

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 1, 1958.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**WINDY POINT RESERVE.**

Mr. MILLHOUSE—About a week ago, during the annual inspection of its area by the Mitcham Corporation (at which I was a guest) mention was made of negotiations between the corporation and the Tourist Bureau for taking over by the Bureau of Windy Point Reserve (sometimes called Mitcham Heights). I entirely agree with the suggestion, as Windy Point is available not only to the citizens of Mitcham, but to all other people, and I suppose everyone living in the metropolitan area has visited it. Can the Premier say whether any conclusions have been reached as a result of the negotiations?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD**—The Director of the Tourist Bureau asked me whether the Government would be prepared to take over this beauty spot, and I informed him that it would be, provided the terms and conditions of the take-over were satisfactory. We cannot have two bodies controlling one place, and if we took it over we would control and develop it in our own way, and the corporation would have to be prepared to accept that. We would not be prepared to be placed in the position of taking over this site and then being told by some outside authority how to run it and how much to spend on it, but subject to the takeover being on the understanding that the Tourist Bureau would control it in the same way as it does its other attractions the Government would be prepared to take it over.

MASTER PLAN FOR METROPOLITAN AREA.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 24 about a master plan for the metropolitan area?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD**—I have received the following reply:—

Section 26 of the Town Planning Act 1929-1957 requires the Town Planning Committee to make an examination of the metropolitan area and an assessment of its probable development. After making its examination and assessment the committee shall prepare a plan indicating the measures deemed necessary or desirable to provide for the proper development of the metropolitan area. The plan accompanied by a report has to be submitted to the Minister and laid before both Houses of

Parliament. The preparation of a plan involves a considerable amount of preparatory survey work, work by various Government departments and consultations with local authorities and organizations. Now that the complement of staff in the Town Planner's Office has been completed, work on initial studies and preliminary consultations is in progress. It is not possible at this stage to give a date when the plan will be ready for submission to Parliament, but it is anticipated that it should be completed within two to three years.

TOWNSHIP ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. KING—On September 24 I asked the Minister of Lands a question about the policy of his department concerning the conversion of perpetual leases in township irrigation areas and the ratio of conversion from leasehold to freehold property. Has he a further reply?

The Hon. C. S. **HINCKS**—I have received the following report:—

Section 35 of the Irrigation Act provides that the lessee of an irrigation town perpetual lease may apply to surrender the lease for a grant in fee simple and that if approved the purchase money shall be that fixed by the Land Board. The board is not required by the Act to follow any laid-down procedure in fixing the purchase money, nor does it disclose in its recommendation the basis on which the figure is arrived at.

Mr. KING—Will the Minister of Lands examine the policy which is evidently being implemented by the Land Board in converting special leases to freehold at a ratio of 60 to 1, whereas at one time it was 20 to 1? Will he ascertain whether this ratio is to apply to future conversions and whether existing leaseholders will be given an opportunity to convert at the old rate before any new rule applies?

The Hon. C. S. **HINCKS**—I will have another look at it, but I think the previous reply answers this question.

LIQUOR PERMITS.

Mr. HAMBOUR—For some time there has been confusion about permits being issued for people who want to use places of public entertainment for social evenings such as birthday parties. Some police officers demand that an application be made and a permit fee paid for holding private birthday parties in public halls. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General have the position clarified? Is it essential to pay a fee over and above the fee for the hall for holding private parties at which liquor will be consumed?

The Hon. B. **PATTINSON**—I shall be pleased to take up the question with the appropriate Minister (I think the Chief Secretary), and obtain the information.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. SHANNON—I have had a number of requests for certain amendments to the Local Government Act. Some of the charges permissible under the Act for certain services which councils render to ratepayers are now quite out of step with present-day costs, and I refer particularly to costs of kerbing and road construction. Councils in my area are becoming more conscious of the need for more roads and kerbing because many areas are being built up. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government say whether a Bill to amend the Local Government Act will be introduced this session and, if so, will those matters that councils in my area are concerned with be dealt with in it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am not sure whether we shall have an amending Bill this year; if we do not it will possibly be the first time in our history. I will draw my colleague's attention to the matters raised so that consideration may be given to their implementation if a Bill is brought down.

CARTAGE OF TIMBER.

Mr. HARDING—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week about the cartage of timber over roads in the South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I referred the question to the Minister of Roads who has forwarded the following statement of expenditure on forest roads during the last three years. These funds are provided by the Highways Department in addition to normal district road grants to councils:—

Expenditure on Forest Roads 1955-56—1957-58.

1955-56—Expenditure £17,235.

Includes £7,278 on Caroline and Myora Forests and Springs Road.

1956-57—Expenditure £89,961.

Includes—

£40,019 Roads in Wandilo Forest.

£20,800 Mingbool-Nangwarry Road.

£10,359 Penola Forest.

£9,467 Caroline and Myora Forests and Springs Road.

£8,357 Glencoe Forest.

1957-58—Expenditure £67,394.

Includes—

£56,920 Caroline and Myora Forests and Springs Road.

£8,832 Mingbool-Nangwarry Road.

The timber industry is of great importance to this State and, as timber carters pay registration and fuel taxes and are subject to the same legal axle load limits as carters for other industries, it is difficult to say that they should be singled out for an additional impost. If specific instances of district roads badly damaged by timber carting can be given they can be investigated.

ERADICATION OF SOURSOBS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether, apart from intense cultivation, there is any method of eradicating soursobs when they become a nuisance in agricultural areas?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will get a full report on the latest methods. I think I answered a similar question recently, when the reply was that such eradication was largely bound up with pasture management.

SEEING-EYE DOGS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—On August 27, 1957, the Minister of Lands, then in charge of the House, replied to a question concerning the transport of seeing-eye dogs. The reply then contained statements from both the Tramways Trust and the Railways Commissioner. That from the Tramways Trust was conclusive and final, but that from the Railways Commissioner was a little up in the air. It was—“I have to advise the Minister that—”

Mr. Frank Walsh—What is the question?

The SPEAKER—The honourable member for Edwardstown has asked that the question be asked.

Mr. O'Halloran—This is private members' day, you know. We thought there was a gentlemen's agreement about questions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, take up with the Railways Commissioner the question of transporting on railways seeing-eye dogs with their owners?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes.

NANGWARRY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HARDING—A considerable sum is provided on the Estimates for the improvement of water schemes at Nangwarry. Can the Minister of Agriculture explain the proposal?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Design work on the overhead tank for the Nangwarry water supply is completed. Plans are being prepared and tenders will be called shortly.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. C. L. DAVIS.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh) moved—

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. C. L. Davis) on account of ill-health.

Motion carried.

SUPERANNUATION ACT BENEFITS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran—

That in the opinion of this House the pension unit payable in accordance with the provisions of the Superannuation Act, 1926-1956, the percentage thereof payable to widows and the allowance payable in respect of dependent children should be increased and, in view of the substantial credit balance in the fund, such increases should be payable without increase in contributions.

(Continued from August 27. Page 550.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The motion, and the Leader's speech relating to it, were based on the assumption that, because there are large sums in the Superannuation Fund which are not committed, they could be used for increasing superannuation benefits as proposed. It became necessary to have this matter immediately examined because the whole basis of the motion is, "Money is available: let us distribute it." The Leader made some general observations about our fund compared with those operating in other States, but his main argument was that, as about £8,000,000 was available, it should be utilized for increasing benefits.

I have never heard it contended that the Government has not made a fair approach to the general problem of superannuation. Indeed, the Auditor-General's reports over a number of years show that the position has consistently been that of the money paid in superannuation each year, more than 80 per cent has come from the Government and less than 20 per cent from the contributions made to the funds by the officers of the Public Service. Initially the fund was established on the basis that the Government and the contributors would each provide half the money, but because of inflation and salary increases Parliament from time to time has had to alter the benefits. We have had a large number of public servants who, because of age, could get the advantage of the additional payments only if concessions were made. At present the Government contributes about 80 per cent of the required money. The percentage has been higher, but it is slowly coming down and if there are no more alterations to the scheme the ratio will become about 60-40. The motion must stand or fall according to the position of the fund. Mr. O'Halloran said that the amount in the fund justified increases in the benefits. I asked the Public Actuary, who has an intimate knowledge of superannuation matters, for a report on Mr. O'Halloran's proposal and he states:—

I have to advise as follows with regard to the matters mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. O'Halloran:—

1. He has requested that consideration be given to the following increases of benefits without any increase in contributions by present or future contributors to the Superannuation Fund and without any increased cost to Government revenue.

- (1) An increase in the value of the unit from £45 10s. to £52 per annum, i.e., from 17s. 6d. to £1 a week.
- (2) An increase in the widow's benefit from one-half to three-quarters of the unitary value.
- (3) An increase in the amount of pension payable to children.

2. The unitary value payable by the Commonwealth Government Superannuation Fund and those of comparable States is at present:—

Commonwealth—£45 10s. per unit, although the unit has been increased by various amounts in respect of pensions of more than 10 years' duration.

New South Wales—£45 10s. per unit.

Victoria—An amount which varies with the number of units and decreases from £52 per unit for under four units to £45 10s. per unit for 10 units or more.

Western Australia—£45 10s. per unit.

Tasmania—£45 10s. per unit.

South Australia—£45 10s. per unit.

There is no justification on a comparative basis for a general increase in the South Australian fund from £45 10s. to £52 per unit. Moreover, since the last unitary increase from £39 to £45 10s. in February, 1955, the Adelaide C series index has increased by only 7 per cent and that increase is not by itself sufficient to justify an increase from £45 10s. to £52 per unit.

(3) The proportion of pension payable to widows in the various funds—

Commonwealth—One half.

New South Wales—One half.

Victoria—Five-eighths.

Western Australia—One half.

Tasmania—Two-thirds.

South Australia—One half.

The comparison certainly does not justify an increase in widows' pension from half to three-quarters of the husband's pension although a small increase may be justified.

(4) The allowance payable to children of contributors or pensioners in the various funds is—

Commonwealth—£52 Orphans—£78

New South Wales—£26 Orphans—£52

Victoria—£26 Orphans—£52

Western Australia—£52 Orphans—£52

Tasmania—£26 Orphans—£52

South Australia—Orphans—£45 10s.
£22 15s.

On a comparative basis there is some justification for an increase on the South Australian allowances.

(5) It remains to consider whether the Superannuation Fund is capable of bearing the increased cost of these concessions without additional Government subsidy. Firstly, a comparison has been made by Mr. O'Halloran of contributions payable for an additional unit

in the Commonwealth fund and the South Australian fund as follows:—

Age next birthday.	Cwlth.			S.A.		
	£	s	d.	£	s	d.
20	1	14	8	2	8	0
25	2	5	6	3	0	0
30	2	16	4	3	16	6
35	3	9	4	4	19	0
40	4	11	0	6	10	0
45	6	3	6	8	16	0
50	8	10	10	12	13	0

In examining this table it should be remembered that contributions to the Commonwealth fund pay for only £13 of the £45 10s. unit or 28.3 per cent thereof, whereas in South Australia the contributor pays for £18.4 or 40 per cent of the unit.

The table therefore should not be interpreted to mean that the South Australian contributions are excessively high. The true comparison per £1 of pension purchased by the contributor is shown in the following table:—

Age.	Cwlth.			S.A.		
	s.	d.		s.	d.	
20	2	8		2	8	
25	3	6		3	4	
30	4	4		4	2	
35	5	4		5	5	
40	7	0		7	2	
45	9	6		9	8	
50	13	2		13	11	

Having regard to the fact that the expectation of life of men aged 65 and women aged 60 is greater in South Australia than in any other State of the Commonwealth . . .

I emphasize this for members opposite, who generally take a dismal view of life, particularly the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) who is always particularly pessimistic about his chances:

the contributor to the South Australian fund does not pay excessive contributions. While the Government has always granted considerable valuable contributory concessions to members of advanced age when the unitary value has been increased in the past in order to avoid hardship, it has always maintained that a contributor for new or additional units should pay a reasonable proportion of the cost of his pension. Secondly, attention has been drawn by Mr. O'Halloran to the large margin existing at present between income and expenditure of the fund. For the year ended June 30, 1958, the items of income and expenditure, excluding from both the amount of pension payable by the Government, was:—

	Income.	£
Members' contributions		848,000
Net interest		433,000
Total		1,281,000

	Expenditure	£
Refunds of contributions		74,000
Pensions payable by the fund ..		232,000
		306,000

leaving for a year a net increase in the fund of £975,000. This surplus of income over expenditure will, however, definitely decrease in future, slowly at first, and rapidly thereafter. In the meantime, the surplus must not in any way be regarded as profit. It has to be set aside in reserve and accumulated to meet increasing liabilities which are certain to occur under the present scale of benefits. The extent of this increase in funds is fairly uniform in the various Government superannuation schemes at present, as the following comparison will show:—

Fund.	Account for year ended June 30.	Total funds at end of year.	Increase during the year.
		£	£
Commonwealth	1956	41,749,000	5,008,000
New South Wales	1957	61,858,000	7,237,000
Victoria	1956	21,357,000	2,328,000
Western Australia	1956	3,831,000	378,000
Tasmania	1956	2,530,000	342,000

On a basis that allows nothing for further increases in life expectation at the older age, and which tends therefore to underestimate the emerging pensions, the number of pensioners from the fund is estimated as follows:—

	30/6/57.	30/6/67.	30/6/72.	30/6/77.
Men pensioners	2,658	2,843	2,721	2,724
Women pensioners	457	619	657	614
Widow pensioners	2,151	2,505	2,651	2,642

Estimates of pensions payable are at least (and could be with reason more than) the following:—

Total pensions payable.	30/6/57.	30/6/67.	30/6/72.	30/6/77.
	£	£	£	£
Total payable	1,022,100	1,757,000	2,015,000	2,248,000
Payable by fund	216,100	525,000	657,000	785,000
Payable by Government	806,000	1,232,000	1,358,000	1,463,000

These estimates assume, of necessity, that the unit remains at £45 10s., widows one-half thereof. It will be noted that total pensions payable are estimated to increase at a greater rate than the number of pensioners. This is due to the fact that the members of the fund now contribute for a much greater number of units than did present pensioners. The average number of units for which members contribute is shown in the following table:—

Members on June 30, 1957.

Ages.	Average number of units.	
	Men.	Women.
15-19	6.2	5.3
20-24	9.8	7.6
25-29	12.1	10.6
30-34	11.9	12.6
35-39	11.9	12.3
40-44	11.7	12.7
45-49	12.2	13.3
50-54	11.3	12.1
55-59	10.0	12.5
60-64	7.7	—

On June 30, 1957, the average pensions payable were to men pensioners £242, or 5.3 units at £45 10s.; to women pensioners £294, or 6.5 units at £45 10s.; and to widowed pensioners, £113, or 5 units at £22 15s. It is obvious therefore that future pensions will become payable at a much higher rate than at present. It will be noted also that pensions payable from the fund are estimated to increase at a greater rate than the total pensions payable. This is due to the fact that whereas the fund at present pays only 21 per cent of the total pensions payable, because of the various rates of age concessions granted to contributors in the past, that percentage should increase to the maximum of 40 per cent gradually. Under present conditions I estimate that the percentage will be 35 per cent in 20 years' time.

As I have said, these estimates will probably tend to underestimate future pensions. They were calculated by assuming that the very high rate of resignations from the service during the past five years will apply also in future, and they make no allowance for future improvement in life expectation of pensioners. Under the influence of adequate medical and hospital services for pensioners and general care and concern for the welfare and good health of aged people, the expectation of life of older people is now increasing quite substantially. Further advances in medical treatment of diseases predominantly of the aged, such as cancer and the heart diseases, must effect an obvious improvement in life expectation.

