

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 9, 1962.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**HAIR SPRAY.**

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: An article appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser* referring to the effect of hair spray on people using such sprays. The article stated that Dr. Munro Ford said that people subjected to inhalation of these types of spray were likely to suffer serious diseases and damaging effect to their lungs. In view of that statement, which expresses concern regarding the danger of inhalation of hair sprays, will the Minister of Labour and Industry ask his department to examine the danger to employees in ladies' hairdressing salons, and if it is found that such danger exists, will he instruct the safety officers of his department to point out to employers and employees the necessity to provide and use industrial respirators for personal safety?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I saw the statement that was made to the press by Dr. Munro Ford, and I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my department in an effort to obtain more detailed information. If that information indicates that some action is necessary in the interests of the health of people, particularly those engaged in the hairdressing industry, I shall be pleased to take appropriate steps to see that they are warned of the danger.

LEAVING HONOURS CLASSES.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: My question relates to the Mount Gambier area where several people for some time have been attempting to have Leaving Honours classes established in various subjects at high school level. I gather that they have been told that their case will be considered at the relevant time. I believe a statement appeared in the press recently that three or four towns north of Adelaide were to have Leaving Honours classes in their high schools, including, I think, Port Pirie, Whyalla and Nuriootpa. I gather from

press statements that Mount Gambier, in spite of representations put forward by certain of the local people, has not been considered at this stage. As Mount Gambier, according to the latest statistical figures available, has a population of about 15,500 and probably has a higher population than the other centres mentioned, and as it is surrounded by a very intensively farmed area, will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Education, see whether Mount Gambier could be favourably considered with a view to having Leaving Honours classes at that centre?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The question of establishing Leaving Honours classes in certain parts of the country has had very serious consideration both by the Minister of Education and by Cabinet, and I think the decisions made followed on a survey as to the number of students that would be available in the respective high schools to undertake those classes if they were provided, and the four country centres for which it was announced that they would be established were able to supply the number of students required. I do not remember, offhand, what the position was regarding Mount Gambier, but I shall be most happy to confer with my colleague regarding the matter and obtain a detailed report.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Is the Minister able to say whether consideration has been given to the establishment of Leaving Honours classes in the Upper Murray areas of South Australia?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I understand that consideration was given to that, and my recollection is that it was agreed that such classes would be established at the Glossop High School.

CITY COUNCIL RATES.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice): Will the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government state the reasons for exempting the Municipal Tramways Trust property in the city of Adelaide from the payment of municipal rates while rent is being received from such property and other city property owners receive no such exemption in similar circumstances?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The trust is exempt under its Act from "general, special, or local taxation". The trust points out that a few years ago there was agitation for the trust to quit its present Angas Street depot. At this time the Simpson property came on the market and the trust, in what it believed to be the public interest, purchased it

for use as a depot in due course. The present city depot would have met requirements for many years to come; in any case, the site could have been developed for its greater economic use. The buildings on the Simpson property are such that they are not readily let and it is not possible to secure rentals that normally would be secured from a site in such a location. The trust's outgoings are, in fact, not met by its income from the property. The property was purchased by the trust for use in its operations and its leasing meantime is simply incidental.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

ORIENTAL FRUIT MOTH CONTROL BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT
ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1263.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to oppose the Bill, the only object of which is to give the Minister of Agriculture the right to license other abattoirs within the metropolitan area, if he deems it necessary. I believe that the Bill was introduced as the outcome of a recent industrial dispute at the Metropolitan Abattoirs, and that was its sole purpose. If the Bill could have prevented that dispute or got producers out of their immediate troubles I could have understood it, but none of these things could have been done by its introduction. One has to look further to ascertain why the Bill was introduced. I believe it was introduced to take away the industrial strength of the abattoirs' employees in future years, or with the object of the Government's keeping in line with its policy of making the way open for a private industry to establish an abattoirs within the metropolitan area. That is the obvious reason why the Bill was introduced. Although I do not know that I am right, I may be. The Government was glad of the opportunity to take advantage of this dispute, with the clear object of making the way open for a company to establish an abattoirs within the metropolitan area.

The Hon. C. R. Story: If that would reduce meat prices to consumers, would you be in favour of it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not think it has any hope at all of reducing meat prices in the metropolitan area. More overhead expenses would be incurred, so meat costs must be increased to the consuming public. There would be two lots of overhead expenses. The Metropolitan Abattoirs is not working to capacity at present, and can supply all the meat consumed in the metropolitan area without difficulty. The abattoirs was not working to capacity at the time the overtime ban was imposed. If that is so, it would be reasonable to think that if a private company started an abattoirs, the cost of meat must eventually rise. To create an opening for a private company to build an abattoirs would be with the express purpose of taking away the industrial strength of the abattoirs' employees. The Government apparently agrees with me because in section 70 of the original Act appears the following:

While abattoirs are available under this Act for slaughtering stock no person shall within the metropolitan abattoirs area—

- (a) elsewhere than at the said abattoirs slaughter or allow or cause to be slaughtered any stock for sale for human consumption or dress or allow or cause to be dressed any carcass for sale; or
- (b) sell or attempt to sell or expose for sale or allow or cause to be sold or exposed for sale any carcass or meat not slaughtered at such abattoirs.

Another section includes a proviso that if meat slaughtered outside the metropolitan area is brought to certain places for inspection, and if there is not enough room or time to make an inspection there it goes to the abattoirs for inspection. Meat is brought from beyond the boundaries of the Mitcham district to Adelaide, returned to Blackwood and re-sold over the counter. The same applies to Noarlunga. The meat works there are now being operated by the Metropolitan Wholesale Meat Co. Ltd., which claims that it is rendering a service to the public. The Minister of Agriculture received a communication from the South Australian Wholesale Meat Co. Ltd. sited in the Government Produce Department works at Light Square to the effect that it is operating at Kangarilla, which is a little more than 20 miles from Adelaide. This company has business interests in three retail shops and supplies processed meat, cooked meat and small goods and the like to another client. It desires to continue its meat supply. There may be other companies in a similar position. Clause 3 of the Bill includes the following:

3. The following section is inserted in the principal Act after section 70 thereof:—

70a. (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the Minister, if he is of the opinion that in the interests of the public it is expedient so to do, may grant a licence for such period as he shall think fit to any person to slaughter, elsewhere than at the abattoirs of the board, any stock for sale for human consumption.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson: Where does it limit the establishment of abattoirs to the metropolitan area?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It does not do so, but we do not have to be told—

The Hon. W. W. Robinson: It could be in the country.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I hope the honourable member will agree with me on that because I propose to move an amendment to make it definite that it shall be in the country. The purpose of this Bill as I see it, and from knowledge I have gained of the industry, is to give a large company the right to slaughter within the metropolitan area for the supply of meat to those who live therein. We are not opposed to another abattoirs in country areas, but we say that there is no need for another in the metropolitan area. The exact reasons for this move do not have to be written into the Act because we know what is behind it.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: There will be one in the country whatever you do.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is possible, but we can only take the opportunity of trying to prevent its being established in the metropolitan area with results which could be serious to the public.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What, with more competition?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What rot!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I wish to intimate quite early in this debate that it is my intention to move an amendment to clause 3 as follows:

After "slaughter" in new section 70a(1) to strike out "elsewhere than at the abattoirs of the board" and insert "anywhere outside the metropolitan area".

