approximate ratio of bread to the total household expenditure was one to 15. That is not considered in any way to be an extravagant expenditure; I should think it is more on the conservative side. Some people have a hardy annual they like to criticize and they never let up. Unfortunately, I think, bread is in that category and those who criticize the price and the services they are getting do not realize how well they are being served and how reasonable have been the charges. I hope the information I have given will be of value to members, because bread is a commodity that we all want baked and delivered in the best possible way and sold at a reasonable price.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Is much wrapped bread sold?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The quantity is growing each day. At least once a month I visit almost every Adelaide bakery and I know that within the last three months seven have arranged for bread to be cooled and wrapped for sale on the same day as it is baked. I think that is a good idea, but naturally the customer will have to pay a little more for it. I am told that the quantity of wrapped bread sold each week is growing, but this type of bread should not be forced on people who cannot afford it.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Do the bakers only wrap sliced bread?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am told that also uncut bread is sold wrapped. I want now to deal with the amendment moved to the motion by the Honourable Mr. Bardolph. It concerns the Government's action last year in joining with employers in the basic wage case. I have no objection to a Government placing facts before a tribunal, but it should be done in a neutral way.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—That is what we did.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. The Government joined with the employers and supported their claim, and that is what I am protesting about. The Government also gave the employers the services of a public servant who is paid by the taxpayers, yet the case he supported was for a reduction in the basic wage of the taxpayers. That was quite a wrong move.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Do you intend to quote from the evidence given by that officer?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. The judgment stated:

We turn now to consider the argument about cost of living which we do without making any decision of principle regarding the relevance of such an argument to the fixation generally of the basic wage. Whether Mr. Robinson succeeds or fails in this argument depends almost entirely on the view which we take of Mr. Seaman's evidence because he can succeed only if we agree that Mr. Seaman has achieved such a better or more precise result than the present one that we are prepared to act on it. Although Mr. Seaman was called by the South Australian Government Mr. Robinson relied on Mr. Seaman's material for this branch of his argument. It is therefore necessary to examine Mr. Seaman's evidence in detail.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: The employees could have relied on Mr. Seaman's evidence if they wanted to.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Court advocates do not act without knowing what can be done. It was because of co-operation between the Government and the employers that Mr. Seaman's evidence was taken, and the employers supported it. He did not go to the court as a neutral, but joined with the employers.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: No. Mr. Seaman gave his evidence and it was open to anyone to take advantage of it if desired.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: It was a long time ago. Let's forget about it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The matter is covered by the amendment and what I say is correct. I suggest that the honourable member knows that it is. Then, while Mr. Seaman was in court giving his evidence, presumably on oath, about the disabilities suffered by South Australia and how poor she was and how she could not afford to pay a higher basic wage, our Premier, when speaking in another place, said that South Australia was prosperous and that everything in the garden was lovely. I wonder who was telling the truth.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: It was a different point of view.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but about the same subject and to different people.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: He was talking about two periods of time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Wasn't Mr. Seaman talking about conditions in South Australia many years ago?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, about conditions at the time. This is true, and members know it. I do not want to repeat what the Hon. Mr. Bevan said in this debate. I thought he put his matter very well. I want now to speak about the unemployment position. People have come to me asking for help in getting work, but when there is nowhere to send them it becomes very disturbing. It is easy to quote figures and percentages, but in this case we are dealing with unfortunate human beings, many of whom are out of work through no fault of their own. I have seriously considered this question and am fearful that history is going to repeat itself, but I hope I am proved wrong. I do not care which political Party makes work available, provided every able-bodied man who wants work can get it. It is a pity that decisions which cause unemployment are made by a Government for its own purpose. The Government even considers the decision will do some good.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: You do not suggest it is not trying to arrest inflation?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is wrong to cause thousands to be unemployed. If that means arresting inflation, then I would say "Let inflation continue," because there is nothing worse or more damaging than for decent families to be unemployed.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: You would rather 98 per cent suffered than 2 per cent?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not mind if there have to be 2 per cent, as long as they get something decent, but they are not getting it. I do not forget my experience as a bread-carter during 1933, and unless a person has had that experience he does not know real hardship. I am deeply concerned about the position and once asked a friend of mine, who was an able public servant, what could be done to stop wars. He said that wars would never be prevented, but that we could only lengthen the periods between them. I have told my own sons to look after the money they have, because bad times will come again.