On the revenue side the fund is receiving contributions of £848,000 per annum at present. On June 30, 1957, the average contribution of men contributors was £61 per annum, and of women contributors £99 per annum. These very high rates are due to the fact that over the last few years salaries have increased at a very rapid rate and hence contributors have had to contribute for additional units at ages much greater than the normal ages of salary increase. Contributions per unit increase rapidly with age at date of commencement. An estimate of future contributions is hazardous, but it can be expected that the average rate

of annual contribution will decrease in future and it is not too much to say that the total annual contributions may ultimately be £300,000 less than at present for the same number of contributors and existing salary scales. I am of course unable to make any allowance for future general increases in salary levels, but such increases as well as numerical staff increases affect both contributions and pensions payable. Again interest is being earned on the funds at present at a very high rate, and although high interest earning may continue for some years, it would be imprudent to anticipate such a high rate for many years in the future.

On current conditions, benefits, and salary scales, the expectation is that expenditure will increase substantially and contributions will tend to decrease, so that the present high margin will most definitely decrease in future, although the decrease may not be appreciable for a few years. The true position of the Superannuation Fund and the possibility of benefit increases from surplus (if any) can be examined only by means of an actuarial valuation of the fund. I have recently completed the quinquennial valuation of the fund due on June 30, 1957, and advise that the result is a surplus of £370,000 in funds of £8,738,138 on June 30, 1957.

The surplus of £370,000 represents only 4½ per cent of the amount of funds, 2½ per cent of the value of the total pension liability of the fund which is, of course, very much less than the value of the full pensions payable, and 4½ per cent of the value of future contributions payable by present members. There is nothing excessive or undesirable in such a surplus with a fund of this magnitude. Obviously, however, any increase in benefits payable from the fund without any increase in contributions by members or enhanced Government subsidy must be very small. Since an increase in the value of the unit from £45 10s. per annum to £52 per annum would increase the value of pension liability by one-seventh, the cost is obviously prohibitive so far as the fund is concerned. An increase of one-seventh even in the pension liability of the fund itself would involve an additional liability whose capital value is £2,300,000.

The capitalized value of widows' pensions (present and prospective) payable from the fund is £3,960,000, while the total liability for widows' pension, Government and fund combined, is much greater. Therefore, if the widows' proportion was increased from one-half to three-quarters as suggested by Mr. O'Halloran the fund would be involved in an additional liability of almost £2,000,000 if it had only to pay its own share of the increase. Moreover, further loss would result from inadequate contributions for units taken out in future.

The liability for an increase in children's pension to say £26 per annum and £52 in the case of orphans would be small and the cost could be borne by the fund. It is therefore not possible for the fund to bear the cost of these increased benefits as suggested with the exception of an increase in children's benefit. It follows that if benefits are so increased,

and the fund is to be maintained in a solvent position without increased members' contributions, Government subsidies must be increased to compensate.

The Government Actuary has gone thoroughly into this matter and has stated that the proposals of the Leader of the Opposition cannot be accepted without placing the fund in a position in which it will ultimately fail to meet pensions becoming due. Under those circumstances it seems that the House must reject the motion, but I should be sorry if it were rejected this year. I say that because some time ago I received a communication from the Public Service Federation asking whether the Government would rectify some alleged anomalies in pensions payable. In accordance with usual policy this communication was placed before Government officers, who made certain recommendations which are acceptable to Cabinet, and a Bill has been drawn up to embody them. Some of the matters contained in it are covered by this motion and I understand that under Standing Orders if a matter is dealt with by the House it cannot be considered again in the same session.

Mr. O'Halloran—I don't mind if you do it, so long as it is done.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We do not propose to do what the Leader suggests.

Mr. O'Halloran—But you propose to do something?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. We cannot but accept the advice of our competent officers as to what the fund can stand in the future. The Government is prepared to introduce a Bill dealing with this matter but it could not do so if this motion were negatived. On the other hand the Government certainly will not vote for the motion or assist its passage because it is based on contentions directly opposed to the best advice we can get.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not intend putting it to the vote today.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In that case I ask leave to continue my remarks. Leave granted; debate adjourned.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 24. Page 877.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The matter dealt with by the Leader's Bill is complex and I have received two reports on it. Apprentices in this State are involved with two authorities

—the Factories Department and the Education Department. The following is the report from the Industries Department:—

1. The alterations, if accepted, would alter the function of the Apprentices Board and would give it wide powers over matters concerning apprenticeship training and, instead of being concerned with technical training only, it would become an executive body actively supervising every apprentice in the State.

2. This Bill apparently seeks to implement a few only of the 90 recommendations made by a Commonwealth-State Apprenticeship Inquiry Committee over which His Honor Mr. Justice Wright presided, the report of such committee being published in 1954.

Actually, of the 90 recommendations made by this committee, the Leader has selected four for inclusion in this Bill. The report continues:—

3. No action has been taken in any State in the four years since the report was made and it appears unlikely that it will be implemented.

4. The Federal awards contain elaborate provisions regarding apprenticeship and, unless action is taken to remove those provisions from such awards, then most of the provisions of the Bill would not apply to apprentices indentured under those awards.

5. If action is to be taken on the 1954 report, it appears logical that all of the recommendations should be first considered, and not just a few of them.

6. If the present Bill becomes law it could well result in less youths being indentured and more youths being employed as unapprenticed juniors at a time when efforts are being made to induce more people to train as tradesmen.

7. The Bill deals only piecemeal with what is an important matter. First it should be shown that it is necessary to change the present method of apprentice training and control and, if this is found to be necessary, then a change should be made only after careful investigation has been conducted to ascertain what methods should be adopted and what provisions are necessary.

8. The detailed provisions of the Bill are as follows:—

(a) Section 4 proposes to increase training during working hours from 4-12 hours per week.

(i) It would immediately increase three-fold the number of apprentices attending Trade School during working hours, therefore the employer would be without the services of an apprentice for one and a half days each week and the apprentice would not be required to attend in his own time at all.

(ii) Section 4 also provides that all Trade School training is to be given during normal working hours. The Commonwealth State Inquiry Committee was divided on this question. Five members recommended wholly daytime attendance and four members supported the suggestion that one-third of the time occupied in

technical training should be in the evening. Those who suggested full-time daylight training recommended that it should be introduced gradually. The Bill proposes to make it compulsory forthwith.

Mr. O'Halloran—Four years have elapsed since that recommendation was made.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. It is rather significant that no State has attempted to implement it.

Mr. O'Halloran—There is no reason why South Australia shouldn't.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, but it reveals that there are some difficulties associated with it, particularly when State Governments sharing the Leader's political philosophy hesitate to implement it. The report continues:—

(b) Section 5. No employer is to take an apprentice unless the Apprentices Board approved the standard of the employer's place of employment and his qualifications to train employees.

(i) The Industrial Code at present empowers the Industrial Court and Industrial Boards to prescribe the number of apprentices and juvenile workers that may be employed by an employer in any industry.

(ii) It is usual for Federal awards to contain similar provisions.

(iii) Where an employer is qualified to engage apprentices under the Federal award (and the majority of apprentices are employed under Federal awards in this State), the provisions of this Bill could not prevent him from engaging apprentices whether he was an "approved employer" or not.

(c) Section 5 also provides that no youth shall be indentured unless he reached an educational standard approved by the board.

(i) Employers generally would select as apprentices those applicants with the best school records, but academic attainments are not the sole criterion of whether a youth will make a good tradesman and other aspects such as an interest in the trade and a will to learn are equally important.

(d) Section 6. The obligation is placed on the board to investigate any matter arising out of apprenticeship raised by any party to the indenture or by the appropriate trade union.

(i) Section 30 of the Apprentices Act already gives this power to the Apprentices Board.

(ii) This clause proposes to make it obligatory on the board to make the investigation in every case.

(iii) The board has only been asked to make an investigation in six cases during the last four years.

(e) Section 8 requires the approval of the board before an indenture of apprenticeship is suspended or cancelled. This amendment may protect an employee from an unscrupulous employer, but it would appear unwieldy; such matters must be considered by a board of eight members.

A detailed report is attached hereto in respect of each of the main alterations sought. I have also a report from the Education Department. Mr. Walker, Superintendent of Technical Schools, for whom members have a high respect and who has shown how sincere he is in his work for technical education, states:—

The following is a brief report which I have prepared this day in consultation with the Acting Superintendent of Technical Schools on the proposed amendments to the Apprentices Act, 1950, for your information and as a basis for further discussion.

The proposed amendments:—For easy reference, I have inserted in the appropriate places in the copy of the Apprentices Act, 1950, the proposed amendments extracted from the Bill now before Parliament. Broadly, the proposed amendments would give additional statutory powers to the Apprentices Board (which at the present time is almost entirely an advisory body) in respect of the following matters:—

Clause 5 empowers the board to prevent an employer from indenturing an apprentice unless the board is satisfied in respect of the following:—

(a) Suitability of the place of employment of the apprentice in regard to equipment and methods of training.

I have no intimate knowledge of conditions in a workshop, but I feel that even elaborate equipment does not necessarily make a workshop the best shop to turn out a fully-qualified tradesman.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is not suggested in the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There is a direct suggestion that if a shop and its equipment are not of a certain standard it shall not employ an apprentice.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is your interpretation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I think some of our best apprentices would come from shops where ingenuity had to be used because of plant not being completely mechanized. I doubt the wisdom of a provision of this nature.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—You are incompetent to express an opinion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, the honourable member will readily concede that to me. The report continues:—

(b) qualifications of persons appointed to train the apprentices.

(c) scope of work undertaken by the apprentice for effective training.

(d) appropriate educational standard for entry to apprenticeship.

Clause 6 empowers the board to:

(a) investigate any matter arising out of the indenture of apprenticeship upon the application of the apprentice, the parent or guardian, the employer or the appropriate trade union.

(b) assign the indentures of an apprentice to another employer if, in its opinion, the practical training given by an employer to an apprentice is inadequate, or to cancel the indentures.

Clause 7 empowers the board to appoint investigating officers to inspect the training of apprentices in the premises of the employer.

Clause 8 requires the approval of the board for the suspension or cancellation of indentures where this is done—

(i) by mutual consent.

(ii) because of the inability of the employer to find suitable employment for an apprentice and transfer of indentures to another employer, or

(iii) in any other circumstances where suspension or cancellation seems to the board desirable.

Clause 9 empowers the board to authorize entry and inspection of premises in which any apprentice in any trade is employed. This power was formerly restricted to the Chief Inspector of Factories.

In addition to giving the board the powers referred to above clause 4 in the Bill, in effect, doubles the number of hours per week which any apprentice is required to attend at a technical school or class, and further provides that this instruction shall be undertaken in the employer's time. Provision is also made for an apprentice who fails to reach the required standard in the compulsory 3-year period of attendance to attend for further instruction in his own time, and also permits any apprentice to attend a technical school in his own time for supplementary instruction. Clause 3 provides that the board shall keep a register of approved places of employment, pursuant to clause 5.

Background—Several of the provisions in the Bill, notably those contained in clauses 4, 5, 6 and 7 have been the subject of discussion in trade committees and on the Apprentices Board for many years and stem from procedures adopted in the selection and training of returned servicemen under the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. This scheme for the technical training and placement in industry of returned servicemen was in many respects similar in scope to the system of apprentice training, except that the trainees were adults and no formal indentures were signed. Under that scheme the training authority, which in this State was administered by the Education Department under the Commonwealth-States Agreement, determined the suitability of an applicant for training. Industrial committees, corresponding to trade committees under the Apprentices Act, determined the suitability of the employer and his

establishment for providing training facilities in industry, and officers were appointed to investigate the training of members of the scheme in the employer's establishment and to assess regularly their proficiency. Provision was also made to transfer a trainee from one employer to another if training conditions were considered unsatisfactory, or to suspend or cancel training if considered necessary.

In September 1950 the Premiers' conference approved of the setting-up of a committee to inquire into apprenticeship matters under the chairmanship of Judge Wright of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. The committee brought down a report in March 1954, which was transmitted through you to Cabinet on 29/6/54. The report was subsequently referred by the Premier in Cabinet to the Apprentices Board on 15/11/54.

Among the 90 recommendations made by the committee in its report (pages 54-59) on each of which the Apprentices Board expressed its opinion after full discussion, there are several which relate to the matters contained in the proposed amending Legislation to the Apprentices Act, 1950, viz.:—

"13. Desirable educational qualifications should be prescribed by apprenticeship authorities for entry into apprenticeship in a trade, having regard to the educational standard of the trade course in that trade."

"15. No employer shall be allowed to employ a youth as a probationer or indenture him as an apprentice without the approval of the apprenticeship authority."

"19. As regards day-time attendance for compulsory technical education, five members of the committee (including the chairman) recommend that wholly day-time attendance be accepted in principle as Government policy and adopted as an objective to be implemented over a period of years—four members (including the chairman) suggest a period of say five years. The other four members would recommend that something like one-third of school attendances for compulsory technical education be evening attendances."

"58. Apprenticeship supervisors should be appointed, with duties to include personal contact with apprentices at their places of work in the interest of their welfare, amicable relations between them and their employers, satisfactory working conditions, and for supervision of their training in the workshop."

"63. All disciplinary functions, including power to dissolve contracts for serious breaches of discipline, should be in the hands of the apprenticeship authority."

"70. Extra-curricular study should be encouraged and workshop libraries and other technical facilities should be made available outside regular class time for the use of apprentices carrying out approved projects related to their trade."

A summary of the opinions of the Apprentices Board on the committee's report is attached. In regard to the framework of the apprenticeship system, whilst the board unanimously expressed its satisfaction with the existing system in South Australia, it was agreed that the board should have more power

in certain directions. The board went on to say that "the system at present operating in South Australia was satisfactory, but could be improved by amendments to the existing legislation."

In regard to recommendation 13 in the committee's report, the board agreed in principle with prescribing certain educational qualifications for entry into apprenticeship, but at that time considered that their application should be left to the discretion of individual employers. During this year the matter of entrance standards has been thoroughly discussed by all trade committees which, with one exception, are in favour of prescribing certain minimum educational qualifications for apprentices. The recommendations of the trade committees are now being referred to the Apprentices Board for its consideration.

The board agreed with recommendation 15 of the committee, namely, that no employer should be allowed to employ a youth as a probationer or indenture him as an apprentice without the approval of the apprenticeship authority. In regard to recommendation 19, the majority of the board agreed that apprentices should do some of their technical school training in their own time. Representatives of the Trades and Labor Council held that all technical training should be in the employer's time. The majority of the board rejected recommendation 58 regarding the appointment of apprenticeship supervisors. The board did not agree with recommendation 63. The board agreed with recommendation 70.

The Bill for the Apprentices Act, 1950, contained clauses similar to those in the proposed amending legislation, thus: clause 30 (2) prescribed educational standards to be complied with before an apprentice was indentured; clause 31 (2) provided that no person may employ an apprentice without the approval of the board. Clause 33 provided that the board may supervise the training of apprentices in the premises of the employer of the apprentice and gave the board power to require the employer to do such things for the training of the apprentice as the board deemed necessary. Clauses 30 and 31 were subsequently deleted and the word "supervise" was altered to "inspect" in clause 33 before the Bill was passed.

COMMENTS.

Although the Apprentices Board has given its opinion on certain matters connected with the proposed legislation arising out of its consideration of the Commonwealth Apprenticeship Inquiry Committee, I am of the opinion that the proposed legislation should be referred to it for its advice since, under the present Act, it is one of the functions of the board to report and make such recommendations as it thinks fit to the Minister upon the training of apprentices generally.