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It does not need an amendment to do that. The Minister can do it now.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We want to make it certain that it will not be in the metropolitan area. If the Minister agreed to another slaughterhouse to operate in the metropolitan

area it would place the existing abattoirs in a very bad position and eventually it might cease to be a paying concern. That is not a light matter as we are told that the amount involved in the abattoirs is in the vicinity of £2,000,000, the greater portion of which is public money. Consequently I was astounded to hear last week a member of another place say that if the whole of that money were lost it would be a small price to pay for assuring the producers that their export lambs would be killed at the right time. A statement of that nature, from wherever it emanates, does not sound good.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Don't you think that the producers should be able to get their lambs slaughtered at the right time?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but it is also important that we do not throw £2,000,000 of public money down the drain just to further that end. I think it could be brought about in a better way. Following that line of thought to its logical conclusion, there is no guarantee that if a private company had abattoirs within the metropolitan area the producers would get their lambs slaughtered just when they wanted them slaughtered. My experience of industrial affairs is that in other States where huge private companies are operating and not controlled by a board such as we have here they run into just as much trouble periodically as we do; so there is no guarantee that if a company were granted the right to establish another abattoirs it would run smoothly, because employees are employees wherever they are and if they have a grievance they will choose the most opportune time for taking appropriate action.

I have made inquiries and find that our own abattoirs has not been working to capacity. When the export lamb season comes along each year the union is asked to find the number of men required to do the job. This year it was asked to find 150 men for the glut season. This usually lasts from eight to 10 weeks, though in a very good season it will run from the middle of September to the end of November, about 11 weeks. This year the actual number found was, I am told, an additional 156 men, so there was no shortage of labour. It should be clearly understood that, except in emergencies, overtime is not worked from Mondays to Fridays; it is all worked on Saturdays and Sundays when the glut is on. We find that when the men recently had the overtime ban operating the number employed was able to supply all the meat

necessary for the metropolitan area without any shortage. When I made inquiries as to whether they were working to capacity I found that there was a fourth chain not in operation.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Did they need more hands to work it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There may be an explanation from that point of view, but from the consumers' and producers' points of view I cannot see any reason which permits a section of works in any factory to remain idle and cater for overtime. Economically that seems wrong. This chain would have required another 27 men to operate it and, in their ordinary working time, those men would have slaughtered 10,800 lambs for export. A further two-fifths of that quota would have been slaughtered if overtime had been worked. I understand that the fourth chain is not a large chain and that it is not equal to any of the other three.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: This is a highly skilled job and it is hard to get people for it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is not a very skilled job.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: It is a slaughtering job.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I understand that men can be trained to perform the key jobs in four to five weeks.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I understood that there were no skilled men available to operate that chain.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They only required 150 men and they got 156 men and if they had only required another 27 men to work the chain and keep it in operation the men could have been supplied. Four to five weeks would have been required to train men as key personnel on that chain. I believe that from an economic point of view the fourth chain would have paid the Abattoirs Board better than working men at weekend penalty rates.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What did the men want to do?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Work!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The men are prepared to work, and I know a few of the men out there. Whilst all human nature cannot be judged, some of the men would want overtime for the sake of the money, but I know that some of the men do not appreciate working overtime every weekend for six to nine consecutive weekends.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: During the time of the dispute the men were not available to work that extra chain.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That was because the management did not seek those men.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: If it had sought them it would have had to train them for four to five weeks to do the job.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: When the board asked the men to prepare for the seasonal quota of lambs it did not intend to operate that chain, nor did it ever ask for sufficient men to operate it, because it banked on overtime to get the work done, and I believe that is bad business. The board acted from an economic point of view, and it must be bad economics to have a chain installed and then have it lying idle instead of being operated. The purpose of my proposed amendment is that we agree that in season there is good reason for another abattoirs to be built in the country areas. We agree that the present abattoirs cannot, even with a fourth chain working, cope with all the lambs required to be slaughtered in the export season. Isn't it preferable to have an abattoirs situated at the most advantageous point where it can be operated on a seasonal basis under the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board for the purpose of decentralizing the work in the glut season and having that abattoirs slaughter lambs for export only? I am informed that the biggest mistake was made some years ago when the Metropolitan Wholesale Meat Company wished to build an abattoirs at Wallaroo.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: And was assisted in every possible way and withdrew on its own investigation of the problem.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I believe that was before an abattoirs was built at Port Pirie. I was told that the Wallaroo project was not proceeded with because the company could not get a high enough percentage of the meat slaughtered to be sold within the metropolitan area.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Who told you that?

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Don't you think that half of their production is enough?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Mr. Pirie told me that, and his word can be accepted. I do not believe his statements have been challenged by anybody.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Then I challenge them now.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: If the honourable member has not been able to peruse the communication from the company he can see it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am prepared to accept Mr. Pirie's word.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Apparently your briefing is not correct.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Not one honourable member in another place refuted anything said by Mr. Pirie. Briefly, that is the position relating to the Bill and I oppose the second reading. When the Bill reaches the Committee stage I shall move the amendment I have indicated and I hope it will be carried, because that may enable us to do something towards decentralization, of which we all hear so much.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the Bill and I consider this measure is long overdue. We have been well entertained by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It does not take much to entertain you. You are easily satisfied.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Leader stated a very good case from his point of view, but other people are involved in this matter besides the people who are actually slaughtering. I believe the Leader of the Opposition skirted around the core of this measure. The position is that people who are spending much time and money in developing an extremely useful export market that Australia needs are, at present, being put to inconvenience and a good deal of expense that is detrimental to the State's economy. All the talk of limiting the supply of meat to the metropolitan area is wrong, because that is only a very small part of the problem.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Do you know what it costs to establish an abattoirs?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am fully aware of the cost of establishing an abattoirs, and if the honourable member will contain himself I will make that position clear later in my speech. The position as I see it is that under the provisions of this Bill the Minister of Agriculture will be able to grant licences for the slaughtering of stock within the metropolitan area. For some time the Government has had a policy—and it has not gone behind the door at all in telling the people what that policy is—in regard to country licences. Country abattoirs can be set up. The Government has made its policy very clear on this matter. Up to the present time no licence has been applied for. The Leader of the Opposition's statement makes it appear that this amending legislation has been introduced specifically for starting another abattoirs in the metropolitan area. Nothing could be further from the truth. In by-election propaganda honourable members opposite may get