Prior to the Boer War in 1899 conditions were fairly reasonable and for five years after 1902 things went along smoothly. However, in the seven years' period prior to the 1914 war, 5½ per cent of the population were unemployed in this country. The position became worse during World War I, when seven per cent were unemployed, despite the fact that 60,000 of our people enlisted during that war. From the end of that war conditions were reasonably

prosperous until about the 1930's. In January 1933 there were 481,000 unemployed, 405,000 males and 76,000 females, being 25.4 per cent of the males and 14.5 per cent of the females. In addition there were a considerable number of youths and young women of working age who had never been employed and were not at work at the time. During World War II there was full employment and this continued until about 1953-54, when there was a slight recession. The *Advertiser* stated recently that registrations for work equalled 2.7 per cent of the estimated work force, which is a total of 111,654 unemployed. If that is so, it could mean that the number of people affected by unemployment could be something like 250,000, and I do not think that is an exaggeration.

It is the responsibility of the Government and to a lesser degree that of the Opposition, to see that these conditions are corrected at this stage, rather than allow them to continue and eventually revert to conditions that existed from 1933 to 1938. We do not have to be very imaginative to know what has occurred on the other side of the world and what might occur here. However, to have 100,000 people unemployed with the possible unemployment of a further 150,000 is a serious matter. There should be no political window dressing on this question similar to that which the Premier indulged in three or four months ago, and again two or three weeks ago when he was asked to convene a conference to deal with this problem. He told a deputation that he would not waste a 5d. stamp on it, but last week he came out in all his pomp and glory and told us what he was going to do. A warning was issued by the Commonwealth Treasurer last week when he said that factories could not be expected to re-engage labour on the same scale as the recent dismissals while economic prosperity returns. I do not wish to take that matter any further, but I have tried to trace the history of Australia since the Boer War to show what has happened and what might happen again. That is the opinion of a person possessing much ability and of a different political complexion to mine. I hope that I have dealt with the question of unemployment in a helpful manner.

I had not intended to speak about the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation but certain comments by the Honourable Sir Arthur Rymill cause me to do so. The committee performs a valuable function but until I joined it five years ago I had no experience of local government and I was surprised at the amount of work the committee did. It is overworked

and underpaid; in fact, it is the lowest paid of all the Parliamentary committees. This committee has been required to examine about 380 by-laws and regulations during this Parliament and much work has been involved in that; particularly as it has to be done properly. Most of the members of the committee do examine these by-laws thoroughly and it will be a sorry day for South Australians if anything is done to take that work away from the committee and by-laws are merely left on the table of the House for members to examine.

I can, however, agree with Sir Arthur Rymill to this extent: that it is wrong that a by-law should be disallowed because of some wording in it. We should have the right to delete the offending words; whole sections or clauses should not be thrown out because of one small error. No council should have to wait a further 12 months before being able to correct an error. Many of our problems could be obviated if provision were made for the regulations or by-laws to be accepted apart from the unacceptable portion. Several regulations have been held up simply because one paragraph was not acceptable.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Could it not be re-introduced in less than 12 months?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. If the honourable member knew the workings of the Crown Law Department and of local government he would know that it takes more than 12 months. One by-law was rejected in 1959 and it was not again brought forward until July of this year. That was simply because of a few small sections that were not acceptable. I might agree with another of the suggestions advanced by Sir Arthur Rymill. He said the rejection should be by both Houses of Parliament and I could agree with him on that point if the Legislative Council were elected on a truly democratic basis. I have a nasty habit of looking for the nigger in the woodpile in some suggestions. Sir Arthur Rymill wishes to have his interests looked after to the detriment of the vast majority of the people. If he is prepared to agree with me on a full franchise for election to this Chamber I will agree with him on his point. The dispensation clauses in a council's by-law are wrong as they allow one law for one person in one street and another law for a person in a different street. Every by-law should apply to all people equally.