After discussion with the Acting Superintendent of Technical Schools, I support the proposals made in clause 5 of the Bill. Although I cannot, in this brief memorandum, present a full report on my reasons for so doing, I have become convinced after many years of

close association with apprenticeship training of the necessity for requiring certain minimum educational qualifications (which would vary from trade to trade) of youths who are to be apprenticed to a trade. The absence of any educational prerequisite results every year in a number of youths being accepted as apprentices who have not the necessary aptitude and ability to complete the prescribed course of training, with a consequent waste of time and effort at our over-crowded trade schools.

I have also encountered numerous cases in which employers have failed almost entirely to carry out their part of the indenture agreement in regard to the proper training of the apprentice in the employer's trade, and have used the lad on tasks which do not provide for his adequate training as a tradesman. I am of the opinion that the exercise by the board of a measure of control over employers in respect of adequacy of training facilities and methods would impose no hardship on the genuine employer, large or small, but would effectively prevent some of the exploitation of youth labour practised today. The keeping of a register of approved places of employment and the appointment of investigating officers to inspect the training of apprentices in the employer's workshop would be a necessary consequence (vide clauses 3 and 7).

In regard to clauses 6 and 8, the position is that in respect of trades covered by a Federal award, the apprentice or his employer may appeal to a Board of Reference presided over by the Deputy Registrar of the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration in matters relating to the suspension, transfer or cancellation of Indentures. In regard to trades covered by State awards the position is not so satisfactory. Under the Apprentices Act, 1950 the board may investigate any matter arising out of the Indentures of Apprenticeship upon the application of any apprentice, or parent, or employer of the apprentice, and may suggest arrangements for the transfer or cancellation of the indentures. Failing a satisfactory outcome of any action by the board, either party may take civil action for breach of contract in a court of law. This latter course is rarely adopted. In my opinion, it would be desirable for the board to have greater powers in this matter than at present, particularly in respect of apprentices in trades covered by State awards.

Clause 4 relating to hours of training in a technical school deals with two separate, though related matters—

- (a) Increasing the period of attendance at a technical school from 6 to 12 hours per week. (Although the present Act does not prescribe the hours of attendance as six per week these are so prescribed by regulations made under the Act.)
- (b) The concentration of all technical school training in the employer's time instead of the present arrangement whereby two-thirds of the training is done in the employer's time and one third in the apprentice's time.

With regard to (a), there is no doubt in my mind that in a number of the more highly skilled trades the total number of hours of

attendance at a technical school (extending over a period of three years) prescribed at present is insufficient to cover a basic course of training. In this State the problem is being met, in part at least, by the establishment of classes for fourth and fifth year apprentices which are attended voluntarily by the more able lad. It must be remembered that the employer is paying the apprentice during the period of his day-time attendance at the technical school, and to increase this would place an added financial burden on the employer. I should point out, however, that the number of hours of compulsory attendance at a technical school for apprentices in Victoria has in most trades been increased to eight hours a week for four years.

The problem of the additional staff and accommodation required to implement such a proposal is self-evident, but could be met by increasing the number of hours of compulsory attendance at a technical school progressively. In regard to the proposal for so-called "all daylight" training, although there is a strong body of opinion among people in the apprentice training field which favours it I do not subscribe to the view that compulsory attendance at evening classes should be abolished.

The employer is making his contribution to the technical school training of the apprentice by allowing him to attend the school in the employer's time, and I think it is only reasonable to require the apprentice to reciprocate, at least in part, by devoting some of his own time to study which is designed to benefit him as well as the employer. Needless to say, I have touched only lightly in this memorandum on the matters raised in the proposed legislation, many of which demand for adequate consideration a full report in themselves, but I trust that the foregoing will serve as a basis for further discussion.

Those two reports show that this question is not as clear-cut as the Leader of the Opposition would have us believe. I am sure every member desires our apprenticeship system to be adequate and just and young men trained so that they can take their place in the great industries being established here, but I consider the Leader has been too impetuous. He has seized upon four recommendations out of 90. Each of those four recommendations has some problem associated with it, but he has brought down a Bill to see what he can do. That is not the best way to deal with this problem, and not the way it was dealt with previously. The Government has appointed an advisory board to deal with all phases of apprenticeship, and trade unions, the Education Department and employers have representatives on that board. They are men of high qualifications and before the Bill is passed it should be thoroughly investigated by them. The chairman of the board is Mr. Walker, whose report I have

just quoted, and I believe the Railways Commissioner is a member.

Mr. O'Halloran—What steps have you taken to have these matters investigated by the board?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I believe the Leader himself will agree that the problems associated with apprenticeship have not been easy to solve over the years, so the Bill should be held over and the Government would then submit it to the Apprentices Board for report. The board should also be instructed to inquire into any other matters which it considers should be the subject of amendments to the legislation. Ninety recommendations were brought down by a highly competent body appointed by a Premiers Conference. No State has implemented those recommendations, though they were made after evidence had been taken throughout Australia from all sections concerned with the apprenticeship system. The Bill should be held over until we have much more information before us. The report from the Industries Department stated in paragraph 6:—

If the present Bill becomes law it could well result in less youths being indentured and more youths being employed as unapprenticed juniors at a time when efforts are being made to induce more youths to train as tradesmen.

Mr. O'Halloran—The wastage of apprentices recently has been considerable.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That may be so, but I do not think the Leader would favour a Bill that would lead to the consequence which the Industry Department pointed out.

Mr. O'Halloran—My idea is to stop it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Unfortunately the Bill may increase it, and that is the opinion of competent authorities who are handling these matters every day of the week. If the Bill were put to a vote I would oppose it, but if it were held over the Government would be prepared to submit the whole matter to the Apprentices Board for report. I should be loth to vote against the Bill, for the reasons I have given.

Mr. O'Halloran—You may not have to vote against it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am pleased that the Leader is again following the Government's lead.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—Despite what the Premier has said I will speak on this Bill now, whatever its fate. He quoted a report from the Department of Industry, and I think one sentence stated that no action

has been taken by any State to implement the recommendations of the Commonwealth-State committee which inquired into the apprenticeship system. I think that is rather a misleading statement for in Victoria several provisions of this Bill are in operation, although not all of them to the letter. The statement that this Bill could result in fewer apprentices or more unapprenticed juniors is a supposition. It is difficult to say just what will happen, but after its effects had been experienced for some time it is just as possible that the reverse would be true. We are undoubtedly losing good potential tradesmen because our Apprentices Act is deficient in the things the Bill is designed to correct. Many potential tradesmen are going into shops that are not properly equipped for their training and they are losing interest. Others are engaging in specialized training with the result that they will not become fully-fledged tradesmen in the best sense.

It was also suggested in the report that award conditions would prevent the board from controlling who should become apprentices in some industries. That may be so, but on the other hand the board would have power over a number of employees in a certain number of industries. The report stated that academic attainments were not the sole criterion as to whether one should become an apprentice or not. That is not disputed, but it is obvious that many persons have been accepted as apprentices without possessing the necessary educational background, and as their studies have proceeded they have been unable to meet the academic requirements. They have lost interest and some have given up their apprenticeships. Frequently it is too late then for them to learn some other trade, and they drift into the field of unskilled labour.

The Premier said that the Leader had been rather impetuous and had selected a mere four from the 90 recommendations made by the Committee of Inquiry which reported in 1954. He said the Leader had rushed in and had not given the matter due consideration. This matter has received long and careful consideration by members of the Trades and Labor Council, who have selected these particular points as the most urgent and most important. It is interesting to note that the remarks of Mr. Walker of the Education Department, far from condemning the provisions of the Bill, mainly support them, with one or two exceptions. Even if the Bill is not accepted in its entirety, there is no reason why those provisions, at any rate, should not receive the support they merit.

When the Apprentices Act of 1950 became law I remember strong criticism of it by many educational authorities interested in apprenticeship. At that time I had a personal interest in apprenticeship, being secretary of a large branch of the Amalgamated Engineering Union with many apprentices among its members. The criticism was that the Act did not go far enough, was limited in its scope, too inconclusive and that the board did not have sufficient obligatory powers—there was too much option in respect of the board's powers. This Bill is designed to remedy those defects and also to bring the Act more into line with present-day requirements. The rapid technical developments in modern industry demand far more highly skilled tradesmen than we have had in the past and that means that the educational standards of apprentices must receive more attention. That demand cannot be met by allowing people without the necessary educational background to enter into apprenticeships. It is not suggested that that educational background should have a common standard. The standard would be fixed according to the needs of the particular trade.

These objectives are all desirable from all points of view. At present there is nothing to prevent apprentices being employed in workshops where the equipment and facilities are quite inadequate for their proper training and where those responsible may not be competent or even willing to give the proper training the apprentices should receive. The Premier said that, although he did not have personal experience, he believed elaborate equipment in a workshop was not necessary for an apprentice's proper training. I do not think anyone will quarrel with that. No-one is suggesting that a workshop should have elaborate equipment for apprentice training purposes, but undoubtedly many workshops have not the necessary equipment, and in many the employer is not qualified to provide the necessary training. A lad today may become apprenticed in a shop where the work is so specialized and restricted in its scope that his training is far too narrow and he is placed at a serious disadvantage upon completing his indenture. Alternative employment in his particular trade is hard to obtain because his training has been too limited. On the other hand, if something happens to his employer during his apprenticeship, and he wishes to have his indenture transferred, he discovers that his field of trade is restricted and limited. If he does complete his indenture he is not the tradesman he would and could have been

had he been given the fullest opportunities in that field.

Many parents and boys when considering the question of apprenticeship are not aware of the pitfalls. They may not have lived in an area of industrial activity or be acquainted with industrial practices and as a result a lad may enter an apprenticeship in which neither he nor his parents are aware of the inadequacy of the equipment and the ability of the employer to provide the training. This Bill is designed to rectify that defect. If a boy becomes uninterested as a consequence of the inadequacy of the factory, his indenture may be cancelled and we could lose a potential good tradesman through no fault of his own. That is something we should prevent and that is one of the answers to the statement in the Industries Department report. Although these unsatisfactory conditions can be found in workshops large and small, there is no doubt that motor workshops and garages constitute a high percentage of them. Some are very poorly equipped, many lack facilities for training apprentices, and some employers fail to give proper instructions. Frequently an apprentice motor mechanic is employed for much of his time as cheap labour attending petrol pumps and doing a variety of other unskilled jobs to such an extent that he has become disheartened and endeavoured to have his indenture transferred, or given up his attempt to become a tradesman. Many of those who get through are not the tradesmen they should be. This phase of the question has not received sufficient attention. Because of the tremendous increase in the number of motor vehicles there has been a heavy investment in precision machinery. In June of this year 259,700 motor vehicles of all kinds were registered in South Australia. This machinery requires highly skilled motor mechanics for proper maintenance. Anyone acquainted with the engineering trade will know that many garages have not mechanics with the necessary training. There are many deficiencies in this matter and no-one with a full acquaintance with the trade can contradict my statement.

Clause 5 of the Bill is designed to prevent employers from taking apprentices unless they provide proper conditions, equipment and instructions, according to standards laid down by the board. The Leader gave some figures regarding the cancellation of indentures in the metal trades industry. He said that it was a

serious factor. In a recent report by an electrical trades union on a question of cancellations in general it was said that the greatest percentage of cancellations was from garages, which bears out my statement on this matter. Several instances were cited by the Leader of the Opposition of unsatisfactory conditions in workshops leading to the cancellation of indentures. I will give further instances. One apprentice had not been getting his correspondence course from the Trades School because his employer had not registered him with the Factories and Steamboilers Department. This has now been rectified but it should never have occurred. The apprentice is required to work overtime without pay because he is not covered by an award. Another apprentice was employed for 18 months without any contract of apprenticeship and when his mother (he had no father) pressed for the signing of the indenture the lad was sacked. He was then employed by another firm for 8 or 9 months. It was prepared to credit him with one year's training with the previous employer, and, owing to his age, agreed to take him as a fourth-year apprentice. He will be 19 in December. As a second-year apprentice in a four-year apprenticeship he should get £7 10s. a week but has been receiving only the first year rate of £6 8s. Up to the present the second employer has not supplied the lad or the mother with a copy of the indenture and he has now applied to a board of reference for the cancellation of the indenture because he says the lad is not interested in his work. Another apprentice has not done well at a trades school and his marks in mathematics and theory were poor, but his practical work was good. His father says he has been engaged in repetition work performing such tasks as taking the tea waggon around and mixing concrete. The employer is seeking to cancel the indenture because the lad is not bright and not interested in his work.

The person who supplied me with this information says that, having been employed at this place himself, he thinks it is a wonder that any lad is interested in work there because of no provision for regular instruction. The lads have to pick up any knowledge they can from the jobs they get, and the only advice they receive is from tradesmen working nearby who may be interested enough in the lad to help him. I know from experience in years gone by that these are not isolated instances by any means. I think educational standards

deserve considerable attention. Clause 5 of the Bill provides that no person shall take an apprentice unless the intended apprentice has reached the educational standard determined by the board on the recommendation of the appropriate trades committee. This change is desirable from all points of view. If the intending apprentice has not reached a sufficiently high standard of education he simply cannot make the grade when he comes up against his technical school studies, particularly in mathematics. Many apprentices have foundered on that subject. In the metal trades this is an important subject; consequently the lad becomes frustrated and uninterested, and one of the various things I have mentioned can happen to him. As a matter of fact, in the metal trades in recent years instances have arisen where many boys have been employed without reaching the Intermediate standard. Anyone knowing anything about education will know that a boy who has not reached that standard will have the greatest difficulty in dealing with mathematics in his technical school studies.

Country apprentices who have been on correspondence courses have sometimes had an insufficient educational background and they have been unable to cope with the examinations, and this also has led to the cancellation of indentures. Although there may be some minor difficulties with the introduction of these new arrangements we contend that if introduced there would undoubtedly be a totally different attitude to apprenticeship, and many boys who imagine that they can get through with an insufficient educational background will realize that is not so. Both they and their parents would take steps to see that they worked harder and got that necessary educational background for apprenticeship. Even if it were true that it would lower the number of apprentices and reduce the number coming into the trades, the introduction of these measures would soon reverse the process, we would have a much better standard of apprentices, and it would make apprenticeship much more attractive to both parents and boys, because they would know precisely where they stood.

To place the investigation of apprenticeship matters on a more definite footing, clause 6 amends section 30 to make it mandatory on the board to investigate the apprenticeship matters referred to instead of leaving it optional. This is consistent with the object of securing better supervision of the whole system.

Following this still further, it is logical and necessary to appoint investigating officers to carry out the work of supervision and make it effective. I noticed with pleasure that Mr. Walker of the Education Department appears to agree with those objectives. The Bill also deals with the cancellation of indentures, and sets out more fully the circumstances under which an indenture may be suspended or cancelled. I think, from memory, that the Premier said the Industries Department was rather critical of this particular matter as it appeared to be unwieldy. I do not know why it should be described as unwieldy; after all, it defines more clearly what the board should do in relation to cancellations.

Mr. O'Halloran—A Bill containing all the recommendations of the previous inquiry would be much more unwieldy.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Well, the Act leaves the matter very vague on a number of important matters relating to cancellation, whereas the Bill provides:—

Subject to the approval of the board but not otherwise an indenture of apprenticeship may be suspended or cancelled—

- i. by mutual consent;
- ii. if through lack of orders or financial difficulties an employer is unable to find suitable employment for an apprentice and a transfer to another employer cannot be arranged; or
- iii. if in the opinion of the board circumstances exist which render such suspension or cancellation necessary or desirable.