this kind of stuff over very well; but some people will be happy if we enable them to see through all this facade. As I see it, the public has been held up to ransom on the question of export killing. The honourable member talked about the number of men who were sought by the Abattoirs Board, namely, 150, but actually 156 were supplied. There has been much talk in both Houses of an idle chain, on which 27 men could be employed. Perhaps my honourable friends opposite have never had to work to make a living.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What do you think we have been doing all our lives?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: When you have to make a living on the open market it is very different from advocating certain things being done by other people. Once or twice I have had to work to make a crust for myself, trying to make a profit. Very properly the abattoirs has a reserve chain, brought into operation when there is a glut, and to operate it the board calls upon slaughtermen in the beef section. The whole object of the board is to use that chain when the demand is there.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Is there not a demand there now?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The demand was there, but the employees would not work overtime.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Was the chain operated last season?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is operated when overtime is required and when there are men there to operate it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It has not been operated for years. They could not operate it now because the machinery has rusted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is different from fact, because the board made a statement on that recently. My honourable friend says that he believes what Mr. Pirie says. I also believe what the board says, which is that that is the purpose of the chain and why it is there.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You have seen on television reference to freedom of choice?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If my honourable friend had his say, there would be no choice. It is not the first time that there has been trouble at the abattoirs. It has happened for years.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That is not true.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes it is. We have had it for four or five years, with one or two gaps between.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: When was the last dispute?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There have been only two disputes since 1953.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will not argue with the honourable member, because that is futile. He says that if there were some competition, people in the metropolitan area would not get their meat more cheaply. He says it might cost a little more.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There is no "might".

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In this type of concern and in co-operatives, too, in which I have had extensive experience, if there is no yardstick to measure these organizations, they become milch cows. I believe that this organization is open to become a milch cow, by the fact that it is a monopoly. I sincerely think that if we had some competition in the meat killing industry, we would be much better off. What we have is in line with socialistic policy.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: What about our Electricity Trust?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Parliament has a guiding hand in the trust, fortunately. The whole plea that the honourable member has made is on the question of the supply of meat to the metropolitan area. He knows as well as I do that lambs must be brought to bloom and be taken off the farms before grass seeds appear and must be slaughtered when they are ready, and not when someone decides to have a little dispute. These are living animals and must be got away on the day that it is necessary before they lose their bloom. These animals do not understand that there is an overtime ban or an industrial dispute; they cannot hold their bloom. I believe that we should have the largest possible export in all our productions. In a time like this we must do what is best for the producers. After all, the Government has a large vested interest in this matter. One honourable member said a few moments ago that public money was at stake. This is true, because I understand that the Government has supplied £600,000 and also several thousand pounds has been provided by the Commonwealth Government for the building of yards at the abattoirs. The producers also have an interest amounting to £900,000, and they are the people interested in this matter. The public themselves have not made a very great contribution.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: How do they put their money into it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: By deductions from producers' returns as well as profits from the board's operations.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: They sell on an open market.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The reserves of the Abattoirs Board include fees received for the killing of the animals and the yard fees.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: But the primary producer gets his price for that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As with everything else, he gets what is left.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: He gets the ruling price at the sale yards.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Obviously the point has got home, because the honourable member is still arguing.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: An amount of £1,500,000 of taxation money is involved in the abattoirs.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is a very good investment. To say that the public had a major financial interest in it is quite wrong as the honourable member will see if he looks at the actual figures. It has been said that it is a socialistic venture. One has to take into account the number of sheep and lambs that have left South Australia to go to Victoria to be killed. Had they been sent to our own abattoirs they would have provided much work for our own men and more money would have been available to help our economy. Instead of that everybody who had some doubts about whether they would get their lambs slaughtered or not and were near enough to the Victorian markets, and those with older sheep, sent them to Victoria where they have been processed by the Victorian slaughterhouses, and the Victorians have gained the benefit.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: And that has been done in very large numbers.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is so. That is not good business on the part of people who set out to protect their fellow workers. Generally speaking, if we draw off from any industry for prolonged periods 25 per cent of its raw materials, and do the work somewhere else, the people concerned must be down the drain. This has a snowballing effect, and it goes right back to the workers, and they include the primary producers. Therefore, in the first place, I cannot see why the Opposition should oppose this Bill. Secondly, why should it bring in this proposed amendment which, after all, simply takes the teeth out of the

Bill? This measure provides for an abattoirs in the metropolitan area as well as in the country. That is the interesting point. The provision already exists for the country and now it is proposed for the metropolitan area as well.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: The provision always has been there for the country. Why alter it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member is the one who is jack-knifing now, because he is using this matter purely as propaganda, and I do not intend to allow the Opposition to get away with it if I can prevent it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Why not take the abattoirs to the source of supply, which is the country?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Why don't you write to the *Advertiser*?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have enough constituents writing to the *Advertiser*, and some of them are inspired to do so by a member or some members of the Labor Party. I do not enter into that type of propaganda because I feel it is rather futile. I hope that in this matter members of this Chamber will at least see the light and support what I consider to be very important legislation because, to sum it up, it will do several things. First, it will give people who want to work the opportunity to do so. Secondly, it will enable producers of lambs to get their lambs away in the best condition. Thirdly, it will give the butchers an opportunity to have more than one supplier, which is a good thing at all times. Fourthly, this debate should give an opportunity for the public of South Australia to be told exactly where they stand and where we stand on this matter. We do not object in any way to having the Metropolitan Abattoirs, but we think it would be better if there were a yardstick by which to measure its efficiency.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1265.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I support the second reading and I do not propose to go into details under the various headings and respective departments because members know that all we can do here is to make observations or suggestions; we have no constitutional power to make amendments to the schedule of expenditure. I was

quite surprised earlier to hear a dissertation upon the workers of this State and, incidentally, the remarks just passed in the debate on another measure have been completely nullified by an article appearing in the *News* this afternoon in which the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. McMahon), is reported as follows:

The first half of 1962 showed a remarkably good record of industrial peace in Australia.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Comparatively speaking.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I know the honourable member is comparatively speaking at times because he does not always know what he is speaking about. Mr. McMahon went on to say that it was a pity that in the field of industrial relations good performances tended to go unnoticed.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Does the honourable member wish to speak to the Appropriation Bill?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am doing so, Mr. President, because all the amounts in the schedule before us concern the workers in the various departments.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What line?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The honourable member knows that I am referring to the workers in the various departments. This debunks the attitude that is growing up during times of election when opponents of Labor try to create a state of mass hysteria by alleging that Labor does not support the man on the land. The genesis of the Country Party in this and other States was the fear on the part of small farmers, whom my friend probably claims to represent, that they were not getting a fair go, and it was the adroitness of the wealthy wool barons and those with landed interests that sought the co-operation of the small man by giving him some of the things he desired to have altered in its policy. We find today that those who were the original instigators of the Country Party are now the great upholders of the Liberal Party. It ill becomes any of these people who claim to represent sons of the soil to deny the right and freedom of choice and the privilege of the workers to sell their labour just as the primary or secondary industries sell their products. To attempt to deny any worker in industry the right to receive a reward for his just claims and consideration of his working conditions is unfair.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: This is a political speech.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: It is not a political speech, but when I hear some people decry the efforts of Labor over the years when it is part of the foundation of our economic structure, I am impelled to make these comments. I criticize things in my own way and, whilst the honourable member opposite criticizes things in his own way and is unfortunately not always right, I do not claim to be always right. In my review I may say something that will stir the opponents of the Labor Party into action. It is not palatable to members opposite when Opposition members state what Labor has done. Obviously, the reason is that they wish to have the worker clothed in a loin cloth with a rice bowl. During the war period who was it that helped the primary producer by working round the clock? Who was it that played his part as other people played their part in industry during the critical days of the war? It was none other than the Meat Industry Employees' Union. I am in a position to state these facts, because I was the President of the Trades and Labor Council then and perhaps dealt with one of the most important stoppages that occurred at the abattoirs. I know something of the workings of the industry. I know exactly the conditions under which those people are employed and I know that whatever working conditions they have obtained have been achieved through wages board determinations or by agreement between the board and the men.