Councils come before the committee and tell it that while they are in office they will not do certain things, but councils are elected only for a period of 12 months. I

remember a disturbance at Mount Gambier when the council was defeated. The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation does not have to assume responsibility for the dispensation clause in a by-law. Parliament has to take the responsibility for the inclusion of dispensation clauses in council by-laws. There is one case before the committee now dealing with a dispensation clause as late as 1958 or 1959. Some people had bought property in a business or industrial area in a certain council area, but now the council wants to declare it a residential area. I believe that in one case the difference in value amounts to a loss of £8,000 to the person concerned and this was because the council changed its mind. To me that is wrong. There should be one law for everyone.

The Honourable Sir Arthur Rymill referred to members of this committee having bees in their bonnets. That is the type of language one would expect from a person brought up in his type of society when referring to Labor people, but when he refers to members of his own Party, who have worked hard and diligently to give service to Parliament and the State, as having bees in their bonnets, I think that is bad taste. I do not suppose that anyone is further apart from me in political beliefs than Mr. Millhouse (Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee) and Sir Arthur Rymill. I do not know whether Mr. Millhouse is further away from me than Sir Arthur. It has been a pleasure for me to work with other members of that Committee. Mr. Millhouse has proved himself a very capable chairman, and to say that members of this committee have bees in their bonnets is unbecoming of any honourable member of this Chamber. I hope that Parliament and the Government will not be overawed by Sir Arthur Rymill's statement concerning the committee because it has done something that apparently does not satisfy him. I have been proud to be a member of this committee. I have learnt much during that time and I think the knowledge gained will stand me in good stead in my future years as a member of this honourable Chamber. I intend to vote for the amendment to the motion and I hope it will be carried.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern): In rising to support the motion, I should like to associate myself with the various formalities connected with this debate and in doing so I hope I do not weary honourable members by repetition. First, I should like to express my pleasure at the arrival of our new Governor, Sir Eddie Bastyan, and Lady Bastyan, and I

hope that their stay in South Australia will be as enjoyable to them as I am sure it will be profitable to the people of the State. The Speech with which he opened the present session of Parliament was one in which we could all take great pleasure. With other people from the country, I am looking forward to the various visits he has promised to make to country districts. I am sure he will be well received.

I express my appreciation of the very distinguished way in which Sir Mellis Napier filled the position of Lieutenant-Governor during the period when we were without a Governor. The people of South Australia, particularly members of Parliament, have great confidence in him and appreciate the work he does as Chancellor of the Adelaide University and as a representative of many other organizations. I regret the early demise of our late Governor-General, Viscount Dunrossil, and with other honourable members express sympathy to the family. I also regret the passing of Sir Malcolm McIntosh, who was a representative in the district in which I live. I had close association with him and in the year that single electorates were introduced I was president of the Albert District Committee of the Liberal and Country League when Sir Malcolm was elected to represent that district. Therefore, I can say I knew him very well. He looked after the interests of his district very capably and as far as we can judge he was a very good Minister. He held various portfolios for many years. I express to his family our regret at his passing.

The late Mr. O'Halloran was accepted by all of us as an exceptionally good orator. If he went to a meeting of farmers, he always gave a very good address; or if it was a meeting of business men or politicians he was always able to rise to the occasion and make an excellent speech. We regret his passing. As to our late friend, Mr. Frank Condon, the Honourable Mr. Melrose, in a very good speech, paid an eloquent tribute to him, with which I am sure we all agree. I looked upon Mr. Condon as a grand old gentleman and endorse the remarks of other honourable members and express my sympathy to members of his family.

