

The Club is anxious to get the money, the Melbourne City Council is anxious to lend the Club the money and, as a member of the Social Club, I am anxious to ensure that the Club gets the money.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time, and passed through its remaining stages.

LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (FURTHER AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from November 20) on the motion of Mr. Rossiter (Minister of Labour and Industry) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. FENNESSY (Brunswick East).—Many of the clauses of this Bill are unrelated one to the other. It is strictly a Committee measure and therefore I shall not delay the House at this stage but shall deal with each clause in Committee.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—I am proud to represent the electorate of Reservoir in this House. I am conscious of the fine record established by the previous member, Dr. Harry Jenkins. I am assured of his co-operation, as the Federal member for the electorate of Scullin, in maintaining that standard.

In referring to clause 8, I propose to speak on the subject of industrial safety. I commend the Minister of Labour and Industry for the way in which he has dealt with the requests placed before him on this matter. Because a machine is stationary, it does not follow that it is safe. I have had a recent experience of a machine designed and manufactured in Victoria and transhipped to Western Australia. I believe that this machine is a potential hazard to any person working on it or cleaning it. It works on an air-cylinder system triggered by micro-switches or valves. Although to all intents and purposes the machine may appear to be idle, it can be a trap for a cleaner, who may brush the micro-switch, and set it in motion, thus endangering any part of

his body which may be in the way of a set of 62 drill heads, or the drilling spindles and the rollers.

An investigation should be made to ensure that, in a contract for the supply of a machine, provision is made for the incorporation of safety features. It is of no use a person inspecting the machine after it is built and then finding that it is unsafe. I recall an incident concerning the machine to which I refer in which a young man had his head between the rollers. On this occasion it was temporarily erected in the machine shop and a person who needed an air line for some other purposes disconnected the air system. The result could have been disastrous but for the fact that several of his work-mates shouted to this young chap. If he had been alone, his head would have been pinned between the rollers and the vertical drilling head.

When I first inspected this machine, the only safety device I could find consisted of a number of red-gum blocks propped in to keep it in a suspended position. It was extremely dangerous because the operator would have had to move amongst the machinery to put the drift through the drill holes to remove the drills from the 62 drilling spindles. That is only one machine of which I have had experience. I have taken steps to have incorporated in Labor Party policy the necessity for provisions requiring that safety features should be incorporated in machines of this type.

I have attended talks and seen films at the Department of Labour and Industry on the subject of industrial safety. Recently, I took 26 trade union delegates and shop stewards to Heidelberg, and they were most impressed at the service offered by the Department. The only criticism I can offer is that the Department does not sufficiently advertise the availability of its services to industry. Apparently, the Department has access to films from New Zealand which were made in America. It should make this fact known, as their use would be of great benefit to industry.

Some companies have excellent industrial safety records. General Motors-Holden's Proprietary Limited is an excellent example of a company which takes great pride in its safety record. Any jig, fixture or new machine must pass stringent safety tests; the management takes every step to ensure that safe working conditions are observed. Fibrecraft Limited has a record second to none in this field; but I know of many other companies that pressure the workers to such an extent that safety is frequently ignored. Scope exists for more discussions to be held on the subject of industrial safety.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause I was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Repeal of No. 6283 s. 33 (2)).

Mr. FENNESSY (Brunswick East).—This clause provides for the repeal of the provision relating to cost-of-living adjustments which formerly applied under the wages board system. It states—

Sub-section (2) of section 33 of the Principal Act is hereby repealed.

Sub-section (2) provides—

Any provision of a determination made pursuant to section thirty-three of the Labour and Industry Act 1953 and in force immediately before the commencement of the Labour and Industry (Wages Boards) Act 1956 shall have no operation or effect after such commencement, but nothing in this section shall affect any adjustment of wages rates or piecework prices thereunder which first took effect before such commencement or any rates or prices as so adjusted.

Sub-section (1) states—

In determining wages rates or piecework prices every Wages Board shall take into consideration relevant awards of or agreements certified by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Recent decisions of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission have forsaken the old cost-of-living adjustment principle and established the principle of a total

wage. Consumer prices are now taken into account in determining the total wage. The Opposition does not oppose the clause.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 3 (Repeal of No. 6283 s. 79).

Mr. FENNESSY (Brunswick East).—This is a simple provision. In the past shopkeepers who wanted to open their shops during what were then restricted hours were required to present a petition to the Minister or to the Department of Labour and Industry. Uniform shopping hours have now been established, and this clause proposes to repeal section 79, which is no longer necessary. My party does not oppose the clause.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 4 (Repeal of No. 6283 s. 80 (2)).

Mr. FENNESSY (Brunswick East).—In his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

Clause 4 repeals sub-section (2) of section 80, which in general terms provides that any class of shop shall be closed on a day that the appropriate wages board determines shall be observed as a public holiday.

However, the honorable gentleman went on to say—

It would still, of course, be open to a wages board to prohibit the employment of persons on a public holiday, but it would not be open to a board to prohibit the opening of the shop.

The Opposition is concerned with the welfare of employees, and as the wages board will have the power to protect their rights in this regard, no objection is offered to the clause. The Minister also stated that another reason for the repeal of the sub-clause was to avoid conflict between State and Federal awards.

The clause was agreed to, as was clause 5.

Clause 6 (Trading hours for special shops in tourist resorts).

Mr. FENNESSY (Brunswick East).—This is a controversial clause concerning the extension of trading hours of particular shops in tourist areas. The Committee will recollect