If we believe in a free democracy we are in duty bound to honour conditions given to employees. In Great Britain a National Planning Council has been set up and it comprises representatives of the great trade union congress, the Macmillan Government and various sectors of industry, trade and commerce. I am convinced that the first report submitted by that council will be illuminating and show how they intend to deal with the problem of the European Common Market and other internal matters relating to the trade union movement, of which we are all proud to be members. Nothing has been done in this State or in the Commonwealth to deal with automation. Many men are employed in industry, particularly in the industry we discussed earlier, and mechanization is playing an important part, but no effort has been made by this Government or by the Commonwealth Government to deal with the problem that will result from advancing automation in industry. Some time ago the Australian Council of Trade Unions met representatives of the Menzies Government for the

purpose of establishing a section in the Commonwealth Department of Labour to review the position and look ahead to ascertain what inroads will be made by automation into industry. Honourable members opposite should realize that people over 40 years of age who apply for positions have no hope of getting employment, and this has been aggravated because, with the advent of automation in various sections of the industry, employees have been displaced in the ratio of one to two. We have to provide employment for the ever-increasing numbers who will be leaving school in South Australia and other States. This force will run into hundreds of thousands of young people who will not be able to engage in gainful employment. I am fortified in that statement by a report from Washington that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*, as follows:

The General Electric Company has announced the creation of a new electronic brain which cures its own "nervous breakdowns". According to the engineer who directed its development, Mr. Shelley Akers, it is, in some respects, more reliable than the human brain. While "curing" itself, the brain continues to function normally with no impairment of its intellectual quality. General Electric Company said yesterday that it had developed the new brain in response to space-age demands for extreme reliability and endurance.

We, in our parochial way, are not taking heed of the scientific developments that will displace labour, that have indeed already displaced it, and that are reducing the number of craftsmen needed. We are making no effort through this Government or through the national Government to remedy this situation.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Is much being done in New South Wales?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Yes, a committee has been set up there.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Has it prepared any report?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: It is still in the process of preparing a report, as is our Industries Development Special Committee. We as members of Parliament must take an over-all view of the question to see that these things are done to the best advantage of the people we represent.

The State has a big burden of recurring interest debt on the railways. In this morning's *Advertiser* the Commonwealth Minister for Transport said, when addressing a meeting at Mildura, that £700,000,000 was spent in the carriage

of goods and passengers throughout the Commonwealth in a year and that that represented more than 10 per cent of the domestic income of Australia. We find that in South Australia and the other States road transport is making great inroads into railway undertakings. Until recently the East-West railway was not a paying project, but by the efforts of the workers and the administration this line is now a paying proposition, owing to the good returns on the mileage travelled. No effort has been made by the South Australian Railways Department to compete against road transport. I may be told that that is not a fact. I qualify that by saying that perhaps very little effort has been made. In other States we find that the railways are out to compete with road transport. The Hon. Mr. Story said that competition was the life of trade.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Is that why they impose a special tax in the other States on the mileage travelled by road transports?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I do not mean that at all. I know that the Minister would like me to say that. I mean that the railways should be put on a business basis. They should go out in competition with those who are attempting to thwart the success of our railway system by competing with motor transport on our roads, for which hauliers pay no special tax, nor make any contribution towards them. In New South Wales there is a campaign where they run excursions to encourage people to use the railways. As members know, the cost of living has increased.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson: They are doing it with their freights and fares.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Everyone is doing that, because the cost of living has increased. You cannot blame the workers. The other States are in keen competition with privately owned transport. I know that some people will say that the railways do not pay because there are not enough passengers and goods carried. They must be run on a business basis. Unless the railways are managed on a strictly business basis, they must lose money. The South Australian Railways lose many opportunities by not using the Islington railway workshops to the full. Contracts have been let to other States and also overseas. Our railway workers are happy to be engaged by the railways, but they are not happy when our first-class craftsmen are unable to build carriages and diesel locomotives because contracts are let to other States and overseas. During the war years Islington workers were engaged in making munitions and in assisting

transport throughout Australia. The Chief Mechanical Engineer (the late Mr. Harrison) was seconded to the Commonwealth Government. Workers at Islington manufactured all kinds of technical instruments that were used in the war, and displayed their skill very effectively, but today it seems that their skill is lying idle and is not recognized by the Railways Department when it could be used on contracts that are now going overseas and to the other States. The work could be done more efficiently and cheaply here.

As I said earlier, this House cannot amend the Estimates. I agree that there should be some method of reviewing the programme before us. Some years ago I advocated in this Chamber that there should be a Public Accounts Committee established and I instanced the position in the Commonwealth Parliament where there is a Public Accounts Committee, and as a result of its operations great savings have been effected. I earnestly submit that the Government would not be losing the faith of the public if it accepted Labor's suggestions of having a Public Accounts Committee, which could consider the large amounts that are necessary to develop the State. The main thing in our economic set-up is purchasing power. I believe that the Hon. Mr. Story will take notice of what I am saying. It may be news to him to know that the productivity of Australian employees has increased by an average of more than 3.8 per cent each year since 1947. It will be seen that if the average employee had retained merely the same share of what he produced, his wages now would be more than 50 per cent higher than in 1947 in actual purchasing power. The basic wage, in relation to purchasing power, is now considerably less than in 1947.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What is your authority for that?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The *Melbourne Herald* economist, Mr. John Eddy. His statements are true. There is a claim by the Australian Council of Trade Unions before the Arbitration Commission, and it is seeking the restoration of the relativity of margins to the basic wage established in 1947. In that year the margin for a fitter was increased from £1 16s. to £2 12s. a week and that figure represented 48.5 per cent of the basic wage. The A.C.T.U. claim will seek to have the fitter's margin made equal to 48.5 per cent of the basic wage. Today, at £4 16s., it is only 31.4 per cent of what the basic wage should be. If cost of living adjustments

had continued the basic wage claim based on the six capital cities would today be £15 7s. a week, and 48.5 per cent of that sum is £7 8s. a week. This is the margin which will be claimed for all base rate tradesmen in the Metal Trades Award.