In this debate we have been treated to many good speeches. I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion, the Hons. Mr. Edmonds and Mr. Story on the standard of their speeches. During the period of nearly 18 years that Mr. Edmonds has been a member of this Chamber he has made many fine speeches and on this occasion he did not fail to do so again. He gave us an excellent

resume of the work he has done in the interests of the country and what Parliament has done for his district during his tenancy of his seat, and also a forward view of what can be done in the development of the area with which he was so closely associated. I am sure that his opinion of a progressive future for South Australia is not ill-founded. The Honourable Mr. Story is always a good advocate for the river districts and he treated us to a very good speech. He is a young man from whom the State will gain much, for I am sure he will go a long way.

We know that Parliament is responsible for most of what is done in South Australia, but the proposals come from the Premier and his Ministers. One would not be human if he did not recognize the tremendous advantages and privileges that have been developed in this State over the last 20 years. Sir Thomas Playford is forward-looking, industrious and tireless. As a Premier he has a proud record, for over 23 years the State has been able to balance its Budget. We cannot sufficiently eulogize his work. I want to extend my congratulatory remarks to other members of the Cabinet.

Sir Lyell McEwin, the Leader of the Government in this place, has done fine work, as have all Ministers in carrying out the portfolios with which they have been entrusted. Sir Lyell has been responsible for setting up many fine hospitals in South Australia, and under his control our mineral development has progressed to an extent never dreamed of. He is also the head of our Police Department, and I hope that under his supervision we shall long see, as we have done in the last two or three years, the famous grey police horses. I have been to several country shows lately where they have been taken and great satisfaction has been expressed at their attendance and display.

The Honourable Mr. Rowe, as Attorney-General, has always been hard-working, industrious, and efficient. He has enhanced his reputation considerably.

Sir Cecil Hincks has done tremendous work in land development and the settlement of ex-servicemen. As Minister of Lands, if he had done nothing more, it would be something to cause him to be remembered with respect and gratitude.

As Minister of Works the Honourable Mr. Pearson has been responsible for many undertakings to the benefit of the State. One can say definitely that the work performed by the

Electricity Trust has been of untold advantage to South Australia. The trust now receives about £15,000,000 annually in revenue from the sale of electricity, which shows the tremendous amount of business it does. The fact that 97 per cent of the homes in South Australia are supplied with reticulated water and 90 per cent with electricity from the trust is a tribute to any Government, and I believe it to be something unapproached in most other places.

The Honourable Mr. Brookman, as Minister of Agriculture, has taken a great interest in farming, and has followed in the footsteps of his father in doing much for agriculture. He administers the two greatest revenue-producing and labour-employing sections of State activities. He has done good work.

The Hon. B. Pattinson, Minister of Education, has carried through a colossal education programme. In the last 10 years we have doubled the number of schoolchildren and provided the necessary schools and teachers. We must congratulate the Minister on what he has done. His work is appreciated.

The Honourable N. L. Jude, Minister of Local Government, Minister of Roads and Minister of Railways, is to be commended. The work done by the departments under his control can be seen by people who travel through the State. When I first went to Keith with two horses and a dray hardly any work had been done on roads, but now almost everywhere we have good sealed main roads, and much of it has been done through the efforts of Mr. Jude. It is a difficult task to control local government, roads and railways, because roads and railways are always in opposition to each other. It must be difficult for the Minister to give satisfaction to the people who use the roads and at the same time run the railways successfully. I compliment him on the way in which he has done his work.

I commend the Government for its successful management of State affairs since it has been in office. Some months ago we were faced with an economic crisis and the Commonwealth Government felt it necessary to impose credit restrictions. At the time we all agreed that it was a wise move, but no-one wanted unemployment or business people to be in difficulties. We all remember the depression years, so we can appreciate now what was done to prevent our having a recurrence of what happened in the 1930's. Rising costs and lower prices for primary products were worrying the Commonwealth Government. There was no question that as well as the adverse balance

of payments overseas, something had to be done regarding the costs of the primary producer, who was on the bottom rung of the ladder and could not pass on his added costs. We agree that the arbitration system is desirable, and that wages must be increased as living costs rise, but some remedial action had to be taken as a result of the abnormal position which had arisen. I consider that credit should be given to the South Australian Government for its attempt to reduce unemployment by continuing and even accelerating the housing programme. Other States did not have the leadership and the wisdom, shall I say, to meet the circumstances as well as this Government. South Australia was probably the most hard hit by the squeeze, as our main industries are the motor industry and its ancillaries, which were the industries at which the restrictions were aimed.

