

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Tuesday, August 15, 1961.

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

**QUESTIONS.****INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL COMMITTEE'S ACTIVITIES.**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I address my question to the Chairman of the Industries Development Special Committee, which is looking into the question of decentralization. I have noticed in several country newspapers that various members of Parliament are making statements which I believe are incorrect. These remarks can be misleading to country people, who are vitally interested in the work of this committee. Can the chairman say whether this special committee, by virtue of its terms of reference, has to report to Parliament; and does he consider that difficulty has been experienced in collecting evidence on this vital matter?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Chairman, Industries Development Special Committee): The honourable member told me shortly before the sitting that he was going to ask the question. I think the answer appears quite plainly in the resolution passed by the House of Assembly on August 24 last:

That this House requests the members of the Industries Development Committee, acting as a special committee, to inquire into and report upon . . .

Then follow six submissions. Under section 20 of the Industries Development Act the committee has certain powers to make inquiries, as follows:

The committee shall be a Commission within the meaning of that term as defined in the Royal Commissions Act, 1917, and that Act shall apply accordingly: Provided that—

(a) no witness other than an applicant for a guarantee, grant or loan shall be compelled to disclose to the committee directly or indirectly any information as to his methods, processes or costs of production or manufacture:

(b) the evidence of any witness before the committee shall if the witness so requests be taken in private.

As no application is likely under the particular special committee appointed for a grant, guarantee or loan, it appears obvious that the power referred to would not be required for the committee acting as a special committee. The committee feels that some difficulty could

be experienced in obtaining witnesses who could give valuable evidence. Members consider that their investigations could be aided if they had that power. Up to this stage only four people have not readily come forward to give evidence when asked. The first one was the mover of the motion in the House of Assembly, the late Mr. O'Halloran, who did not desire to give any evidence; the United Trades and Labor Council, after being asked on several occasions, decided not to give any evidence; Mr. Dwyer, officer in South Australia for the Department of Labour and National Service, informed the committee that his Minister desired that if any evidence were required from the department it could be obtained by submitting questions in writing. That would meet the committee's requirements. The only other people asked who did not wish to give evidence were T. Borthwick and Sons, meat exporters. I think that that explains generally the question asked.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I happen to be a member of that committee, and I should like to ask the Honourable Mr. Giles who are the members making statements around the country?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: The honourable member would no doubt appreciate my attempts to keep personal references out of this matter, but I can tell him that they were not members of this special committee.

**SEACLIFF PRIMARY SCHOOL.**

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Education, yet received a reply to my question of August 3 regarding improvements at Seacliff primary school?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Plans are practically completed for a new toilet block at this school, and following upon their completion an estimate will be prepared and specifications written. Subject to the approval of the Government being obtained for the scheme, it is expected that tenders will be called in September.

**MEAT SUBSIDY.**

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Has the Chief Secretary obtained a reply from the Minister of Agriculture regarding the payment of subsidies to producers of export fat lambs under the British Meat Agreement?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have received the following report from the Minister of Agriculture:

The subsidy on export spring lamb will be administered by the Australian Meat Board,

which will make payment at the rate of 2s. per head on whole carcasses or three farthings per pounds on cuts. Payment will be made to the exporter who actually ships the meat concerned. Subsidy applies only to spring lambs slaughtered for export on and after August 1, 1961. In the case of producers marketing on their own account through the Government Produce Department, or a licensed agent exporter, payment will be made to the department or agent exporter for transfer to the producer. Sales by producers to export operators will be on the basis of payment of the subsidy to the export operator who, it is assumed, through competition between various export operators, will make provision for passing on the subsidy to producers per medium of his buying price.

#### EFFICIENCY IN PUBLIC SERVICE.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: During the Address in Reply debate I referred to the desirability, in my opinion, of an efficiency investigation being made periodically in relation to various Government departments, not on the ground that they are not efficient but on the ground that there is the possibility that the efficient may be made still more efficient. Since then the Chief Secretary has drawn my attention to the fact that certain efficiency investigations already take place. Can he tell me the nature of those investigations?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I shall be pleased to give the information that the honourable member seeks. He referred to the desirability of having efficiency investigations into Government departments and I have been informed by the Deputy Public Service Commissioner that the position is as follows:—

One of the functions of the Investigating Branch of the Public Service Commissioner's Department is to devise ways of improving the organization and efficiency of departments of the Public Service and staff has been engaged on this work—management consulting within the service—for over 30 years. Methods and techniques are similar to those used by the private management consultants and some of the investigating officers have received part of their training working with outside consultants. In addition, on the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner and the heads of the departments concerned, private consultants have been brought in for specific assignments.