I think that clarifies the position definitely as to what the board should do in relation to cancellation, and that is eminently desirable. The Act covers only one aspect of cancellation. Two points in particular are not covered and obviously need clarification and definition. To achieve better results from the training received by apprentices at technical schools and classes for instruction, the Bill requires them to attend at those places for instruction for not less than 12 hours a week during the normal hours of employment. As the Leader said, this was a majority recommendation—five members of the Commonwealth-State Committee were in favour of it, and four were opposed to it. I think the reasons of the majority portion of the Committee for making those recommendations are well worth placing on record. They put counter-arguments to those made by those opposing the suggestion. Firstly, it has been said here today that the matter should be investigated more thoroughly all round and that we have rushed in on this proposal. Let

me emphasize that nothing could have been more thorough or complete than the Commonwealth-State apprenticeship inquiry conducted in 1954. It is interesting to have on record how it came about, and the terms of reference. It was set up as a result of a Premiers' Conference in 1950, and the terms of reference were:—

1. To inquire into and report upon whether to meet present and future requirements for skilled tradesmen, having regard to the needs of a rapidly expanding industrial economy and defence, and in the light of the functioning of the apprenticeship system as now practised in Australia, the development of technical training, technological changes and other relevant circumstances, any adjustments in the apprenticeship system are necessary. The committee's inquiry would comprise such matters as the educational requirements for, and the regulation of, apprenticeship (including methods of selecting and attracting apprentices) and the terms and conditions of employment of apprentices.

2. To make such recommendations as are necessary and in particular the measures that commend themselves to the committee as desirable if the requirements of Australian industry for skilled tradesmen are to be met.

South Australia was ably represented on this committee by Mr. G. S. McDonald, then Deputy Director of Education, Superintendent of Technical Schools and Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board. The majority recommendation in relation to full time day apprentices was as follows:—

The majority of us do not base our conclusion on identical grounds, nor are we all influenced to the same extent by particular factors, but the following are considerations which have affected our conclusions:—

(a) Daytime technical education has been a movement of steady growth all over Australia during the last 25 years or so, we think with beneficial results to everybody. The general trend over the years has been towards more daytime instruction and less at night. It has similarly been a movement of steady growth in other countries. We have noted, *e.g.*, amongst other information, that Great Britain has affirmed by the provisions of the Education Act, 1944, the principle of continued education for one full day a week to all young people from 15 to 18 years not in full-time attendance at school.

The report goes on to deal with the situation elsewhere, and then states:—

(c) It is accepted by the whole committee that apprentices should be regarded primarily as training units and not as industrial units, that workshop training must be supplemented by appropriate technical education and that school attendance should be compulsory. Those hypotheses we consider point strongly to the conclusion that as such education must be regarded as part of the complete training of the apprentice, it is just that it should be done

within working hours. We feel the force of evidence submitted by organizations of teachers of much greater efficiency of day-time instruction and the low absorptive capacity and lack of concentration of young apprentices required to attend evening classes after a day's work, and the complaints from youth organizations of the unduly long day of many apprentices required to attend evening classes, sometimes without the opportunity of a proper evening meal, and who travel considerable distances to their homes.

Some of the awards covering principal apprenticeship trades forbid employers from requiring overtime work by apprentices under 18 years of age, and it seems anomalous that he should be under a legal compulsion to attend for another aspect of his training outside of ordinary working hours.

(g) Day-time attendance would lead to better correlation of school work, and according to organizations of teachers and instructors, to greater efficiency in schools and in the work of apprentices;

(h) The widely held belief that apprentices are the only section of the community of their age group subject to compulsory education in their own time has, to some extent, discouraged entry to apprenticeship;

(l) While we feel that apprentices should not be compelled to attend evening classes as part of the compulsory trade course, we have no doubt they should devote a substantial period of their own time to home study if they are to make satisfactory progress in their prescribed courses; and we agree that every encouragement should be given, particularly in the later years of their courses, to undertake voluntary additional evening classes to prepare themselves for greater responsibilities or to improve their general education;

(m) We are not deeply impressed by the plea that day-time education is an intrusion on the "employer's time" as it is obvious that, in the long run, it is the community which pays the apprentice's wages for the time he is at school.

Those remarks are very pertinent and are the complete answer to those who say that day-time training is something that we should not introduce at this juncture. I am certain that those reasons are so good and sound that instead of reducing the number of apprentices, once those ideas are accepted we shall have more and better apprentices. Regarding the long hours which some apprentices have to work during the day, I shall quote some typical cases of apprentices in the metropolitan area who have to travel long distances. One boy leaves home at 6.30 a.m. for work, and he has to attend night classes. The instructor releases the lad before the class has finished, and he arrives home at 8.45 p.m. If he stayed for the full lesson he would arrive home at 9.45, which would make his day 15¼ hours. After working a full day he is not able to do full justice to his evening studies. An apprentice

wood machinist attends the trade school commencing on Tuesdays at 8 a.m. He attends a day class which finishes at 4.30 p.m. He lives at Seacliff, and he has to fill in time until the 7 p.m. evening class, and arrives home at 10 o'clock. That sort of thing is detrimental to an apprentice's progress. I said earlier that in Victoria many of the recommendations of the Commonwealth-State inquiry committee have already been implemented. Therefore, the Premier was not correct in saying that none of them had been adopted elsewhere. I shall now quote from the 29th Annual Report for the year ended June 30, 1957, of the Apprentices Commission of Victoria. Under the heading "Employer's facilities for training apprentices," it states:—

An employer must satisfy the commission that he has suitable training facilities before approval is granted for the employment of an apprentice.

Under the heading "Supervision of Training" it states:—

Much is involved in the training of apprentices if they are to become skilled craftsmen and close supervision is essential. The training in the employer's workshop is, of course, of fundamental importance and the commission considers that the supervision of this practical training is one of its most important obligations. In addition, there are the many day-to-day problems arising concerning the responsibilities of employers, apprentices and parents, complaints of absence from technical schools and many other matters all requiring investigation. The work of supervision and investigation is carried out by a staff of 21 trained supervisors, most of whom are skilled tradesmen.

It is interesting that the recommendations that Victoria has adopted are the very ones which we say should be implemented in this State, so there was nothing haphazard or rash in our selection. The Victorian commission's report gives a list of the minimum educational qualifications for entry to apprenticeship to the various trades. It states:—

Many applicants who lack the necessary qualifications for entry attend evening apprenticeship preparatory classes in order to qualify.

That shows the effect of having minimum educational standards. Boys know that they cannot become apprentices without those qualifications, and if they do not have them they attend preparatory classes in order to qualify. I shall now refer to some of the recommendations of the Commonwealth-State inquiry committee to show that what we are suggesting is sound and in line with those recommendations. They are those that we consider the most likely

to be of benefit to the community. The report stated:—

In South Australia, administrative supervision of apprentices is not as close as in other States and there is no single statute, or portion of a statute, which provides a complete code. In other words, South Australia is the State that is lagging. Regarding the apprenticeship authority, the report stated:—

It must carry out a day-to-day administration of the apprenticeship system.

Regarding educational qualifications the committee stated:—

Desirable educational qualifications should be prescribed by apprenticeship authorities for entry into apprenticeship in a trade having regard to the educational standard of the trade course in that trade.

Regarding qualifications of employers, it stated:—

Being opposed to a state of affairs in which a lad may enter into a contract with an employer who is unable to fulfil his obligation to train him adequately, we recommend that no employer be allowed to employ a probationer or an apprentice without the approval of the Apprenticeship Authority. The Authority would, of course, keep the employer's qualifications under periodic review.

That means that an employer could easily fit himself so that he could obtain permission of the board to employ apprentices. The committee also dealt with the question of correspondence training, and it referred in its report to supervision:—

Correspondence technical education supplemented by intensive training should be compulsory for apprentices unable to attend technical colleges, and measures should be instituted for the supervision of apprentices undergoing this form of education.

The report mentions the question of apprenticeship supervisors and states that they should be appointed with duties to include personal contact with apprentices at their places of work in the interests of their welfare, amicable relations between them and their employers, satisfactory working conditions, and to supervise their training in the workshop. I think that what I have said proves conclusively that there has been nothing haphazard in our approach to this question. It has been with all due deliberation and with a full knowledge of the responsible nature of this particular task.

If these amendments are carried I believe the general effects will be to raise the level of apprentices' education; reduce the number of cancellations of indentures; ensure more adequate and thorough training of apprentices with a resultant greater number of more highly skilled tradesmen; prevent the disappointment

and wasted years now experienced by apprentices in poorly equipped workshops; encourage parents and boys to confidently consider apprenticeship with the knowledge that a sound training is assured by the general supervision of the apprenticeship authority; and the apprentice would know that he would have to reach a certain approved standard of education before he could become apprenticed, which, in itself, would be a spur and incentive to intending apprentices to attain that level of education. A number of matters are dealt with in the two reports read by the Premier to which I should like to reply after I have fully considered them. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran—

That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed—

(a) to recommend to the House during the current session new boundaries for electoral districts for the House of Assembly to give substantial effect to the principle of one-vote-one-value; and

(b) to consider in the preparation of such electoral boundaries the advisability of providing for multiple member districts.

(Continued from September 24. Page 897).

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—When I obtained leave to continue my remarks I had almost completed my speech and I do not intend to delay the House much longer because we want the motion accepted so that the Royal Commission can get on with the job. The Premier, in opposing the motion, mentioned that a time factor was involved. His friend and ardent supporter, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) also referred to the time factor. Members opposite should be more realistic about time. They should remember that we deliberately embarked on a go-slow policy during the Premier's absence in the United States of America.

Mr. Lawn—At the Premier's request.

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes. We requested that members refrain from asking questions, other than urgent ones, on the only day we have to discuss private members' business, but that gentleman's agreement is not being honoured by gentlemen opposite. Apparently time is not nearly so important as they suggest. I had replied to the Premier's statements concerning the electoral laws in the various places he visited on his recent tour. I am

surprised that as yet no Government member—although I am sure the member for Burnside (Mr. Geoffrey Clarke) would do so—has referred to a Federal Labor Government appointing the Northern Territory Legislative Council with more nominated members than elected members. We have heard that argument every time this question of electoral boundaries has been debated. We have also heard, on other occasions, that the Attlee Government appointed more lords to the House of Lords for political purposes. Those arguments have been adduced before and I mention them unless they have been forgotten and to give members opposite a chance to resurrect them.

I turn now to the remarks of the member for Torrens. There has been an unfortunate tendency, since the member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) on one occasion melodiously and mellifluously sang a certain little ditty,* to describe things in musical terms. I hope this is the end of it, but I am prompted to describe Mr. Coumbe, in his speech, as "Little Sir Echo." He certainly did not say one thing the Premier did not say before him.

Mr. Fred Walsh—His Master's Voice!

Mr. Lawn—Are they allowed to say anything?

Mr. JENNINGS—I think they are allowed to amplify what he says, but on this occasion Mr. Coumbe almost repeated him word for word, and he was not worthy of repetition. Mr. Coumbe introduced a few red herrings, as, for instance, nationalization.

Mr. John Clark—Was the card vote mentioned?

Mr. JENNINGS—Not on this occasion. He also said that if we brought the sizes of electorates into numerical comparison, the country areas would be far too large for proper representation. Of course there is an obvious answer to that. It is to increase the size of Parliament. Comparing population, our Parliament is smaller than any other in Australia, and we have an Upper House that does nothing. It is a useless Upper House, so why not abolish it? It is dead but it won't lie down.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—What about abolishing State Parliaments altogether?

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes, that will come in time. We could abolish the Legislative Council and increase the effective Parliament of this State by 20, simply by the abolition of the other place. It is said it would overcome the problem of country electorates being too large for proper representation, but there is a good argument against that. We do not represent areas or square miles, but people. No matter

how large the area, the country member is no busier than the metropolitan member representing 20,000 to 25,000 electors. He may have to travel long distances but generally he visits all his area only three or four times a year.

Mr. Heaslip—You don't know much about country electorates.

Mr. JENNINGS—I have never represented one but I have had a lot to do with country electors. A country member can go to a town in his electorate and everyone will know he has been there, but I, as a metropolitan member, can go to a street in my electorate, see people and do a job, and then have to go back to the same street the next night. I want to quote some statements made by Mr. Hollway, a former Premier of Victoria, and one of the best Premiers that State has ever had. He suffered the inevitable fate any Liberal suffers when he does something approaching reasonable political honesty. He was kicked out of the Party eventually. In supporting the Electoral Districts Bill in 1953, he said:—

My regret is that it has been introduced by a Labor Party Government whereas it could have been brought forward by a Government representative of the official Liberal and Country Party, which previously had the opportunity to do so. In my opinion this Bill is the best piece of democratic legislation that I have seen in my 20 years of Parliamentary life. Victoria has frequently led the way in democratic reform. In fact, one of the earliest reforms which was initiated in Victoria, and for the first time in the world, was the secret ballot . . . As far back as the 50's Victoria initiated an electoral reform by introducing the system known as the secret ballot, and by this piece of legislation it is again giving a lead to other States in democratic progress. It is showing the other States how their electoral boundaries should be arranged. I am not a supporter of any undemocratic method of electing members of Parliament and I disagree with the South Australian system.

Further on Mr. Hollway said:—

In discussing this question, the fundamental point is: whom do we represent? The answer is that we represent the people; we represent their problems, their ambitions and their aspirations. We represent humanity. We do not represent vested interests and we do not represent acres or square miles. I reiterate that we represent people. I have no quarrel with members of the Country Party who on this occasion have adopted, as they did last year, the very practical and possibly the somewhat cynical viewpoint that they have an electoral advantage which they are reluctant to give up. I can understand that point of view; it is perfectly clear to me.

It is clear to members here also. Although the following statement by Mr. Hollway has

little to do with the matter under review, it is worth quoting:—

The last State election was the most bitter campaign in which I have ever taken part. I thought, when I was representing the electors of Ballarat, that members of the Labor Party used to play the game pretty hard but, by heavens, our Liberal Party members can teach them a tremendous amount. It is useless for members of the Country Party, who are sitting on the corner benches, to try to heckle me. After they have been heckled by a few enthusiastic Liberals they will really know what heckling is. In my opinion the Bill comes down to this very simple question: are we a democracy? Do we represent the people? Do we represent humanity or do we represent vested interests of some sort? If we represent people then the question of square miles or acres does not matter at all. If any person studies the electoral history of this State, it will be seen that from the early 50's the tendency in Victoria has been gradually to introduce to Parliament more and more measures of democracy. I believe that for the first time there will be operating in the future the perfect democratic system under which all votes will be of approximately equal value.