We can appreciate the Government's action of granting additional finance to the Housing Trust, which built nearly 150 more houses during the last year than it did during the previous year, which compares favourably with the slump in house building in other States. The Government was able to make available £1,000,000 to the Electricity Trust to erect a power line to the South-East, and this will greatly assist in increasing employment in that area. I hope that all the displaced workers will soon be re-employed, so that progress may be continued. I said a few months ago that if the road system in the South-East could be doubled in 10 years, in 20 years production in that area would be perhaps more than doubled. We look forward to that progress being made in that period, because the area has a vast potential and any increase in power and water supplies will result in great development.

The Hon. Mrs. Cooper said that restrictions on the intake of students were being imposed at the medical faculty at the University. As in other universities, these restrictions will apply to other faculties in the future. The University Council has found it necessary to restrict enrolment to 120 students in the medical course next year, although it is anticipated there will be 160 to 170 applicants. Much thought was given to how these restrictions should apply, and one member of the council said that justice should not only be done but should be seen to be done. It seems that the university acted on that policy when fixing the intake at 120, as academic qualifications at Leaving and Leaving Honours

standard are to be taken into account. I have advocated in this House (as the Minister of Education has elsewhere), and at the University Council that the matriculation standard for entrance to the university has been too low. I believe we should raise the matriculation standard rather than curtail the number of students entering it. I understand that there will be a middle course between Leaving and Leaving Honours which will be adopted later as a matriculation standard, but if this is to be the basis of entry students in the country will be at a disadvantage because there are no Leaving Honours classes in some areas.

In spite of certain remarks in this Chamber, I feel that we shall have to provide more scholarships for country students who are not able to keep attending local schools because they do not have a Leaving Honours class. It is difficult for students to enter colleges and to find board in Adelaide, and consequently, if it is necessary for them to have high academic qualifications before admission to the university, more scholarships should be provided for the more brilliant country student to give him the same opportunity as those living in the metropolitan area. Primary schools in country areas today compare favourably with those in the metropolitan area, and I understand the proportion of passes in the country areas has exceeded those obtained in parts of the metropolitan area. This is partly because young teachers who are receiving higher education themselves before being sent out to teach are more adequately prepared to teach others, and partly because of some smaller classes. They are advantages the country student has over the city student.

There are several abattoirs in country areas not far from Adelaide, which are working under a considerable handicap. They have to bring their meat into the city; have it inspected at Sturt Street, with the various organs attached to the body; re-load it and then distribute it to butchers in some of our country towns as well as to their own shops in the metropolitan area. There is room for improvement in this system. It is unhygienic in warm weather to kill sheep or cattle and hang the carcass up with the organs still intact, and then have to bring it into a depot to be inspected, re-loaded and delivered to the various shops. The Government should act to preserve the quality of meat sold to consumers in the metropolitan and near-metropolitan areas and to provide a reasonable opportunity for the decentralization of killing in this State.

Many members of this Council have often urged the Government to use regulations in preference to proclamations because of the long procedure involved in the disallowance of a proclamation. I believe that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is doing a good job because it draws our attention to these things in the only way that it can after they have been laid on the table. Every member has an opportunity to speak, but few have the time to read and examine all the by-laws and regulations. I believe that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation should examine these by-laws and bring them before Parliament if it has some reason to object to any of them.