I know that this has been done. In the case of organizations that are not entirely Government organizations, but where some financial support has been given, the Government has provided funds for the engagement of investigating consultants. I hope this information will be of interest to members.

#### MILK SUPPLIES.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Has the Chief Secretary obtained a reply from the Minister of Agriculture following on my question of August 1 regarding the attitude of the Metropolitan Milk Board towards refrigeration and the suspension of licences of dairymen under the conditions dealing with poor quality milk?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Minister of Agriculture communicated with the Metropolitan Milk Board and received the following reply:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 2 enclosing a *Hansard* clipping of a question asked by the Hon. G. O'H. Giles, M.L.C., and forward the following comments thereon:

(1) Suspension for unsatisfactory methylene blue results—The basis of suspension on which the board has worked has been three unsatisfactory tests out of four during a monthly test period, excepting where the last test was satisfactory. In such cases no action for suspension has been taken. To cushion the impact of such a policy during the first few years of its application, a limit was placed on the number of suspensions each month. It is now felt that sufficient time has elapsed for the producer to become fully conversant with the production of quality milk. As it is vital to improve the bacteriological quality of milk during the summer months, the board decided that in future any producer whose milk does not comply with the required standard will have his licence suspended until such time as results of further tests satisfy the board that the milk is of a satisfactory standard.

(2) Refrigeration on farms—The letter setting out the Board's policy in regard to refrigeration on farms was published for the express purpose of clarifying the board's position in this matter. The letter referred to reads as follows:

With greater interest being shown in refrigeration by producers the board considers it opportune to clarify its policy concerning the use of refrigeration in the production of milk for consumption within the metropolitan area. All licensed producers are under an obligation to supply milk which will conform with the bacteriological and compositional standards. This means, in effect, that the producer is charged with the responsibility of providing the equipment and the method necessary to produce milk which will conform with these standards. In future, the number of suspensions for unsatisfactory methylene blue results will not be limited during the summer months. This means that greater emphasis is being placed on the quality of the milk produced by licensed producers, and, therefore, quality must be maintained at all times throughout the year, irrespective of weather conditions. The bacteriological quality of the milk, as determined by the methylene blue

test, has shown that the quality is satisfactory for the major part of the year except during the hot weather when there is a sharp falling off in quality, particularly in those areas where milk is collected only once daily. To combat this difficulty and to improve quality, it may be necessary for some producers to provide refrigeration. Whilst the board appreciates that there is a great need for refrigeration on dairy farms for the cooling and storage of milk held overnight, it has no intention, at this stage, of making farm refrigeration compulsory, nor is it prepared to amend the prices structure to provide a special bonus for farm refrigerated milk. The emphasis will, in effect, be on quality and the producer will be expected to comply with the four hour methylene blue standard at all times.

This clearly sets out the board's policy. Answers to the specific questions asked are: (a) No, the board's policy is as stated above; and (b) It is extremely unlikely that milk of 100 per cent quality when it leaves the producer's premises would not comply with the methylene blue standard of four hours when it is tested at the factory. It must be appreciated that the standard is determined for milk as delivered to the factory, not at roadside awaiting collection. Unless milk is of satisfactory quality when delivered to the factory it is not possible for the board to ensure that the consumer is supplied with milk of good quality.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT.

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

1. Is the Chief Secretary aware that the Australian Council of Trade Unions is seeking the setting up of a special section in the Department of Labour and National Service to make a more intensive study of automation and mechanization so that unemployment may be minimized?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to establish machinery in this State to co-operate with the Management and the Trade Unions so as to provide work for displaced workers brought about by automation and mechanization?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The replies are:

1. Yes.

2. It has been the practice in the past for research into labour matters of a national nature to be undertaken by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service and as the Commonwealth Government is at present looking into this matter it appears that it will be wise to await the result of their investigations.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on:

Port Lincoln Hospital Additions,  
 Drainage of Ral Ral Division of Chaffey Irrigation Area,  
 Airdale Primary School,  
 Brahma Primary School,  
 Vale Park Primary School,  
 Beefacres Primary School,  
 Elizabeth West Primary School,  
 Mansfield Park Primary School Additions,  
 Newton Primary School,  
 Tonsley Park Primary School,  
 Findon High School Additions,  
 Mitcham High School (Daws Road),  
 Flinders High School (Underdale),  
 Marion High School Additions,  
 Modbury High School,  
 Kidman Park Boys Technical High School,  
 Mitcham Girls Technical High School Additions,  
 Port Pirie Technical High School,  
 Port Augusta Gaol Re-Building,  
 Brighton Primary School Additions,  
 Whyalla North-West Primary School,  
 Port Lincoln High School Additions,  
 Cummins Area School,  
 Geranium Area School,  
 Kangaroo Inn Area School, and  
 Duplication of Morgan to Whyalla Pipeline.

#### HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Act, 1935-1960. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I move:

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

The object of this Bill is to remedy a weakness in the legislation dealing with the licensing of buildings used for the purposes of rest homes. Section 146a of the principal Act deals with the licensing of rest homes. Subsection (1) of that section defines a rest home as any building (other than a building licensed under an enactment specified in the definition) in which any person receives any other person (not being a relative) to board or lodge and who undertakes for fee or reward to exercise oversight, care or control over such other person by way of nursing treatment or treatment applicable to aged, infirm or helpless or partially helpless persons.

Both the Central Board of Health and the Municipal Association of South Australia have drawn the Government's attention to the difficulty arising from that definition in establishing that oversight, care or control is undertaken or exercised for fee or reward in cases where the fees for such services are included in the fees charged for board or lodging. This difficulty had in fact been experienced in a recent case and the Government is concerned that the weakness in the legislation could afford a means of evading the law with regard to the licensing of buildings used for the purposes of rest homes.

To remedy the weakness paragraph (c) of clause 3 inserts in section 146a of the principal Act a new subsection by virtue of which a building or part of a building will be deemed to be a rest home or used for the purposes of a rest home, if, during the relevant period a person exercised over another person boarding or lodging in that building or that part of that building any oversight, care or control by way of nursing or other specified treatment, unless it is shown that no fee or reward was paid or given or agreed to be paid or given for such oversight, care or control, and that no fee or reward for such oversight, care or control had been included in any payment made or agreed to be made for the board or lodging of that other person during the relevant period. The Government feels that this provision would not place any undue burden on any person conducting an unlicensed rest home, as the fact as to whether or not a fee or reward for the oversight, care or control was paid or payable or included in any payment for board or lodging would be within his peculiar knowledge. Paragraphs (a) and (b) of clause 3 clarify, and make drafting improvements to subsections (1) and (2) of section 146a respectively.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SALE OF FURNITURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Sale of Furniture Act, 1904-1935. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move:

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

The principal amendment effected by this Bill will be to require all furniture other than secondhand furniture and furniture not sold by way of trade, to be stamped or labelled

with the name of the manufacturer and the name of the country or State of Australia of origin before it can be sold. The opportunity is being taken at the same time of making some other amendments to bring the Act into line with modern conditions.

The principal amendment to which I have referred is effected by paragraph (b) of clause 4 which will amend the present section 5 of the principal Act. That section requires all furniture made in the State to be stamped but does not require the stamping or labelling of furniture not manufactured in the State. The effect of the amendment will therefore be that not only will local manufacturers be required (as at present) to stamp their names upon furniture made for sale, but also all traders will be required to see that any furniture, whether manufactured in this State or elsewhere, is stamped or labelled with the name of the manufacturer and the place of origin. The object of the amendment is to afford some measure of protection to the public who will, when buying furniture, be able to discover by whom and where furniture was made. It appears from representations made to the Government that there is some tendency for shoddy furniture becoming dumped in this State to the detriment of the local industry and the buying public, which at present has no means of discovering where the furniture was made or by whom. I may add that a not dissimilar requirement is in force in New South Wales.

Clauses 3 and 4 (a) will enable furniture to be either stamped or otherwise labelled. It is considered that the present provision, which requires an indelible permanent ink or stain or impression, is not reasonable either in respect of highly polished furniture or in respect of furniture which consisting of a wooden frame is subsequently covered by upholstery. For many years branding by means of stickers or sewn labels has been permitted as substantially complying with the spirit but not the letter of the Act, and it is considered desirable to make proper provision to permit of this being done. Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 3 of the principal Act, while clause 5 will amend section 6 concerning the nature and position of the stamp to accord with modern conditions.

Clause 6 will amend section 7 of the principal Act which provides that an inspector may seize furniture and detain it for the purpose of proceedings, but that it must be returned if proceedings are not taken within

three days. It is proposed to increase this period to seven days. Clauses 7 and 9 will provide for the offence of obstructing inspectors or refusing to answer questions, and also provide protection to inspectors in respect of actions taken by them in pursuance of the Act. Clause 8 will increase the general penalty under the Act from £5 to £25, the present

penalty having remained unaltered for some fifty odd years.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 2.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 22, at 2.15 p.m.