We accepted the Arbitration Court's previous decision on that matter and all that the workers, as represented by the trade unions, and the members of the A.C.T.U. desire, is that the same method of computation as with the 1947 formula shall be adopted. In the period since 1947 everything has been on an appreciated scale, except wages. Rates and taxes have gone up on an inflated spiral. The cost of a worker's home and even some of the equipment he uses is all based on an inflationary spiral, but the worker's margin has remained static since 1947. These are some of the factors in which the Government's responsibility is to provide some amelioration if it wishes to maintain the purchasing power of the community: if it wants a permanent buoyancy instead of a "boom and bust" economy, as we have had under the Liberal Governments in Commonwealth and State spheres.

In connection with unemployment figures, I was charged by the Minister of Labour and Industry that the figures I gave were incorrect. I do not want to be too dogmatic or be accused of being provocative, but I now wish to tell the Minister that the South Australian work force is 377,564. The unemployment figure quoted by him was 6,109 which corresponds with the figure given in the monthly bulletin of Employment Statistics No. 248 of July, 1962 issued by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. The percentage which 6,109 bears to 377,564 is 1.61 and not 1.5 as quoted by the Minister.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: It is still the lowest.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Second lowest. The Minister will probably say that those figures may not be correct. I know that some economists are funny people, but those figures are just as correct as the Minister's; indeed, more so, because the previous figures of unemployment were obtained from the same source as his, and there was a storm in a teacup when he attempted to say—I do not suggest maliciously—that I was trying to fool this Chamber. I think the Minister can work it out for himself and he will find that on those figures it should be 1.6 per cent and not 1.5 per cent.

Finally, I wish to have something to say on the proposed festival hall. I have heard

a lot, and read much in the press, about the need for a festival hall. We have also been told that the Government should hand out many thousands of pounds to establish it. I heartily agree that we should have a festival hall and members will recall that it was not so many months ago when I suggested that there should be a call by the responsible authorities for an architectural competition. I now suggest, with all the humility at my command, to the leaders of the Adelaide City Council and the committee that before they ask for money they should have some definite proposal to submit as to exactly where this hall will be placed. When first mooted there was quite a flutter in the dovecot; some suggested a site in Victoria Square. Others wanted to use the site of the Municipal Tramways Trust car barn, and quite a number of councillors and others expressed their views as to where it should go. If we believe in the project—as I do—the correct procedure is to call for competitive designs from architects. First determine what is wanted and then go to the responsible authorities with a firm proposition. I am convinced that if a Labor Government were in power it would be quite happy to build a festival hall which would be a monument to the culture of South Australia. Architecture is the printing press of the age, and we have quite a number of young architects, as well as older ones, who would consider it an honour to enter and perhaps win such a competition. I remind my friends opposite that many of the major buildings in the capital cities of Australia have been placed on their respective sites following an architectural competition.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Some are not too happy about the design of the Opera House in Sydney, even though they had a competition.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am not dealing with Sydney. I could probably deal with Elizabeth Hospital, but I do not want to do that. I am dealing with the festival hall, which is a totally different project, and those are the avenues along which I shall proceed for the purpose of having something definite to place before the Government. I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): I also support the Appropriation Bill before us, and in doing so perhaps the easiest way of getting at the overall effect of this year's Estimates compared with the previous year's is to look at the various items. For instance, revenue from succession duties is down in

terms of the overall effect of the Budget; stamp duty is down; land tax is up (this is a subject dealt with in another matter before this Council); railways revenue is up; Harbors Board is up; and Education is down (and I point out that it is down largely because the Government has acted to give better salaries to teachers throughout the Education Department). I believe that these added payments take up 22 per cent of the difference in revenue between the two years I am at present reviewing.

I wish to deal now with one or two small matters. Strangely enough the first fits in with the remarks of the previous speaker (Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph) and deals with the railways. The Auditor-General's report shows that the Railways Department's revenue for this year has improved considerably. Much credit for this is due to the Minister of Railways (who is on an overseas visit), and the entire Railways Department, including its Commissioner. Their job is not an easy one. Many people, including myself, are often prepared to criticize the amount of protection given to the Railways Department by authorized instrumentalities set up for that very purpose. I believe (and I shall later devote some time to the practices of the Transport Control Board) that the board still exercises too tight a rein over transport problems affecting this State. I know that is not the fault of the board, because it is set up under certain terms of reference and its duties are defined. However, in the interests of the State, Parliament should further examine the terms of reference of this board. I am sure that the whole of the primary producing section of this State could show a healthy return in the State's interests if transport, in certain ways, were freer than it now is. We had an interesting line of argument that can be adopted in respect of competition when another Bill was debated earlier this afternoon in this Council. My attitude on both questions would be identical: more competition would be better for the people who have to use these facilities. I do not wish to err, as the previous speaker did, by straying from this Bill, but it seems desirable from the point of view of all sections of the community that healthy competition should be allowed in many spheres. Road transport operating against railways is an entirely healthy form of competition, and I disagree with the Hon. Mr. Bardolph's views that the railways should be operated more on business lines. I adopt the view that the railways have been capable of competing as a

business department over the last 12 months. I think the proof is here in black and white to show that this is so.

Some of us consider that certain railway routes, on which inquiries have already been held, should have been closed to allow the Railways Department to act more as a business, but the attitude has been taken that by keeping open some of the uneconomic railway lines, the department is providing a service to the community and that it would be detrimental to the State if they were closed. I do not subscribe to that point of view, and I think an overall examination of transport facilities throughout the State would lead one to suppose straightaway that competition from other sources would not allow some of these uneconomic lines to remain open.

The Hon. C. R. Story: If the Transport Control Board issued a permit?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: If a permit were given for road transport in those areas no case would exist to support the uneconomic railway lines, and I am certain that a greater degree of efficiency would be provided for primary producers or any of the users (for commercial reasons) of those lines. That is my personal point of view, and I am certain that it may not be everyone's point of view on this particular matter. Getting back to my original point—I do not care whether we are examining transport, abattoirs or any other subject—there is no doubt in my mind that healthy competition is a very good thing. I am certain that primary producers do not look with favour on a State-owned monopoly killing stock in the metropolitan area. I am certain, too, that many primary producers are not happy that in certain areas they have to use a certain form of public transport, and all these things are relevant to the debates that have been taking place in this Council. I think I am quite in order in mentioning these things.