That is a principle the Premier of South Australia has not heard of, judging by his remarks in this debate. Mr. Shannon rose merely to make a personal attack on the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) but a most ineffectual attack it turned out to be. It was one of the honourable member's most imbecile speeches. He was probably put up to speak because he is known to be a member who can stone-wall, not let the side down and not run the risk of being caught. He meandered on for half an hour or so and said absolutely nothing. After Mr. Coumbe had asked for figures and got them from where he did not want them, Mr. Shannon said figures did not count anyway. The Premier said that the Liberal and Country League obtained one more Senate seat than the Labor Party, but the fact is that we had six Labor representatives out of 10 in the House of Representatives, and we now have six out of 11. Since 1949 we have had a Senate majority in this State in every election, except for the double dissolution, when it broke even. After the last Senate election a minority Party came in and split the vote, having been fortunate enough to draw first place on the ballot paper. It has been adequately proven here that this State's voting figures are very close to Senate figures, so on that basis we should win a State election. However, I think this has been adequately dealt with. In a book called *Australian Democracy*, Mr. A. F. Davies, senior lecturer

in political science at the University of Melbourne, in a section dealing with electoral machinery, said:—

In South Australia, it is possible to say that the present arrangement of electorates—under which the ratio of city to country votes is 100 : 30—puts victory beyond the reach of the local Labor Party. Although equal electorates had obtained in the earliest period, redistributions in 1872, 1902 and 1915 had established a substantial country margin. It was the 1936 redistribution, however, which, by exchanging a system of two or three member seats for single member constituencies, while keeping the country margin, made Labor's position really difficult. And it became more so election by election since Adelaide continued to grow faster than the rest of the State. A minor tidying of seats within the two categories after the 1953 election gave no relief. Later, he said:—

Both Western Australia and New South Wales also indulge the country voter—but, no-one suggests, to an extent that prejudices electoral contests.

During this debate we heard the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) who quoted Dr. Finer, and the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) who quoted Sir Winston Churchill and others. We also heard what Mr. Davies, an acknowledged authority on this subject, said. I challenge members opposite to get anybody of any political or academic standing whatever to justify their stand on our electoral law.

I will now refer to what the Premier said about our desire to change the electoral laws so that we could obtain power. That is not true. We certainly want to change the electoral law, not so that we can get an unfair advantage, but so that people will have the right to elect or dismiss a Government: that is all we want. However, the Government is determined to keep the law as it is because it suits it. That is the only reason it has been able to remain in office for so many years. This is a subordination of political integrity to personal aggrandizement, and I am sure there are members opposite who would rather be ex-members with a clear conscience than members suffering the shame they must suffer all the time because of these electoral laws; so I sincerely hope on that basis that the motion will be carried.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I was surprised to hear the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) refer to the time factor. I believe question time today occupied about 15 minutes, and for the first time during my term in this House a member (the member for Edwardstown) interrupted a member's explanation of his question so as to force him to ask his question forthwith—I am not suggesting that he was not

justified in doing so—and the Leader of the Opposition made some reference to an agreement. I know nothing of any such agreement. There was a desire on the part of members opposite to speed up things this afternoon, yet the member for Whyalla spent nearly an hour reading a lengthy report of a committee. I am not suggesting that the report was not worth reading, but if the Opposition is so keen to speed up matters on the Notice Paper it could find ways to get through much more business than it did this afternoon. I leave that thought with members opposite. Maybe they will continue to interject during question time and save time on questions, but I think that could very well be applied to them when they seek to explain their questions. I regret it if I offended this afternoon by asking a number of questions, and I offer my apologies to the Leader of the Opposition, although I had no knowledge of any agreement.

Mr. Lawn—It is supposed to be a gentleman's agreement. Does that include you?

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Enfield said that the Opposition was very considerate in the absence of the Premier in the United States, and I accept that. I believe the Leader of the Opposition gave an undertaking that he would not call for a division or cause a disturbance of a major nature, knowing that we did not have a majority in the Premier's absence. However, the Premier said that unless he had had that assurance he would not have gone overseas. I believe Mr. Jennings wants to make a trade: for what his Party did during the Premier's absence, he feels that we should refrain from asking questions on Wednesdays. When the Premier comes back into the Chamber I will ask if he has given that undertaking, and if he has, I shall be happy to abide by it.

Mr. Lawn—It got under your skin.

Mr. HAMBOUR—It did not. I will abide by any undertaking that has been given, but I would not think the member for Adelaide would abide by anything. Was his Party unanimous in its decision to permit the Premier to go to the United States under the conditions mentioned? I would like to know his attitude on that. I venture to say that he would be so vociferous that it would only be the strength of his Leader that would keep him in his seat. The member for Norwood thinks he can represent a bigger electorate as well as Cyprus and the Italian community, and in his opinion he could do

it very well. Honourable members opposite think they are so capable that all they have to do is come into this House and vote whichever way they are directed, which is an easy way out for a member of Parliament. From my short experience I know what I have to do to keep in touch with my constituents.

Mr. Jennings—But can you speak to the motion?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I will deal with that in a moment. The member for Enfield made much play of the abolition of the Legislative Council, and suggested that we could utilize what he considers surplus members of the Council by bringing them into this Assembly and making it a one-House legislature.

Mr. John Clark—Most of my constituents would not know who their Legislative Council representatives were.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Enfield went on to say that he would like to abolish the Legislative Council, and I think he would be gracious enough to allow the four Labor Party councillors to come in and swell this Chamber. He then said that ultimately he would abolish State Parliaments, but I do not think that would receive the plaudits of all honourable members on his side of the House. In my short experience in this Chamber I have also heard members opposite say they do not wish to abolish State Parliaments.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Is there anything in the motion about the abolition of State Parliaments, or haven't you read it yet?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am not concerned with the policy of the Labor Party but with what has been said in this House in my time. The member for Enfield said that his Party would eventually abolish State Parliaments. The member for Norwood in my time has said that the Labor Party would make State Parliaments smaller but more numerous so that virtually they would govern zones and be something between a local council and a State Parliament.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—They would not have policies.

Mr. O'Halloran—But they would have principles.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Enfield referred to political honesty. What a cheek to accuse the Liberal members of this Parliament of political dishonesty! I am sure members opposite are not proud of their colleagues in New South Wales and Tasmania who have been made to toe the line. I am sure that if the member for Adelaide's mother had known

what he would become she would have called him "Gerry" instead of "Sam." I have heard the cry of "Gerry" more often in this House than I ever heard it in my infancy.

Mr. John Clark—You heard plenty of "Tom" too; they go together.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I had not proposed speaking on this motion, which is a very loose one, but having risen to speak I will deal firstly with the last part which deals with multiple districts. Opposition members who have spoken on this question have made very little reference to multiple districts. I believe they are not very keen on them themselves, but they put that in as an extra so that the commission would have something to do because the first part would not furnish the commission with any work at all. The Opposition gives no indication whether it wants more members in this Assembly or not, and simply asks for new boundaries. I would not wish to share my responsibility; if I represented an electorate I would like to do it on my own, and then I would know whether I had carried out my duties fairly to my constituents. I would not countenance multiple districts in any way.

Mr. John Clark—The commission might decide on that.

Mr. HAMBOUR—As far as I am concerned this matter will not reach the commission, because I hope it will be concluded in this Chamber.

Mr. Jennings—You are going to vote against it?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member need have no illusions about that. I am quite certain in my own mind that in 1955 the Labor Party was quite happy with the new Bill. It has been admitted on the other side, I think by the member for Gawler, that it was better than what they had before. I think he said it was a small improvement, or words to that effect.

Mr. John Clark—"Microscopic" would describe it.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Happiness and elation can come in degrees, and what little elation the Opposition had after the passing of the 1955 Bill has shrunk to its present gloomy approach to this question. I know Opposition members are not happy. They had a shot in the arm when Mr. Hughes won Wallaroo for them, but after all is said and done he won a seat that had been held by the Labor Party for 40 years; and it was only the dominating personality of the late Larry Heath that won it for the Government. I congratulate the member

for Wallaroo, who has a very pleasant personality, and I do not wish him any harm. The success of the member for Mount Gambier represents that small dose which goes into the phial to give a stimulant, and that is what has stimulated the ego of members opposite. They are up in the air as a result of the success of the Labor Party in Mount Gambier, but they are losing their sense of proportion and they should remember that the L.C.L. has never held Mount Gambier. If our candidate had not stood at the by-election Mr. Ralston would not be here, for it would still be represented by an Independent. I know that Mr. Barry received over 90 per cent of Mr. Cocks' preferences, and I warn the member for Mount Gambier that if Mr. Cocks does not contest the next election he may be defeated. Therefore, members opposite should not be too cocky about what happened at the by-election. I am sure the political colour of South Australia has not changed since I have been a member. The Premier told the Labor Party it would have to get a policy acceptable to the people to have any chance of occupying the Treasury benches.

Mr. Hutchens—You do pretty well without one.

Mr. HAMBOUR—That is an inane remark. I would like to be a force in formulating a policy for the coming election, and if the Government does what I suggest the chances of members opposite will be next to nil. If I may be so presumptuous as to give them some advice, let me tell them that their socialization policy will not appeal to the people, much less the nationalization of banks as propounded by the member for Norwood. On two occasions the member for Burra won the Stanley portion of my district for Labor. He had a shandy-gaff policy; part Labor Party and part his own.

Mr. Fred Walsh—He had no policy at all.

Mr. HAMBOUR—He won two elections as a member of the Labor Party. The late Mr. Sid McHugh won Light for Labor, and I admired him as a citizen and a political representative. He was moderate in his views; he begged me to stand for Parliament for the Labor Party. I was a member of the L.C.L. at the time and he knew that.

Mr. Fred Walsh—He must have thought you would join the Labor Party.

Mr. HAMBOUR—He knew that I was a moderate gentleman who looked at all sides of a question. He spoke to me for 3½ hours, and I asked him what I would have to do if I joined the Labor Party. He did not deny that

I would have to obey the dictates of the hierarchy at Grote Street.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Is that how he put it?

Mr. HAMBOUR—No, and I do not want my remarks to be taken as a reflection on him. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawa) said that the gerrymander, as he put it, was responsible for the Labor Party not occupying the Treasury benches, but I advise members opposite to pay heed to the Premier's remarks that they should revise their policy so it will appeal to the people. My district has been won by Labor, and other seats at present held by the L.C.L. have been won by Labor. I think Torrens is one.

Mr. John Clark—Not as constituted at present.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member should thank his lucky stars that he has Elizabeth tacked on to his district.

Mr. John Clark—No, ask the member for Barossa about that.

Mr. Laucke—Quite, and the honourable member is very highly regarded.

Mr. HAMBOUR—My district is about 45 miles by 80, and if anyone looks at my diary he will see I would not have time to serve a greater area. Next Monday I shall have to drive 51 miles to a meeting, but that is only one of many nights out that I have. If members opposite want one vote one value my district would have to be twice its present size, but there is no indication in the motion of any increase in the number of members.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You don't think there would be more representatives?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member could ride around his district on a bicycle. Metropolitan members opposite would have districts not more than about four miles square.

Mr. Stephens—How many electors do they have?

Mr. HAMBOUR—They could have 25,000.

Mr. Stephens—You do not represent that number.

Mr. HAMBOUR—That is where the whole question hinges. The electors mean everything. Unless you know what your people want, how can you faithfully represent them? I think I have the biggest possible district with which any member can keep in close contact successfully. The Leader of the Opposition will admit that his district is far too large to cover regularly.

I know that honourable members opposite feel that we are accusing them of trying to bring the numbers together so that it will

improve their chances of getting to this side of the House. I differ with the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh), who is anxious to move over here, no matter what means are employed for that purpose.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Do you think it would be in the interests of the people to have a change of Government?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I think the people of South Australia during the past 20 years have had the best Government they have ever had or will ever get. The Premier has given his life to this State unstintingly, every hour, every waking moment. He is South Australia through and through and, if members opposite were honest about it, they would admit that and give him his just due.

I am sorry I cannot support this motion. I feel that members opposite are wasting their private members' time by bringing it forward. There are country members on that side who, I am sure, are not behind it but who, as the majority have ruled that this motion must come up, have to support it. How will the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) go back to his district and tell the people that he is being asked to serve twice as many?

Mr. Bywaters—I will tell you directly.

Mr. HAMBOUR—How could the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) serve twice as many people as he does today? The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston) and the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) would not be so badly off.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I would put my correspondence against yours.

Mr. HAMBOUR—If we are going to make comparisons, I would reply that I have to spend four hours getting here and back every week and I can read a lot of letters in four hours. I have to spend an hour going to almost any meeting in my district, and an hour getting back. I get to bed at least an hour or two later than any metropolitan member. It is all right for the honourable member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). I suppose he does his own work in the daytime and attends to his constituents at night. I know what time I have available for leisure—very little. I do the best I can to serve my electors. I hope the electorate will never be changed and I am quite happy to continue to serve them, if they will have me.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I had no intention of taking part in this debate, but I want to challenge the Government on its sincerity, because I say it is not sincere; also,

I want to let the motion go to a vote as soon as possible. Had it not been for the remarks of the Premier when he deliberately misrepresented me, I would not have participated in this debate. When I heard him make a statement about me, I told him it was not true. That is reported in *Hansard*. He did not retract it and was not requested to do so by the Speaker. I am availing myself now of the opportunity of replying to the accusations of the Premier and the observations of the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) against us, particularly against the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). I also want to add a few remarks in support of the motion.

Ever since 1950, whenever the leader of the Opposition has put a Bill before this House dealing with electoral justice, there have been no more than three Government members to speak on the Bill—the Premier and two others. On this occasion, which involves a motion and the time factor, which has been stressed by every Government speaker, we have already had four speakers from the Government benches. Although not conclusive, the evidence indicates delaying tactics on the part of the Government supporters, who fear this matter going to a vote.

The honourable member for Light (Mr. Hambour) did not discuss the motion; he did not mention either of its two parts. Instead, he praised his master and spoke about everything but the motion. He told us a story about the late Sidney McHugh and said, just before he sat down, that country members on this side of the House had to abide by the majority vote, and that they did not like the motion.

Mr. Hambour—I did not say that.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, you did.

Mr. Hambour—I asked, did they like the motion?

Mr. LAWN—You said they had to abide by the majority vote.

Mr. Hambour—I didn't say they had to.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member said, "There are country members opposite."

Mr. Hambour—I said, did they like the motion?

Mr. LAWN—You also said that they had to abide by the majority vote.

Mr. Hambour—If it was carried, yes.

Mr. LAWN—That is all I am saying. I let me remind the honourable member that there are nine country members and eight metropolitan members.

Mr. Hambour—Where?

Mr. LAWN—On this side of the House in the A.L.P., not counting the two Independents.

Mr. Hambour—You cannot claim that.

Mr. LAWN—The majority on this side are country members. The metropolitan members have to accept that.

Mr. Hambour—Is the honourable member for Port Pirie a country member?

Mr. LAWN—Of course he is.

Mr. Hambour—He represents a city electorate. What are you talking about?

Mr. LAWN—Of course, we admit here that we have discussions in our Party, take a vote, and abide by it.

Mr. Hambour—It is just as well you do.

Mr. LAWN—The vote on the matter before this House was unanimous in our Party. The member for Light does not get a vote when his Party has meetings. They have a discussion but they have to do what the master tells them. They do not get an opportunity to vote, but we do. When we discussed whether or not we should submit this motion to the house, those present voted that we should and that the Leader should submit it on our behalf. However, that does not deal with the motion to which I wish to speak; but first let me deal with statements already made in this debate. At page 753 of *Hansard* the Premier is recorded as saying:—

Members opposite seem to anticipate some catastrophe because they do not want me to continue what I am saying. The facts are that when the recommendations were published there was much rejoicing and the press gave great prominence to the belief that the new districts would bring about the defeat of the Government.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Who said that?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Almost every member opposite. We were told that a number of Liberal-held electoral districts were wiped out.

Mr. Lawn—Who said that?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The honourable member's memory is short, for he is one who did.

Mr. Lawn—That is not true.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—In a few moments I will produce for the honourable member the record in *Hansard*.