I congratulate the Adelaide City Council on the vast improvements occurring in Adelaide. I give credit where credit is due and because one member disagrees with the views expressed by another member that does not mean that he disparages the efforts of the other. I suppose about 75 per cent of the members in this Council have worked in local government, many of them as chairmen of councils for many years. Surely those people have some respect for local government and for its work. I have the highest respect for local government, but Parliament has given certain authority to councils and it is Parliament's duty to see that that authority is properly used. I congratulate the Adelaide City Council on its good work in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It has increased its assessments.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY: We know that progress and prosperity bring higher assessments but we are happy to have progress and prosperity rather than depression and low rates. I pay a tribute to our Public Service because its officers help all members on the many occasions when they seek help. I thank public servants for that. Finally, Mr. President, I thank you for your indulgence over the years. You have held your office for so long that one doubts whether your handling of it will ever be excelled. You have presided over this House with great diligence and the way in which the Council has been run is a wonderful tribute to your presidency. I thank you for the help that you have given to us all.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): In view of the pending adjournment it is not my intention to address myself to the whole field covered by honourable members during the course of the debate, but I wish first to associate myself with certain

matters that were mentioned by the mover and seconder of the motion because this will be the only opportunity during the session that I shall have of doing so. I refer to their mention of the arrival of our new Governor in this State. I endorse to the full the sentiments expressed about him and the fact that we have enjoyed continuous administration by Governors from England. I am sure that the present Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, will maintain the high reputation that has been established by the long line of illustrious gentlemen who have occupied the position before him.

I was glad to hear the references to the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Mellis Napier, for the valuable contribution he has made over the years when acting in that position. He has had a very distinguished record in that capacity and in his official capacity as Chief Justice. He has well merited the references made about him. I also commend the mover and seconder of the motion. They, of course, are both experienced members in this House and we could anticipate that what they were to say would be worth listening to. I regret that the mover, who has been a colleague of mine for so long, has announced his retirement and will be leaving us, but I shall leave any further reference I wish to make about him to an appropriate occasion that will occur, and that applies also to you, Mr. President. As both of you are looking hale and hearty I am sure you will be with us when we farewell you at the end of the session.

Regarding the deceased members, I refer firstly to the late Sir Malcolm McIntosh, who was a Cabinet colleague of mine for a number of years and one whom I learned to appreciate to the fullest degree. Sir Malcolm was a keen advocate and an equally keen debater and I well remember many of the debates we had in Cabinet, but he was one of those gentlemen who could join in the most serious argument and reach a conclusion without retaining any personal animosity. It was not surprising, when acting as Premier from time to time, that I should learn to appreciate the qualities of the late Sir Malcolm to the highest degree.

We have also lost the Leader of the Labor Party in both Houses and that is a unique happening. I do not know whether two Leaders have ever before been taken so close together. The late Mr. O'Halloran was the member for one of the electorates in the Northern district, and I was associated with him, as a Council member, for the whole period that he was the Assembly member for Frome. All I wish to say about him is that he worked

in that district but did not once try to gain some political advantage from anything that he did for the district. That is something that anyone associated with politics can appreciate and it was a privilege to work with him. I can say the same of the late Mr. Condon, the Leader of the Labor Party in this Chamber. He was a member when I first entered the Council and from my very first meeting with him I, like other new members, soon learned that I was associating with someone who, although completely different in political views, commanded the respect of his fellows; and later, when he became Leader of his Party in this Chamber, it was my privilege to experience and appreciate his qualities. His word was always observed to the letter.

I am confronted with two promotions opposite, one relating to the Leader of our own Party in the Honourable L. H. Densley, who has filled the position with credit. I have always appreciated his sincerity and I thank him for his assistance. The other relates to the Hon. Mr. Shard, the new Leader of the Labor Party in the Council, who today made his maiden speech in that capacity.