I was interested also to hear the Hon. Mr. Bardolph refer, as he so often does, to two matters; firstly the good that the Australian Labor Party has done for the primary producers and, secondly, how much the Party has the interests of the workers at heart on all occasions. I have heard him say this many times and, I suppose, unfortunately I will probably hear him say it a great deal more yet. I do not think I should take such great objection to that remark that the honourable member so blithely trots out, because we all know him well.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is true.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: What is true—that we know the honourable member quite well?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: No, what he said is true.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: We all know how he reacts and how he puts over his own little story.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Don't wriggle out of it.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Who is wriggling out of it? The second part of his speech that comes out so frequently is his reference to the workers and their rights in the community. Furthermore, he is apt to become a little hasty on occasions and refer to the fact that some outrageous member on the Government side has spoken of the workers in highly derogatory terms. Sometimes I wonder whether it is his imagination.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It is very vivid.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Sometimes it is extraordinarily vivid, and we could be excused for wondering why it does not react in technicolour. I am very glad that the honourable member has returned to the Chamber because I wish to refer to the remarks that he comes out with so often about the workers.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: What are you going to do for the workers?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I hope, when the time comes, to do something constructive for the workers to help them, and I know that other members of my Party would do the same. What rather annoys me is that when the honourable member and many of his friends are talking they forget about a certain large percentage of the workers. I think the honourable member referred to members here who get a rude living from the soil.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That is a figment of your imagination.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: That could well be, but the honourable member made a remark on those lines. When it comes to considering who are the workers, I remind him that the man on the land today plays a very big part in that particular category.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Hear, hear! I have always said that.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I do not know whether the honourable member has ever said it. I know that when the honourable member uses the term "workers" he is usually thinking of those who live in a modern house, often

provided by the Government through the Housing Trust, and who have many facilities and amenities available to them, including a car. I know many who work on the Port Adelaide wharves and have a shack at Port Noarlunga and also a second car.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Why shouldn't they?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: That is a very good thing and I am not complaining, but I object to quite a percentage of South Australian workers being left out of the category of "workers". If one type of employee is a worker, so is the man who gets up at 6 o'clock in the morning and works into the late hours of the night.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: On a point of order, Mr. Acting President, I know that there is to be a by-election in one district shortly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill): What is the point of order?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am not going to have any statement I make in the Chamber misconstrued. I said in my speech this afternoon that it was Labor who gave full marks to the importance of the man on the land.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! What is the honourable member's point of order?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I want the honourable member's remark referring to my statement regarding workers, including those engaged in rural industries, withdrawn. He mentioned the alleged statement I made. *Hansard* will prove me correct. I said that the Labor Party stood for the man on the land to be fully recompensed. I ask that the honourable member's remark be withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: I rule that the remark is not offensive, but that the Hon. Mr. Bardolph has the right to make a personal explanation at the end of the Hon. Mr. Giles's speech.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I am prepared to withdraw any remark that the honourable member considers offensive. However, I feel that there is nothing in what I have said that could offend him. When he uses the word "worker" I should like to think that he also includes the worker I have in mind. Every time that he uses the word "worker", the people I refer to are not in his mind. When he uses the word, it would be nice of him to think at the same time of those people who have to work without the facilities provided for those working in the metropolitan area.

I think I have said before that a huge expansion in South Australia, and indeed in Australia, over the next 15 to 20 years is expected to come under the very good guiding hand of the Governments in both the Commonwealth and South Australian spheres. There will be a great expansion of population in that period. I have drawn attention in this Chamber before to the fact that agricultural trends are not keeping up with the population expansion. The position will have to be carefully watched. I will quote figures showing the increased trend in primary production that were published in the *Statistical Register of South Australia* for 1959-60. I do this intentionally, bearing in mind that the figures will show the gross value of the products concerned in terms of wholesale prices. It is worth while to note that figures quoted will be gross values. The figures do not include any adjustment for any movement in the value of the currency.

The following figures were published regarding potato production for the years from 1951-1952 to 1959-1960: £1,640,688; £1,142,525; £1,302,845; £674,365; £1,593,471; £1,879,136; £938,766; £1,200,680; and £1,008,469. In other words, the figures show a slowly declining quantity being grown for the Adelaide market. This is due to a large number of factors. It will be noticed that in the last five years mentioned there has been more uniformity of production than in the previous years. That is because potato production in South Australia has become almost entirely an irrigated crop. This is contrary to the production of potatoes in Tasmania, which is almost entirely seasonal. There are more fluctuations in the Tasmanian crop than in South Australia. If one compares the 1951-1952 period with the 1959-1960 period, one notices a drop in the supply of potatoes. That picture is not unique. I will not bore the Council by going through the other columns of figures appearing in the *Statistical Register*. The position that applies to potatoes also applies to onions. The quantities have decreased over this nine-year period and the same applies to carrots. You can go through most of the vegetables and a lot of important commodities on the market and get much the same type of picture. In some lines, of course, production is up; as in dairying, for example, and almonds, although the latter has remained fairly static.

The point is that even in the case of primary production in a certain line that has risen, as in the case of dairying, the trend is not great enough to look after the home market

in the years to come. I do not intend to get very involved as to what exactly is the reason for this, but I seriously say that there is no good having one section of the community that becomes more downtrodden or less financially well off than another, and the danger at present is that on many of the smaller agricultural holdings this will come about unless the position is watched carefully. Mr. Bardolph says that the Labor Party has always been the friend of the primary producers. I hope that, later in the session perhaps, when certain measures are brought in, as they may be, to help the lot of the one-man farmer, he will vote in favour of the measures. I have not been a long time in this Chamber, but it has been most apparent to me that on some little matters such as this the attitude of the Opposition has been against the man on the land. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1266.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): There is only one operative clause in this Bill, namely, clause 3. As previous speakers have said, this clause seems to be well designed to meet the appropriate purpose, and the only point that has been exercising my mind is the one raised by the Hon. Mr. Giles on the question of onus of proof. Members will be with me in a desire that we should not take the onus away from the Crown and throw it on the defendant to disprove any allegation, unless that course is absolutely necessary. There are cases where Parliament has deemed that it is satisfactory to throw the onus of proof of certain things on the defendant. Mr. Giles referred to parking offences, which are very minor and only encompass a minor penalty. They are very difficult to prove against the mass of people involved, except at enormous expense. I feel that the onus which has been altered in that sort of case is justified, but I think that such power should be exercised with the greatest of care. Consequently, we should analyse this clause very carefully. It is rather unusual because it does not, as others of a like nature do, throw the onus on the defendant altogether; it is a sort of half-and-half clause because first of all it says that any person who does a certain thing under such circumstances as to give rise

to reasonable suspicion that it is not for a lawful purpose shall be guilty of an offence.

That means that the Crown has first to establish a *prima facie* case against the person, or at least it has to show that on the probabilities of the case it is more likely than not that a reasonable suspicion exists in relation to the particular fact. So there the onus which the Crown has first to discharge is, I believe, a proper onus to be thrown on the Crown, and I do not think that it need be as high as the ordinary onus in a criminal action of establishing something beyond reasonable doubt. In these circumstances the Crown has to prove that a reasonable suspicion exists, otherwise the case lapses. After that, we have to analyse the clause a bit further. It goes on to say that if the accused can show that he did these things for a lawful purpose he will not be deemed to be guilty. This is the only thing upon which I would like to question the Attorney-General, and if he cannot give an answer offhand I would ask that, if and when we get into the Committee stages on this Bill, he would report progress so that the Crown Solicitor can advise as to exactly what this onus is.