However, he did not and *Hansard* discloses that I did not speak or vote. The Leader of the Opposition spoke on behalf of the Party and pointed out that previously, when the Premier had a motion before the House to set up a Royal Commission on electoral boundaries, an amendment was moved on behalf of the Labor Party. In 1955 the Premier introduced a Bill providing for alterations to electoral boundaries and Mr. O'Halloran was the only one to

speak for the Labor Party. No division was taken and the Bill was passed. During the present debate members opposite have been content to make deliberate misrepresentations against members on this side and have misinterpreted the motion. I give them credit for knowing what it means, but each one who has spoken has said he did not know. It is quite clear and, if it is carried, the Government will set up a Royal Commission and handpick the members, who will be directed:—

(a) to recommend to the House during the current session new boundaries for electoral districts for the House of Assembly to give substantial effect to the principle of one-vote-one-value.

Members opposite say they do not know what is meant by one-vote-one-value, but Mr. Jennings this afternoon, in reading from the Victorian *Hansard*, has shown that Mr. Hollway, a former Premier of that State, knows what it means. Also, Federal members know, because it is part of the Federal Constitution; and the people of Australia know, even if the Premier and his supporters in this House do not know. If the motion is carried, members of the Royal Commission, whoever they may be, will know what is meant.

The motion also provides that the royal commission is to consider, in the preparation of electoral boundaries, the advisability of providing for multiple member districts. It is not a direction. The members of the commission could recommend to the House that the present single electorates should continue or that there should be multiple member districts. They would have a free hand, and that is all the motion means. Members opposite who have already spoken are the Premier, Mr. Coumbe, Mr. Shannon and Mr. Hambour, and Mr. Geoffrey Clarke is to be the next speaker, with others still to follow. Speaking on the motion Mr. Coumbe said:—

The simplest way for the Labor Party to gain power in this State, without going to the humbug of this unnecessary motion, is to have an acceptable policy.

This was also mentioned by the Premier and Mr. Hambour. Referring to the last South Australian State elections Mr. Coumbe said:—

The Liberal Party gained 21 seats, Labor 15 and Independents 3. The primary votes cast were Labor 120,707, Liberal 100,452 and all other candidates 38,932. That gave Labor 20,255 more than the Liberals in 24 contested seats.

That meant that the Labor Party had to average 8,047 votes to obtain a representative in this Parliament whereas the Liberal Party had

to receive only 4,783. That is not one-vote-one-value, nor is it a democratic system, one recognized by any democratic country. Our Commonwealth Parliament does not accept that principle and even in the States where they accept some differentiation, as in Queensland, they do not adopt our policy of having two country members to one metropolitan member. Mr. Coumbe referred to the voting at the last Senate election and said it resulted in a majority for the Liberal Party. Mr. Coumbe must admit that whereas the Liberal Party received a majority of the votes it also had returned a majority of representatives to the Senate, getting three of the five seats. At the previous Senate election the Labor Party polled a greater number of votes and had three representatives elected, whereas two Liberal Party members were returned.

Mr. Coumbe—I did not deny that.

Mr. LAWN—But the honourable member says that at the last State elections, held three months after the Federal elections, the Liberal Party polled 100,452 votes as against 120,707 votes for the Labor Party—20,255 fewer votes—and yet it obtained 21 seats as against the 15 seats for my Party, and he attempted to justify that.

Mr. Coumbe—My Party did not contest every seat.

Mr. LAWN—It is the very system supported by the honourable member that is responsible for the uncontested seats. He said that in the seats contested the Labor Party polled 20,255 votes more than the Liberal Party, yet it had six fewer representatives returned; and he still says that is democracy. He also said that he did not know what was meant by one vote one value. I suggest that he read the *Hansard* of the Victorian Parliament when the electoral Bill was being discussed. Mr. Coumbe suggested the Labor Party should get a policy, but I point out that the vote of the people justifies our claim that they prefer our policy to the Liberal Party's policy. Only once in the seven elections since 1938 has the Liberal Party received a majority of the vote of the electors. On the other six occasions the Labor Party has had overwhelming majorities. As a matter of fact, in 1953 my Party polled 46,000 votes more than the Liberal Party. Even had the votes for the Independents and Communists been added to the Liberal total, Labor would still have had a majority of 4,500, yet we had only 14 members whilst the Liberal Party had 21.

Our policy is printed in book form of which several members opposite have obtained copies. Last Wednesday I went to the office of the Liberal Party to purchase a copy of its platform. I received a copy bearing the title *Constitution, Principles and State Platform*. I thought that was what I wanted, but there was no State platform. The Liberal Party hasn't a State platform so it cannot claim that the people prefer its policy.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) commenced his remarks by attacking the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). He has done that repeatedly since he engaged in a debate against Mr. Dunstan at the University on this particular topic. Those who heard that debate realize that Mr. Shannon got a thrashing. Referring to Mr. Dunstan last Wednesday he said:—

He went to some trouble to explain why he, disregarding his colleagues, voted for this very electoral law that is now the law in this State, but he omitted to tell us—and I think it would have been of some interest to the House—why he really voted for the legislation dealing with electoral re-distribution when it was before Parliament. He voted for it because he was instructed to vote for it.

Mr. Dunstan interjected, "Do you think I was against it?" and Mr. Shannon said, "I know jolly well the honourable member was, because I heard his speech and saw him vote." That was a deliberate lie.

The SPEAKER—Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw the words "deliberate lie."

Mr. LAWN—The member for Norwood did not speak, nor did he vote, so it is a deliberate lie.

The SPEAKER—The expression, "deliberate lie" is un-Parliamentary.

Mr. LAWN—You can suspend me, but I cannot withdraw it. Members on that side can make a statement that is not true and get away with it. If I draw attention to it I can be suspended.

The SPEAKER—I do not accept the explanation of the honourable member. If he is not prepared to withdraw the words I will have to name him. I remind him that it has been held time and again that those words are un-Parliamentary.

Mr. LAWN—If it is Parliamentary to accuse an honourable member then it should be Parliamentary for another member to deny it.

The SPEAKER—Order! Does the honourable member withdraw the words?

Mr. LAWN—I will withdraw those words, but say that the words of the member for Onkaparinga were completely untrue. I will not withdraw those words.

The SPEAKER—I ask the honourable member for an unqualified, unconditional withdrawal.

Mr. LAWN—I will make an unqualified withdrawal. However, the member for Onkaparinga's statement was completely untrue. He did not hear the member for Norwood speak, nor did he see him vote.

Mr. Bywaters—Didn't Mr. Riches take a point of order?

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and the Speaker said it was no point of order. It does not seem fair that a member may make a completely untrue statement about which another member can issue a challenge and be asked to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member must not reflect on the Chair.

Mr. LAWN—I am trying to explain my attitude. I did not intend to reflect on the Chair. I know that Government members are not sincere on this motion. They have mentioned the time factor involved in establishing a Royal Commission. On previous occasions, when similar measures have been debated, three Government members have spoken, but on this occasion four have already spoken and I am about to be followed by another. They will see that this debate continues until the end of the session because they fear the report of an independent Royal Commission.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE (Burnside)—I oppose this motion, and at the outset desire to refer to a matter which has caused me some concern for some time, namely, the derogatory and derisive use by the member for Adelaide of the word "master" when referring to the Premier. I deplore that growing practice, which he adopts so foolishly and stupidly *ad nauseum* and with tremendous repetition. It is quite un-Parliamentary and is a practice I should be glad to see him drop. It is not in accordance with the best traditions of this Parliament. I would not have mentioned it but for the fact that he used the term again during the course of this debate.

It would seem a good thing if definitions were included in a motion, when particular words are to be used, in the same manner as they are included in our Acts of Parliament. The term "gerrymander" has been used frequently in this debate and I think the House should be clear what a gerrymander is before our electoral system is described as such. To

my knowledge "gerrymander" is a system of electoral boundaries under which it is impossible to change the Government. If it is difficult to change the Government, but not impossible, it is not a gerrymander. In this session Opposition members have said on many occasions that they are confident the Government will be changed at the next State elections, but it appears to be a matter of whistling to keep up their courage. If they are sincere, and I believe that they are, they cannot have it that the electoral boundaries are gerrymandered. They cannot have it both ways. Either they believe that there is a gerrymander and they have no chance of winning, or there is not and they have a chance. They point to Mount Gambier and other electorates where they say they will win seats to give them a chance at the next elections. It is absurd to use the term "gerrymander" when speaking of our system of electoral boundaries, which apparently the Opposition does not like.

Mr. Stephens—Who says that your definition of "gerrymander" is correct?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—There is no other definition. A "gerrymander" is an electorate so rigged as to make it impossible for the Opposition to win, but Opposition members say they will win the next elections. They cannot have it both ways. I prefer to accept Labor's view that it is not a gerrymander, which must be the position because they expect to win next time. In previous sessions in debating similar motions I have said that if Labor had an acceptable policy, which the Premier and others have said is necessary, it would have been returned with a majority under the old distribution of seats, and held seats it lost to L.C.L. candidates. Labor members declare that the Government will be changed next time. That was said in this Chamber even before the motion appeared on the Notice Paper. Opposition members must have believed then that the motion would result in the electoral boundaries being rigged in their favour or that they would produce a policy more acceptable to the people. If they are confident about winning the next elections, why worry about this motion? Even if we carried it today it would not be physically possible to do what the Opposition seeks, particularly in view of the coming Federal elections. It would be necessary to reprint rolls, recast districts and set up new polling booths, which is a big task for a department to perform four or five months after another election.

The staff of the Electoral Office is not unduly large, and constantly it has routine matters to attend to. It has to keep changing the rolls and bringing them up to date, as well as printing them. To superimpose another task a few months after a Federal election seems to be a practical impossibility. During this debate you, Mr. Speaker, have allowed a good deal of latitude and Opposition members have advanced their political theories about the constitutional position of the State and the Commonwealth. Mr. Dunstan said he wanted to abolish State Parliaments. Unless I am given the lie direct, I believe Mr. Dunstan said, "I have not said in so many words that I would abolish State Parliaments." He said he would set up 20 subordinate bodies without any legislative authority.

Mr. O'Halloran—Did he say 20?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Approximately 20.

Mr. Dunstan—I did not say that.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—My recollection of what the honourable member said is clear. He challenged me to quote the words he used when advocating the abolition of State Parliaments and I believe he said he had not done so in so many words. When asked by interjection how many subordinate authorities he would have, he airily said it might be 20 or so. Obviously he had not given the matter much thought.

Mr. Dunstan—Why not quote *Hansard*?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—The honourable member should do that himself. I ask him to deny that he made that remark. As nearly as I can remember, when he challenged me he said, "I have not said so in so many words, but I give the honourable member the lie direct." That is one of his pet phrases, and then he went on to refer to the subordinate committees he would set up. He did not say they would have legislative powers, and he allowed the House to assume that they would not be authorities with legislative power. I assumed that they would perform only administrative duties.

Mr. Dunstan—Nonsense!

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I agree, because that is what the honourable member said.

Mr. Dunstan—I did not. You know that is untrue.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—If the honourable member did not say that, it is up to him to tell the House what his views are on the abolition of State Parliaments. He believes in their abolition as at present constituted. I do

not know what he will put in their place other than the local authorities which he spoke about airily and which he has not considered very much. Labor has not set out its views on this matter. The New South Wales Labor Party says it does not want a Legislative Council, but it elects to that Council members who subscribe to the Labor Party view, yet do nothing to abolish the place. Mr. Jennings wants to abolish State Parliaments. The Opposition does not know where it stands. On the one hand it wants to abolish them, but on the other hand it wants to keep them.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—It wants a policy.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Yes. Opposition members are flying flimsy kites, nothing but a few rags with strings attached to a framework. Mr. Jennings wants to abolish State Parliaments, yet Mr. Calwell wants to make the Northern Territory a self-governing State. Dr. Burton says the Labor Party should play down its Socialistic objective, and keep it in the background.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—What is its Socialistic objective?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—It has been whitewashed on paper, but it is still there—the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange. I do not know whether that includes farms, but perhaps Mr. Ward knows something about that. What will we get in our electoral set-up if we accept all these opinions and kite-flying? The Labor Party has in the past moved to abolish the Legislative Council. Then they wanted to abolish State Parliaments, although the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) did not say this in so many words. They then will want to abolish the Senate, which will leave us with one Federal House and 20 or so subordinate legislatures to carry out the functions of the central Government. A very good example of decentralization, I must say! They cannot have it both ways: they either have to believe in centralization or in the Federal Parliament, with the State Parliaments legislating in their respective spheres. We are to be left virtually with one Federal Parliament. I remind the House that it is a matter of history that cannot be contested, even by the member for Norwood, that Hitler as one of his most drastic actions abolished the German States. The abolition of the Australian States would harm democracy to the point of destruction.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is what your Party is doing to South Australia.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I am sorry, but I must laugh at that. Even members of the Opposition have grudgingly admitted that our productivity is high, our people have fared well, and Savings Bank deposits in this State are the highest in the Commonwealth, although the member for Norwood would say that the figures were false.

Mr. O'Halloran—World history has pointed to Governments that have fallen because they would not give representation to the people.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—No, because the representation of the States was taken away. Hitler destroyed German democracy by abolishing the States. This motion envisages the possibility of multiple electorates, so I ask the House to consider the position in States that have, or had, such electorates. I think there was fairly general satisfaction in this State when multiple electorates were abolished some 20 years ago; I think that satisfaction was evident from both sides of the House when they disappeared from our political scene. In Tasmania, which has multiple electorates, it is extraordinarily difficult for any Government to get a workable majority. In that State there is a ragtag and bobtail Constitutional procedure under which agreement has to be reached with the Opposition to appoint a Speaker, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

Mr. O'Halloran—But dependent on the majority vote of the people.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Yes, but the majority vote could be that of only a handful of people, and the Opposition has to be called upon to help administer the official functions of the House.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Opposition has not refused to do so.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—But there is provision for a refusal, as the Leader knows, and there may come a time when there will be a refusal, in which case the Constitution provides for another member to be elected. Under the multiple electorate system the individuality of a member is completely subordinated to the multiple representation of a district. It means that a member can "shove off," to use a colloquialism, the responsibility that he ought to accept. He can pass it on to his colleagues or to members of the other Party representing that electorate. Ask Tasmanian members privately what they think of multiple electorates, and members of both Parties there will say that they have many practical difficulties. One member can never go alone to a function, but must be tailed

up by a member of the opposite Party who also represents the district. If one man goes to a small function the other man feels he cannot be left out, and then others feel they must go too. There seems to be undue toadying in a multiple electorate by members seeking electoral kudos.

Mr. Stephens—Do you say members of both Parties are opposed to that system?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I think many are, although I do not say they all are, but if asked privately, I think they would say it presents many practical difficulties that make it almost unworkable at times. The honourable arrangement we have for giving and taking pairs is almost unknown in the Tasmanian Parliament. I understand that a member wishing to go to a function can only get a pair if he goes for some official purpose, which means that the ordinary accepted processes carried out in this House are carried out only with great difficulty in Tasmania.

Mr. John Clark—But the Royal Commission would decide that issue.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I know that, if we have one, but there will not be one.

Mr. John Clark—In other words, you are debating something that does not exist.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—This matter appears to be a matter of urgency because, until a few months ago, members of the Labor Party felt they could win the next election under the present system.

Mr. Fred Walsh—They still can.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Then no great harm can come about if this motion fails, as its failure will only mean putting off what members opposite will do in six months' time. This is not a matter of great urgency, and we will allow the Labor Party to deck out its policy with it in the next State elections and see what effect it has. At one stage banners were put up relating to the "electoral reform campaign," but people were not interested. They were only interested in their welfare under the Playford Government, under which this State has fared well. It appeared to the Labor Party that it was possible for it to win under the present system.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It was a probability.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Very well, but that probability is not as strong as it was a month ago, when the D.L.P. announced that it would contest every seat in the next State elections, so it is a matter of greater urgency that boundaries be altered in favour of the Opposition before that election. I oppose the motion on many grounds.