Whilst I am in the humour of handing out congratulations, I must include our Clerk, Mr. Ivor Ball, who will shortly leave with delegates to attend a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in London. I wish him a very interesting, pleasurable and happy trip. It is one that he has well deserved, and no-one is more competent to undertake the task than he is. I have heard it said by some honourable members that they cannot get interested in the affairs of this association, but I say that never before was it more necessary that the Parliaments of Australia should be members of this association. It is one means whereby members of the Commonwealth democratic countries can meet and gain knowledge of conditions in the other parts of the Commonwealth. It gives delegates an opportunity to bring back results of their observations. If we wish democracy to continue, it is necessary that we should make it work. We should endeavour to get a proper understanding of the problems and the conditions existing in the various Commonwealth countries.

One honourable member during this debate questioned whether it was worthwhile to express opinions or make observations in this Council because he wondered whether any notice was taken of them. I think that that rests with the honourable member concerned. Like the Hon. Mr. Shard, I can look back with pleasure

on some of the things I introduced as a member before I was elevated to Cabinet rank, because I did get results.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Even if you got no kudos for it.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Even if I did not, I got a lot of pleasure. When one is in politics long enough one learns that one does not get kudos for things one does. That is accepted as a matter of course; but one always gets criticism for the things one does not do. As a celebrated politician of another Parliament once said, "Any publicity is good"; so I was pleased that I got a little yesterday. After all, it is something to be included in a cartoon, but today I seem to have lost all the credit. That is life. Perhaps we cannot afford to take too seriously many of the things we say. I assure honourable members that notice is taken of what is said. If an honourable member is speaking 20 years ahead of his time and what he predicted actually happens, it can give him great pleasure to say "That is something I advocated 20 years ago". Such members can have all the credit; I certainly would be one to give full credit to such people. I shall now make some reference to the amendment to the motion, which has not been discussed very seriously during the debate, except by Mr. Shard today.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I happened to move it and I had something to say about it.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: An attempt was made to reflect upon the Government in relation to the basic wage case before the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission. There is no disagreement between what the Premier said and anything that the Under Treasurer submitted to the court in the form of statistical information. The Premier said that the State was prosperous, and this was not contradictory to the information submitted by the Under Treasurer. The Premier was justified in his statement, and he was optimistic and sincere enough to hope that prosperous conditions would continue. South Australia has an excellent employment record. The Government is desirous of maintaining employment and the only way to do that is to keep men fully employed. We want healthy industry. In this State we have to manufacture goods at a price at which they can be sold 600 or 1,200 or even more miles away. South Australia has always had the advantage over the other States of more favourable conditions as regards costs. I hope that we can

retain that advantage and do not just get casual about being in the common pool of things, because when that happens I can see factories in South Australia closing and shifting elsewhere. As soon as it becomes unprofitable to manufacture goods in South Australia we shall have much unemployment. Labor members have complained about the support given to the employers in the basic wage case, but it was only because the figures supported the employers' view. The case put up did not advocate a rise or a fall in the basic wage: that cannot be read into the Under Treasurer's statement. If the figures supported the employers' case it was not because of an arrangement, but purely coincidental. In any case there would have to be a decision by the court that they did, and by nobody else, not even the Government.

I have said enough to indicate that I do not ask members to support the amendment. I oppose it because what it says is not in accordance with fact, and I hope it will be defeated. I thank members for their contribution to the debate, which has been most informative and valuable.

The Council divided on the amendment:

Ayes (2).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph (teller) and A. J. Shard.

Noes (14).—The Hons. Jessie M. Cooper, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, G. O'H. Giles, A. C. Hookings, N. L. Jude, Sir Lyell

McEwin (teller), A. J. Melrose, Sir Frank Perry, F. J. Potter, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, and R. R. Wilson.

Pair.—Aye—The Hon. S. C. Bevan. No—The Hon. C. R. Story.

Majority of 12 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; motion for adoption of Address in Reply carried.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform members that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive them for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 4.45 p.m. today.

At 4.43 p.m. the President and honourable members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: I have to report that, accompanied by honourable members, I attended at Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Governor the Address in Reply adopted by the Council this afternoon. His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to my speech at the opening of the third session of the thirty-sixth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.03 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 15, at 2.15 p.m.