I think that the onus on the defendant is that he has to establish on the balance of probability, as compared with the onus of "beyond reasonable doubt", the fact that he did those things for a lawful purpose. If that is the whole of the onus upon him I am perfectly satisfied with the clause. If, on the other hand, he has the criminal onus encumbered on him to establish "beyond reasonable doubt", I would think that the onus is too high. I am not sufficiently versed in criminal law to be able to give that answer with absolute satisfaction. I think the correct answer is that he has merely got to prove that a lawful purpose exists on the balance of probabilities or, in other terms, that it was more likely that a lawful purpose existed than not. If that is the position I am perfectly happy to leave the clause as it stands, but I would like a reassurance from the Attorney-General on this matter in the Committee stage or in reply. In the meantime I propose to support the second reading of the Bill.

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

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1272.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill. The Loans

to Producers Act is administered by the State Bank, which is empowered under the Act, amongst other things, to make advances to primary producers or persons associated with industries that are closely allied to primary production, with the object of encouraging rural production and effective land settlement. This is a desirable object and the provisions of the Bill before us merely seek to relieve the Government of providing funds for this purpose. It is interesting to note that when Labor members suggested that additional funds were available outside Government sources for the erection of additional houses, for example, the Treasurer was very definite that no such funds were available.

On this occasion, however, the boot is on the other foot, because the Government now wishes to obtain additional funds from the Loan market to finance its Loans to Producers Act. It is also interesting that under this activity the State Bank has approximately £2,200,000 out on loan to various organizations such as distillers, butter and cheese factories, fruit-packing sheds and cool stores. New advances net of repayments have been increasing in recent years at the rate of approximately £300,000 yearly. Clause 3 provides that the bank may borrow moneys for the purposes of the Act, and under the guarantee of the Treasurer, and therefore the indications are that the State Bank will be seeking to raise approximately £300,000 yearly on the local Loan market, and I would like the Minister to say how he can assure members that the funds available to local authorities will not be depleted by this amount.

The rest of the clauses appear to me to be machinery clauses; for example the rate of interest to be charged is to exceed the bank's borrowing rate, and any excess funds borrowed may be deposited at the Treasury at interest. Those provisions do not require any further comment. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I cannot, at the moment, say that I support this measure, because one or two things in the Bill need much explanation and probably some amendment. Under the provisions of the Loans to Producers Act, as pointed out by the Hon. Mr. Shard, most of the co-operative enterprises are financed, and this amendment seeks to add (amongst other things) new section 3a, which reads as follows:

The bank may borrow moneys for the purposes of this Act under guarantee of the Treasurer in such amounts under such terms and conditions as the Treasurer may from time to time approve.

The position under the present Act is different, section 4 being as follows:

The money required for the purposes of this Act shall be paid out of money voted by Parliament for those purposes.

That provision occurs after the Act has dealt with various things that can be done, and after the provision in section 3, which commences:

In this Act, unless inconsistent with the context or subject matter—
followed by various definitions in that interpretation clause.

New section 3a will give Parliament absolutely no control, nor will Parliament have an opportunity of examining what will happen to this money that the Treasurer may authorize the bank to borrow, fix the interest rate on, and use for any purpose which, in the opinion of the Treasurer, is proper. I have implicit confidence in the Treasurer of this State but I am not clairvoyant. How we can look ahead in this matter is beyond me. All sorts of co-operatives could be set up under this Act and, unless Parliament acts as some brake on the situation, we could get into terrific trouble as was proved recently in the case of the tomato fiasco. I do not like to see Parliament's powers taken away as is done by clause 3. Secondly, this amendment cuts right across the taxation privileges that co-operatives now enjoy. Section 120 of the Income Tax and Social Services Contribution Assessment Act, 1936-1961, carries a marginal note headed "Deductions allowable to co-operative company" and that section provides:

(1) So much of the assessable income of a co-operative company as—

(a) is distributed among its shareholders as rebates or bonuses based on business done by shareholders with the company;

(b) is distributed among its shareholders as interest or dividends on shares; or

(c) in the case of a company having as its primary object that specified in paragraph (b) of section 117 of this Act—

and paragraph (b) of section 117 provides
the acquisition of commodities or animals from its shareholders for disposal or distribution;

Section 120 continues:

is applied by the company for or towards the repayment of any moneys loaned to the company by a Government of the Commonwealth or a State to enable the company to acquire assets which are required for the purpose of carrying on the business of the company or to pay the Government for assets so required which the company has taken over from that Government, shall be an allowable deduction:

"Commonwealth or State" are the important words. Under the provisions of clause 3 we shall lose that right, which is an important right to the co-operative movement and I do not see how the £220,000 provided in the Loan Estimates this year from Loan funds will help, but perhaps it is to attract another £200,000 from outside sources. Unless these two amounts can be completely separated by the State Bank, borrowers will be deprived of all the benefit they derive under the Act. It seems to me that that is dangerous and that it would be unfair if one set of co-operatives received taxation benefits whereas another group, because the money came from an outside source, did not.

The Government is setting out to help producers under the Loans to Producers Act; the whole purpose of the Bill is to make more money available, but I am afraid that in doing this two important privileges may be lost. These privileges are, first, that Parliament has an opportunity to see what the Treasurer is recommending to the State Bank, and, secondly, the taxation benefit, which is a great help to co-operatives. I have raised these points because these things are extremely important to the co-operative movement. I laud the Government for having brought in this measure, which will make more money available, but I think an amendment is necessary so that Parliament can see what the Treasurer is actually authorizing the State Bank to borrow. This provision, which we have now, is useful. I do not want the co-operative movement to be brought into disrepute by money being given to various organizations which are not worthy of the name. I should also like the Government to have a close look at the taxation matter I mentioned. I support the second reading to enable the Bill to get into Committee, where I am sure the Minister will provide some further information but, if necessary, I shall move to amend the Bill.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1273.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): This is a short Bill comprising, as it does, three clauses, the amending clause being clause 3, which amends section 52 of the principal Act by inserting three new paragraphs. The amendment relates to the licensing of sellers of explosives, and provides for

further regulation on the control, storage, display and importation of explosives. I think this is a wise move and that it could well have been made earlier because, if it had, painful injuries received by people and damage caused to property by the indiscriminate and careless use of explosives by people not qualified to handle such dangerous substances might have been obviated.

I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that some people who use explosives in their businesses or industry seem to be careless in the way they store them. We often hear that detonators, gelnite and fuses are found in possession of young people, and the provision relating to storage could well take this into consideration. Also, sometimes these materials find their way into the hands of people with criminal intent. People who need to have explosives readily accessible for legitimate business reasons should take care that they are not readily accessible to people who are unaware of their danger or who may want to use them illegally.

Although the Bill does not refer specifically to fireworks, they were mentioned by the Chief Secretary when he introduced it. As many accidents have occurred in the past, control over fireworks is a wise precaution. Fireworks (in my youth they were called crackers) are now more powerful and are manufactured with little thought to the danger to people who may use them for certain celebrations. Sometimes people have been injured in accidents caused by the carelessness of young people who throw them around. Parents could exercise more control, of course, but often accidents occur because fireworks imported into this country (most are now imported) are more powerful than they once were and because the instructions relating to their ignition are written in a foreign language which people do not understand. People experiment with the way to let them off, and accidents happen as a result.