Mr. John Clarke—What about telling us some?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I will put them in simple terms for the honourable member. Firstly, it is a matter of urgency because members opposite have not yet obtained a desirable and acceptable policy, and secondly, because the Democratic Labor Party will preclude the Labor Party from obtaining a majority.

Members interjecting.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—We heard a member opposite become very angry today because he thought someone misrepresented him. Some time ago a member of the Opposition said that the Liberal Party was financing the Democratic Labor Party. That was hotly denied by members on this side and in the press by the Leader of the Democratic Labor Party, but the person who made that statement in this House did not see fit to withdraw it when challenged, yet today a similar position brings about great indignation—a member of the Labor Party is accused of doing something he did not do. Thirdly, the Opposition has no policy; even on Constitutional reform members opposite do not know where they are. “More States” said one; “Abolish the States” said another; “Abolish the Legislative Council,” said yet another; yet in N.S.W. men elected to it do not abolish it. “We want more representation,” said one; “We want a greater Adelaide,” said another. For those reasons I oppose the motion, which is not necessary and will do no good. It cannot be said that the system of electorates is a bad one or that it is not democratic. Proportional representation is not mentioned in this motion, but I believe that is also part of the Labor Party’s policy. Had the Senate votes over the last 50 years been counted on the basis of proportional representation, no Government in the House of Representatives would have had a working majority in the Senate. The introduction of that system would be a setback for democracy and a breaking down of the institutions built up on the experience of trial and error over many years.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—Various remarks made last week and today prompted me to speak on this motion. Some were to the effect that country Labor members were not supporting this motion or were supporting it against their will. I deny that because it is not true. I support the motion and I remind members that prior to the election in 1956, when I was elected to this House, I spoke in favour

of its contents at every public gathering I attended. The Leader will bear me out in that statement, and the local press reports will also confirm it.

Mr. O’Halloran—That is why you are here.

Mr. BYWATERS—Yes. I supported it then and the people saw fit to put me here. If they had opposed this motion of the Leader’s they would have said so at the time. I have no fear whatever of going back to my electorate and telling the people where I stand on electoral reform, as I have told them before. In 1956 I was the only member to defeat a sitting member of this House, and the man I defeated was a Liberal and Country League member. If the people of Murray had objected to this electoral reform we are suggesting they would have made it obvious in the 1956 vote.

Much has been said on this motion regarding the time factor, and this has been mentioned several times today. It had been the intention of the Opposition to take a vote on the matter today, and it would have done so but for the fact that time has run out against us because members opposite have spoken at great length in saying nothing. I do not think there is enough time now to enable the Leader to do justice to his reply on this matter.

Mr. John Clark—Strictly speaking, he would not have very much to reply to.

Mr. BYWATERS—That may be so, because honourable members opposite spoke on anything but electoral reform.

Mr. O’Halloran—They have not mentioned ships and sealing wax yet.

Mr. BYWATERS—It would have been possible to pass this motion on September 3 when the Premier in answering the Leader asked leave to continue his remarks.

Mr. John Clark—The Premier should have agreed to the motion, and there would have been no debate at all.

Mr. BYWATERS—Had he done so I am sure the members on this side of the House would not have gone on with the debate. Some things can go through fairly quickly. Last week the Bill for the ratification of the oil refinery agreement was before this House and it went through in a very short time because members on both sides of the House supported it. The same thing could have happened on this occasion had everyone been happy about it. I do not hold it against members opposite that they have disagreed with this motion, because after all it has become a common practice to disagree with Opposition proposals. Members on this side of the House have supported the Government on many measures because they have felt

there was perhaps a good deal of merit in the arguments placed before this House, but I cannot recall an occasion when the Government supported anything that the Labor Party put forward, be it good or otherwise. In the time that I have been in this House, and before that too, we must have brought down proposals that merited some support by the Government. We have been asked today to hold off various aspects of this matter because the Government does not wish to oppose it entirely. It appears that the Government wishes to take the credit for bringing it forward, and perhaps some good will come of it. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

THE ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 30. Page 986.)

THE LEGISLATURE.

House of Assembly, £13,896; Parliamentary library; £6,973; Joint House Committee, £11,405—passed.

Electoral Department, £52,092.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Under the heading "Joint Rolls—Commonwealth and House of Assembly—Half cost of printing rolls, joint forms, subdivisional maps, etc.," it is the "etc." with which I am concerned. I suggest that attention be paid to the importance of road maps being made available to the electoral officers in addition to the present subdivisional maps. For instance, there should be a distinct dividing line between the district of Mitcham and the district of Edwardstown. I went so far as to suggest that the department might attempt to go to T. M. Burke Pty. Ltd., to see if it could get from them a subdivisional plan that would give a fair indication of the boundaries.

In Federal matters, particularly those relating to boundaries, an unfortunate thing happened in Kingston when its returning officer died recently. Another was appointed but he has not had an opportunity to become familiar with the electorate. There are new subdivisions in the State electorate of Edwardstown, but not one road map is available to indicate their exact boundaries. No road map is available to indicate all the streets, and yet we tell these people that they are in the subdivision of Edwardstown. They may also be told that they are in Brighton, therefore, subdivisional maps are most important in that area.

The same thing is happening in other newly developed areas. For instance, I do not know whether Elizabeth has a map indicating the electoral boundaries. After all, everyone is entitled to know from a subdivisional map the line of demarcation. Present day electoral maps do not clearly indicate where subdivisions commence and finish. Can the Treasurer tell me who is the appropriate person in the Electoral Department to furnish these people in the new subdivisions with plans of their districts? For instance, on the borderline between Edwardstown and Mitcham, some people are enrolled as being resident in the Mitcham subdivision of the division of Boothby while others are registered as being resident in the Edwardstown subdivision of the division of Kingston.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The districts are set out by definition and anyone taking the trouble to read the definitions can see whether they are in a certain district or not. The electoral maps are not official. The definitions in the Act are official; the electoral maps are only based on what is defined to assist the elector in that respect. What the honourable member says about the metropolitan area is relatively simple compared with what obtains in the country, because there the boundaries are not divided by clear-cut streets. Many are sectional boundaries. I agree that electoral maps are not on a large enough scale and that they do not show the boundaries sufficiently clearly to enable anyone to pick them out. I will see if it is possible for the Surveyor-General to provide the Electoral Office with clearer maps.

Line passed.

Government Reporting Department, £35,260.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I refer to the shorthand typiste whose services have been made available to assist private members with their correspondence. The lady who has been doing this work for some years is an officer of the Government Reporting Department and the Director of the department has arranged that, when she is busy, the services of another shorthand typiste will be made available to members. This morning the members' typiste was doing work which had been dictated to her by members yesterday. That is hardly fair. It indicates the amount of work she is expected to perform on behalf of members. On occasions another officer can do some work for members, but often she is too busy. We have reached the stage when at least one more typiste should be appointed. I do not know whether the Government would agree to the

appointment of a secretary-typiste for each member, as is provided for all Federal members, but I am not suggesting that.

Mr. Shannon—I wonder what they do with most of their time?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Some honourable members who can type do some of their own work rather than wait in a queue for the official typiste. Because of the amount of work members do for their constituents they should be provided with reasonable typing assistance. Often a member has to visit his electorate to interview constituents personally because the facilities are not available for him to correspond with them. Therefore, another typiste should be appointed.

Mr. JENNINGS—I support Mr. Walsh's remarks. Parliament House is a funny place. We have all the facilities to entertain people and every comfort, but no facilities to enable us to work. I think a third-grade clerk in a fourth-grade office would have better typing and filing facilities than any honourable member has. It is time that more consideration was given to members in this respect.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I think this is the first time the question has been raised. I will have it examined and advise honourable members later.

Line passed.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, £2,653—passed.

Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, £5,230.

Mr. BYWATERS—In view of the announcement that the Federal Government does not intend to continue the land settlement scheme in conjunction with the State Government, does the Government intend to continue the operations of this committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government proposes to introduce a Bill to extend its term for another year.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £42,575.

Mr. HAMBOUR—What does the Government pay for members' tram passes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—From memory I think they cost £42 each.

Line passed.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.
State Governor's establishment, £9,093;
Chief Secretary, £17,371; Statistical, £32,151;
and Audit Department, £66,820—passed.

Printing and Stationery, £264,620.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand that the Treasurer previously announced that new

quarters were to be provided for this department. I do not know why this matter has been delayed because I understand favourable consideration was given to it before the retirement of Mr. Stevenson. Can the Treasurer indicate the Government's intentions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The present Government Printing Office is unsatisfactory because some of the heavy machinery is on the upper floor, which is not good practice, and also because it is regarded as desirable in modern printing offices, from the point of view of efficiency, to have the entire plant on one floor. The Government is anxious to establish an entirely new printing office, but is experiencing difficulty in procuring a satisfactory site. Much of the work of this department is associated with Parliament and quite frequently rushed printing is required, consequently it should be close to Parliament House. We could easily procure five acres of land in the suburbs, but it is necessary to have the office centrally situated. We considered Government-owned land at North Adelaide and also a site in Kintore Avenue behind the Public Library. The latter site was unsatisfactory because it would preclude possible extension of the library service and would also curtail any extension of the Teachers College, which must be near the University. To indicate the consideration this question has received, the Government examined the possibility of purchasing Fowler's site on North Terrace, but the buildings were unsatisfactory and the cost would have been prohibitive. I assure the honourable member that Cabinet has decided that a new printing office should be established, but the delay has been caused through the difficulty of securing a suitable site.

Line passed.

Police Department, £2,019,746.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Treasurer indicate whether a Deputy Commissioner of Police has been appointed?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have been informed that police officers in uniform travelling on official duties are compelled to ride second-class on our railway system. That lowers the dignity of the force, which is well respected. Will the Government examine this matter to see whether first-class accommodation can be provided to officers travelling on official duty, particularly as they would not occupy seats which could be used by other passengers as there is no dearth of such accommodation?

Mr. HAMBOUR—In the line relating to the purchase of motor vehicles amounts of £20,840

and £25,437 are provided for additions to fleet and net cost of fleet replacements respectively. Can the Treasurer say whether both these items will be devoted to increasing the size and improving the mobility of our police motor vehicle fleet?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No Deputy Commissioner of Police has yet been appointed, but as provision is made for only 13 pay periods I presume the appointment will be made fairly soon. I will examine the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I have not heard the suggestion before and I did not know the class in which police officers travel. On the recommendation of the Police Commissioner the Government has provided the greatest mobility possible for members of the police force, which has meant a better service to the community, and there have been large savings because otherwise the force would have had to be much greater. Last year I was shocked to learn that some of the vehicles used by police officers on routine work had each done over 150,000 miles. Police officers must have the most roadworthy vehicles possible, and consequently their vehicles must be changed quickly, but that does not mean they do not have a secondhand value.

Mr. QUIRKE—I notice that the Commissioner of Police is to be reimbursed with £30 for his uniform, but special constables get £40. Can the Premier explain this?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I cannot give the reason.

Line passed.

Sheriffs and Gaols and Prisons Department, £393,943—passed.

Hospitals Department, £4,555,201.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Is it correct that the Bedford Park Sanatorium patients are to be moved to Northfield? If it is, when will the removal take place, and what will happen to the sanatorium's land? It has been suggested as a site for the South Western Districts Hospital, but it seems that that hospital will be erected on the land available at Oaklands.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Children are admitted to the Northfield Mental Hospital. I have it on the best authority that they are well treated, but there is a strong view that it is wrong to have adults and children together. Is it intended to have a separate institution for children?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Hospitals Department sends its officers to the country to tell subsidized hospitals how to run their institutions

economically, and to take them to task when their daily costs exceed £3. I think they should be used in an attempt to curtail expenditure at Government hospitals, where the daily cost is £5, according to the Auditor-General's report. This is a matter for much criticism in country districts, especially where there are subsidized hospitals. Each country Government hospital has a lay superintendent, who is virtually the manager, and he should be able to keep costs down. I ask the Government to investigate this matter with a view to bringing the costs closer together.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No decision has been made about the Bedford Park Hospital. Although the number of inmates has fallen sharply, it is not possible to close the hospital or to transfer its activities to the Morris Hospital. With regard to keeping children separate, provision is made in the Loan Estimates for new buildings at, I think, Parkside. With regard to the suggestion about hospital costs, the honourable member is not comparing the same services. To a certain extent Government hospitals are the backbone of hospital services; difficult cases involving costly treatment and equipment are ultimately transferred to them, and they are also teaching institutions. Every effort is being made to keep down costs and, although some are exorbitant, I point out that modern treatment is extremely expensive. If it came to a question of deciding whether or not to provide adequate services, everyone would agree that the expenditure of a few extra pounds is worth while.

Mr. HUGHES—An amount of £14,000 is provided for the Wallaroo hospital for many things, one item being for funerals. Does that item cover the burial cost of paupers who die in that hospital?

Line passed.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, £773,338.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—For children placed out, £38,000 is provided for maintenance, £800 for medical, hospital and dental attendance, and £9,750 for clothing, motor hire, fares, medicines and sundries. What is covered by the provision for maintenance? I think certain wards of the State are boarded out, and some allowance is made to people for maintaining them. No doubt the provision for medical, hospital and dental attendance is for these children, but I am concerned about the large item for clothing, etc. What is covered by

that? Who provides the motor car, who gets the benefit of the clothing allowance and who is reimbursed for fares?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Leader was quite correct in surmising that the expenditure is for wards of the State who have been boarded out with foster parents. That system has much to commend it, provided that the foster parents are good people and that they provide good homes. A better class of home is given than could be provided in institutions, and I believe the system is well worth persevering with. The increased allowance for maintenance is due to the fact that, as the cost of living has risen, a new scale has been provided. The other item is for expenditure on the children, not the foster parents. The maintenance item is to recoup the cost of keeping children.