Not many years ago some fireworks in a shop window were exploded by the sun's shining through the glass window, and considerable damage was done. The Bill provides for the control and regulation of the things I have mentioned, and I think it will do much good. In another place, it was said that Guy Fawkes Day should be celebrated at another time of the year, but I do not know what the Government can do about this. I think this is in the hands of councils and, if they find it desirable to change the day on which it is celebrated, they can do so. I do not know whether, because

this celebration relates to a time when a previous Parliament was saved from, perhaps, the results of its own actions, it is thought that Parliament has some control. However, it is not a national celebration; it is spontaneous. Some people use it as an opportunity to let off steam, as other people let off steam in other ways—sometimes people let off steam in this Chamber. As it is not a public celebration, some people recognize it on one day, whereas others let off fireworks to celebrate something else on some other day.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Some let them off to scare away evil spirits.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, the Chinese let off fireworks to frighten evil spirits. Americans let them off on July 4, and religious sects let them off on other days. I do not think the Government has much control over the day on which they can be let off, although it can control their sale, storage and importation. I think the Bill is a wise measure and I support it. It could well have been introduced earlier, although it is better late than never. I therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING LOANS REDEMPTION FUND BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1275.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I support the second reading of this Bill. Although it does not contain all the ingredients that the Labor Party would desire, nevertheless my Party supports it because it makes some provision whereby people can buy houses on a £50 deposit. Payments to amortize a loan are steep and it appears that the thought has been conjured in the minds of the authorities that there will be an atmosphere of buoyancy despite the unemployment rampant among the working community now.

This measure is really on all fours with the housing scheme in the United States of America, where all banks lend money for housing and the guarantor is the Government. In America there is no central pool or housing commission, and there is no limit on the sum that can be borrowed; the only condition required of the borrower is that he shall be credit-worthy and able to pay. Although in Australia the War Service Homes Division assists returned servicemen, in America the returned serviceman does not have to provide

any deposit either for the house or for the land upon which it is erected. I think that is a laudable policy, and it is much more liberal than the policy of the Australian War Service Homes Division. However, that is a Commonwealth instrumentality, so it does not come under the Bill we are now discussing. I mention that because it is related to the amount of money that can be borrowed in the United States of America through low-deposit. Some two years ago I mentioned in this Chamber that they have packet loans in America.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is always greener over the fence!

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The honourable member knows all about it, because he sells green oranges. It is a question of making a comparison of various housing schemes. The housing shortage is not peculiar to South Australia, but is also a difficult problem in other parts of the world. We have had much publicity following upon the return of people to South Australia after having investigated the housing position in other parts of the world; but having studied the position overseas, they do not attempt to implement any scheme for the good of our own people. As I know many people engaged in the building industry I think it would be illuminating for the Hon. Mr. Story to know something of the relevant facts. Members of the Labor Party support this Bill, although it does not go as far as they would prefer. It is interesting to mention that recently in Canberra there was a National Housing Conference convened by the Victorian Building Industry Congress. They agreed to a motion that the percentage of funds which savings banks must place in Commonwealth securities should be reduced from 70 per cent to 65 per cent and that the 5 per cent released should be made available for housing. House building is certainly in need of a stimulus from somewhere. The Budget did not provide it.

Between 1946 and 1962 the average price of a brick veneer house rose 245.3 per cent, the average price of a building block 1,290 per cent, the price of land in relation to the price of land and a house from 9 per cent to 25 per cent, and the amount of the total purchase price of a house for which finance was required rose from 10 per cent—25 per cent to 34 per cent—45 per cent. That brings me to the point whether there should be a national housing authority.

Legitimate builders are prepared to accept a fair margin of profit, but we find that in South Australia many hundreds of couples with their own block and with from £200 to £500 for a deposit are unable to receive funds from the State Bank, and have to wait 12 or 18 months, and even up to two years. It is true that the finance that will be made available under this measure will be by way of Government credit. That means that the Government will not have to find liquid currency; that will be done presumably through the State Bank or the other lending institutions which the Government guarantees. I do suggest, however, that there should be a general acceleration of finance by the State Government for those young couples who have had their applications in for 12 or 18 months, in order to protect the value of their savings in view of the steep increases in prices that have taken place between 1946 and 1962. The Labor Party has no opposition to the measure and I support the second reading.

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

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1276.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): Although short, this is an important measure and it, too, deals with house finance. In 1958 section 32 of the Advances for Homes Act was amended by increasing the period of repayments from 42 years to 50 years, at the same time increasing the maximum amount that could be borrowed under the Act from £2,500 to £3,500. The Homes Act was also amended in 1958 to provide for an increase in the maximum loan from £2,500 to £3,500, but section 7, which governs the period of repayments, remained unaltered with a maximum of 30 years. The Bill now before us extends the period from 30 to 50 years. Lately we have heard quite a lot about uniformity, and I see no reason why the provisions of this Act should not be the same as those of the Advances for Homes Act. House purchasers would then be able to obtain the same conditions either through the State Bank or through the various institutions registered under the Homes Act. Admittedly, because of the extended time of repayment, the borrower will be paying more for his house than he would if the loan were for a shorter period, but I feel that he will realize that, although eventually he may be paying more, he

will be prepared to accept the additional responsibility in return for the benefit of the lower weekly payment.

There is still a grave shortage of houses in South Australia and, to strengthen my point, I would draw attention to the fact that according to the reports of the Housing Trust there are already 2,300 applications for houses under other legislation, which has not yet been passed by this Chamber. Unfortunately, many wage-earners find that because of the cost of building and land they are unable to undertake the burden. An ordinary three-bedroom house such as the average worker needs, with normal amenities, costs up to £4,500, and that is more than he can meet in weekly repayments. The average borrowing for house building is approximately £3,000, and repayments over 30 years, plus water rates and council rates, amount to about £5 a week, and this is beyond the means of the average wage-earner, because it entails drastic economies in the weekly budget.

This Bill will have the effect of reducing the weekly payments by about 16s. and that is a big thing and should go a long way towards inducing more young people to purchase their own houses. I feel that the measure is a good one, for it brings the Homes Act into closer relationship with the Advances for Homes Act, and it should be a considerable advantage to young people who contemplate purchasing houses for themselves. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

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

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1277.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill, which has been introduced as a result of representations made to the Government by various local government associations and which were supported by the Local Government Advisory Committee. The major amendment proposed by the Bill will increase the penalties on and fees charged to owners of trespassing cattle, bringing the amounts more into line with current money values. The Bill also seeks to facilitate carrying out the objects of the principal Act. I do not intend to debate this Bill at length, because it is quite an improvement compared to that introduced in another place. The original Bill was fully and keenly debated in another place and was substantially amended to bring the penalties prescribed for various offences by owners of stock that were not properly looked after more into line with current money values than penalties first proposed by the Government. As the amendments in another place were wholly accepted by members there I think it would be needless repetition if we again debated the question. Therefore, I content myself by saying that I endorse what has been done in another place, and I congratulate the other place on doing a very good job. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.59 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 10, at 2.15 p.m.