Mr. HARDING—For the Struan Farm school, £9,188 is provided. Is this farm, which provides a good opportunity for boys to become good citizens, self supporting, or is it hoped that it will be in future?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Provision is made for maintenance officers, Children's Welfare officers and the like. I have previously expressed my concern at the lack of sufficient staff in the Children's Welfare Department to cope with maintenance prosecutions. If a deserted wife wants to have a prosecution launched against her husband, it is at least six weeks before she is able to get an appointment with the prosecuting officer. If she becomes desperate in the meantime and continually worries the department, she may get some public relief, but that is not granted automatically when she makes an appointment with the prosecutor. Constituents coming to me have been in desperate circumstances because they and their children have been left without support. Some years ago I said that this department was overloaded in the work of maintenance enforcement and that the work was getting steadily further behind. However, no provision has been made for additional officers to be appointed. I would like to know what proposal there is for increasing the staff of the department to cope with this particular need.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know the staff of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, as determined by the Public Service Commissioner, is up to strength. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Public Service Commissioner and ask him to make an investigation to see whether additional staff is neces-

sary. The Government fills vacancies as quickly as possible whenever recommendations are made, and if vacancies now exist it is because the Public Service Commissioner has not been able to get suitable people to fill them. However, I think it is likely that the staff is inadequate for the needs of the department. This problem exists in many departments. Our population is increasing quickly and our services are expanding rapidly, and notwithstanding criticism we quite frequently get that both the State and Commonwealth Public Services are becoming bloated, in point of fact the State Public Service is much smaller, on a population basis, than it has ever been. For example, the number of officers in the Treasury, now handling probably more than five times as much as 20 years ago, is actually less than it was then. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Public Service Commissioner for a report, and if a recommendation is made for an increase in staff I assure him that it will be dealt with promptly.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The Treasurer some time ago dealt with the question of whether the Struan farm school could be used to greater advantage than it is today, especially when compared with other places, such as Magill and Glandore. I wonder whether the Government instead of having these children in so many different places, could provide one establishment where the accommodation could be better than what those children have at present.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I regret that I did not answer the question put by the member for Victoria. The Struan farm school is not self-supporting by any means. It is the most costly of all our institutions at present, as we have so few occupants at the moment that it scarcely justifies its retention. As I mentioned when speaking on the Loan Estimates, this matter will be examined and I hope we shall be able to arrange for the Struan farm school to be used to better advantage. I doubt very much whether the suggestion made by the Deputy Leader is one that we should encourage, as I think that segregation of our institutions is probably better than the grouping of them. I would not be in favour of buying a big block of land and putting all the children's institutions upon it, because I do not think that would be a move in the right direction. I assure honourable members that the question of the use of the Struan farm school is being thoroughly investigated.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—On looking over the various items under this department I notice that a provision of £3,088 is made for the

matron, housekeeper, cook, domestic, gardener and temporary assistant at the Allambi Girls Hostel, Norwood, and on another page an amount of £1,750 is shown for provisions, equipment, clothing, office expenses, light, fuel, reimbursement of travelling expenses, insurance, rates and sundries for the same institution. The point that intrigues me is why the total cost of this institution cannot be shown under the one heading. Honourable members will see that the same applies to the Seaforth Home, Somerton, for which an amount is provided on page 29 and another amount on page 31. I cannot see any reason why expenditure associated with a particular institution should not be grouped under the one heading, so that members might know quite readily, without wading through different sets of figures, what the actual cost of the institution is to the taxpayers of this State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Leader's suggestion could be given effect to in next year's Estimates; there is no difficulty in that. The position is that this department, which has a considerable contact with wards of the State, has separated under each institution the lines with regard to provisions, such as food, and has shown the amounts required for staff separately.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I asked the same question last year. In the Hospitals Department, salaries and wages are set out separately from all other items. That applies throughout all the departments of the Chief Secretary and Minister of Health. I do not know whether there is any reason for it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The reason is long standing. At one time Parliament was sensitive about our getting too many staff, and members complained that the staffing was not segregated so that it could be readily picked up. Indeed, at one stage they went so far as to demand that we print in our Loan Estimates the name of every person paid from Loan. It was at the suggestion of the Leader about four or five years ago that that cumbersome practice was dropped. If honourable members desired the departments compacted again, there would be no difficulty. The information is provided. It is just a matter of adding two figures together to get the total cost of the department; or, easier still, the total costs of the department are set out in the Auditor-General's report.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In an earlier debate this year, some mention was made of the form in which our reform institutions were to be run. I then expressed my concern at the proposals

for the new Magill Reformatory. Since then, I have taken the trouble to investigate in one or two other States, and was particularly interested in the situation in Tasmania where they have up-to-date ideas about the way in which reform institutions should be run. Their reform institutions are not closed institutions, like Magill. They have set up two institutions for boys, each of which is near a country centre. The boys, among whom are a few incorrigibles who have to be put into a security block to prevent them from escaping, are not segregated from the community. They attend the local schools and are allowed out. They are not kept under prison conditions. They mix in the ordinary institutions existing for young people in the community with boys who have not gone wrong.

It is found that this does much towards their rehabilitation. In fact, it has been found by the Tasmanian authorities that this system works more satisfactorily than that at Magill, which we apparently intend to perpetuate at the great cost to the State of some £400,000 for putting up a luxury gaol. Cheaper institutions could be erected where the boys could actually take part in the community. In Tasmania they are taken away from those things that have lead them astray. They are segregated in institutions each suited to the class of offence. Attention is paid to the kind of background of every boy before he enters an institution. He is psychologically examined by vocational guidance officers and a full report given; he is supervised by trained people.

Under this scheme of open reform institutions (much more cheaply run than what we are proposing for Magill) where the boys are taken away from city life but nevertheless are living and carrying on their activities within the community and are not segregated, Tasmania has had substantial success. Instead of having an institution where there is little effectual segregation of offenders into different types and different backgrounds, a closed institution that develops a hot-house atmosphere, an institution, no matter how luxurious it may be with swimming pools, etc., which is known as a school for crime, Tasmania has effective reform institutions.

My plea is that, before this proposal for Magill is sent to the Public Works Committee to meet the concerted opposition of practically everybody in South Australia who knows anything about reform institutions, the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board will look at it again to see if it cannot go forward with

a modern reform proposal for open institutions at country centres at nothing like the present proposed expenditure.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £2,052,518.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Will the Treasurer consider the suggestion I made in the debate on the first line that mileage subsidies be provided to the South Australian section of the Flying Doctor Service and the Bush Church Aid Society (Flying Doctor) instead of the former approach to this question, because that would be a far more equitable way to deal with these organizations that do such an excellent job, particularly the Bush Church Aid Society, which battles under great difficulties?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The Home for Incurables is an excellent institution that eases the suffering of many unfortunate people who, because of their physical affliction, can be treated only in a home of this kind. I suggest that the Government take up with the controlling body the question of changing its name. I believe it would be possible to devise a more suitable name that would not carry with it the sentence of death from some incurable malady that is implied by admission to it. One of my colleagues once said, when speaking about this institution, "All hope abandon ye who enter here."

Last year £12,000 was provided under the heading, "Sundry grants to medical services, etc., as may be approved," but apparently nothing was spent. An amount of £11,600 is provided this year. It is curious that although the Government provided £12,000 for some form of expenditure associated with health services no-one, apparently, claimed one pound of it. Can the Treasurer say what conditions, if any, attach to this grant? Last year the District and Bush Nursing Society was granted £16,000, all of which was spent, and £20,000 is provided this year. I know the splendid work done by this institution in the sparsely settled outback areas. It efficiently conducts a number of small hospitals, and I am happy that it is to receive £4,000 more this year. Last year £1,000 was provided towards the Marree and Meningie hospitals and that total was spent, but nothing is provided this year. Perhaps last year's vote was for a special purpose and a recurring grant may not be necessary. Can the Treasurer say whether my assumption is correct?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In reply to Mr. Loveday, I say that the Govern-

ment receives many requests from societies and institutions doing charitable work and it is very difficult for the Minister to make a close survey of each of them. Normally, the procedure is to send applications for special requests to the Auditor-General for a recommendation. I will see that the honourable member's suggestion is referred to this officer and if his recommendation favours an increased grant I am sure the Chief Secretary will give effect to it. As to the name of the Home for Incurables, I mentioned this very matter to a member of the committee some years ago because the starkness of the name struck me that it might occasion the inmates some anxiety and distress, but he assured me that that was not the case; on the other hand it brought home to the public very directly their obligations to support this institution. The question of changing its name has often been submitted to the committee, but I doubt whether it would be anxious to change it, for the reason mentioned. It is one of our best institutions which, without fuss or bother, day in and day out, gives service to those most in need of help—people who are helpless and incurable. I commend those serving the institution. The amount voted this year will enable more accommodation to be provided.

The amount of £11,600 is an emergency amount. Each year the Government may spend £100,000 on lines not included in the Estimates and £400,000 on lines provided for in the Estimates. The total reserve vote the Government has for new lines for which no amount has been appropriated by Parliament is £100,000. In respect of health services, if it were necessary to take prompt action in an epidemic, it would be essential for the Chief Secretary to have at his disposal a sum that could be promptly utilized. This amount has been useful in assisting hospitals that, for some reason or other, get into difficulties. Last year no amount was required because the Estimates proved adequate. There was no call upon the unattached emergency amount. However, I believe it is necessary to make provision lest there be a call. I recall at least two occasions when such provision was utilized in emergencies.

Mr. O'Halloran—Why has it been reduced by £400 this year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—When departmental estimates come to the Treasury initially, it is frequently necessary to refer them back for economies. I should think the £400 reduction would be a small economy measure. The amount provided for the District and Bush Nursing Society is decided by the

committee advising the Chief Secretary. Possibly the additional £4,000 is required for an extension of its services. The society is doing a good job. If the Leader examines the item relating to Meningie and Marree he will see that it is a subsidy item and would be for some particular purpose not recurring.

Mr. LAUCKE—An amount of £30,000 is provided for metropolitan and country ambulance services. Can the Treasurer indicate how that will be divided? A further amount of £10,000 is provided specifically for country ambulances. Can the Treasurer also indicate the basis on which it is proposed to distribute that sum?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government entered into an agreement with the St. John Ambulance Brigade in respect of an ambulance service to cover the metropolitan area and country districts. At that time it was proposed to provide £20,000 annually, but as the service has extended the amount has been increased to £30,000. About two years ago some members suggested that the bulk of the grant was being used in the metropolitan area. Many ambulances being taken over were out-of-date and inefficient and the replacement costs in the metropolitan area were absorbing most of the grant. It was suggested that additional provision be made specifically for the country and Cabinet decided that £10,000 should be earmarked for country ambulances.

Mr. COUMBE—The sum of £360,000 has been allotted for general expenses of the Adelaide Children's Hospital and £30,000 towards the Gilbert Wing additions. Can the Treasurer indicate the basis on which provision is made for the hospital and whether it is a set annual amount? As it has been announced that several multi-storey buildings are to be erected within the next few years, is it the Government's policy to continue the same basis of contributions to the hospital or is it intended to introduce a different scheme?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Each year the Children's Hospital Board provides the Minister of Health with an estimate of its requirements as well as an indication of what it believes it can raise personally. I believe that every amount the board has asked for has been provided. Obviously the hospital could not undertake a big building programme without something more certain than an annual grant from the Government. The amount provided this year is, I believe, part of a three-year programme. Speaking from memory, £85,000 is provided this year and £100,000 in each of the next two years. The board has

been informed of the amount the Government can make available over the three-year period.

Mr. BYWATERS—The Country Women's Association Incorporated is an able body and doing a good job. I notice that £120 is to be provided this year for loss of wages and housekeeping services. Can the Treasurer explain the line?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is an amount to cover the wages of housekeepers where the parties concerned cannot pay the full wages.

Mr. JENKINS—The sum of £10,000 is to be made available to the Victor Harbour (South Coast) District Hospital. I take it that is portion of the cost of providing the new maternity wing. The Hospital Board has raised £6,000 and seeks another £10,000. The main drive for the money has not yet been launched, but it will be soon. The board wonders whether the £10,000 provided in the Estimates will be carried over into next year if the hospital does not raise its quota this year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The money is portion of the amount to be spent on the maternity block, which is estimated to cost between £18, and £20,000. The half share to be provided by the Government will be £9,000 or £10,000. If the work is not done this year the item on these Estimates will lapse, but if the project is carried over an amount will be included in next year's Estimates.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I join with the Treasurer and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing appreciation of the good work done by the District and Bush Nursing Society. Again, £2,000 is to be provided for the National Safety Council, which has assisted my district greatly, and has been responsible for saving many lives. I notice that £5,500 is to be spent in 1958 on the Royal Tour. Is it expected that we will have another Royal visit this year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The money is voted to finish off the expenditure on the last visit.

Mr. LAUCKE—I notice that £30,000 is to be provided for metropolitan and country ambulance services. Can the Premier say how much money is to be allocated to each service?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I cannot give the figures because the expenditure of the money is in the hands of the St. John Ambulance people.

Mr. Laucke—What access has the country to the money?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It will be spent where the need is greatest, in the opinion of the St. John people. There is a special grant of £10,000 for country services.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am pleased that Meals-on-Wheels Inc. is to receive a Government grant. I realize that the Treasurer must make the money available go as far as possible, but I am disappointed that this organization is not to receive a larger amount. It was started by Miss Doris Taylor, an invalid pensioner living in my district. Single-handed she organized the institution which has provided an enormous amount of help to people in needy circumstances. Members know the work that is done by it in their districts. With the assistance of a number of public-spirited citizens Miss Taylor has had established in a number of districts kitchens from which meals are served to people unable to care for themselves adequately without assistance. The first kitchen was established at Port Adelaide. Then News Limited built a beautiful kitchen at Hindmarsh, which has now been extended to cope with the Thebarton district. Kitchens have been provided at Prospect by the Rotary Club, at Norwood by the local government authority, at Adelaide by the Adelaide City Council, and at Woodville by the local government authority. Although the buildings were provided by this organization, the money for the equipment, the value of which runs into many thousands of pounds, was raised by public subscription and donations from generous-minded citizens. The whole of this was organized by Miss Taylor. Each kitchen has its own committee, and services are provided voluntarily to prepare meals and serve them to people in their own homes; and a service has been provided for reading matter. This has saved the State a great deal of money, because it would otherwise have been necessary to provide infirmary treatment. If many people had had to go into hospitals or be admitted to Parkside as some had to because of lack of infirmary accommodation, the State would have had to pay a great deal for their maintenance. Miss Taylor has managed the whole institution without the slightest payment, her only income being the pension. As she is a complete cripple and has to go everywhere in a wheel chair, members can appreciate that what she has done has been a great achievement. Some full-time assistance must be found for the central organization if it is to continue. Obviously an organizer, an assistant organizer and office assistants will have to be paid for this organization, which pro-

vides for the bulk buying of equipment, cannot be carried on.

It provides meals for 2s., far less than the price at which any comparable institution has been able to supply them anywhere else in the Commonwealth, but to keep this up it must have assistance. I am sure the Government realizes this, because it has allowed a provision of £1,000, but as projected costs of administration are £3,000 more than the projected income, I ask the Government to increase the grant. I point out that this organization has saved the Government far more than £3,000 a year.

Several grants are made this year as war concessions. I have previously asked the Government to give tram concessions to Boer War veterans, and passes have been given to those who receive pensions, but there is a small group of these men not in receipt of pensions. The Federal Government does not provide any concessions, because they were State troops and therefore a State Government responsibility, and they find it difficult to pay tram fares. These fares are sometimes incurred because they have to receive out-patient treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I ask the Government to place a line on the Estimates next year to take care of this small body of men by providing tram passes to enable them to obtain hospital treatment.

With regard to the line "Building Act Advisory Committee" on page 39, I am concerned that that committee has not yet recommended some revision of the schedules to the Building Act. According to modern architectural practice, the schedules are hopelessly out-of-date in prescribing building standards. Modern architectural practice has gone far beyond the restrictions in the Building Act. For instance, the provision of a ceiling of 9ft. was inserted at a time when methods of building and ventilation were quite different from modern architectural practice. This is only one example, and people who have a knowledge of architecture could multiply the examples to cover many pages. It is fantastic that our Building Act prescribes standards which mean in fact that architectural short-cuts which are perfectly valid and perfectly consistent with the maintenance of high building standards cannot now be taken, and many building costs cannot be cut because of the provisions of the schedules to the Act.

I hope that something will be soon done about this, because it is long overdue. If the Government were to take some additional advice from many architects in South Australia and

from the Professor of Architecture at the university, it would be able to make many useful improvements in the schedules to the Building Act, which would alleviate the position.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In the main the honourable member did not seek specific information, but desired rather to bring matters before the notice of the Government for consideration. I assure him that those matters will be considered. Concerning South African war veterans, I think that matter came before Cabinet some time ago with a request regarding rail concessions, and I fancy that that provision is contained in the last line on page 38. The honourable member will see that an amount is set out there for rail fare concessions, and I fancy that that covers rail concessions for South African war veterans. The honourable member took the question further and mentioned tram concessions. That opens up another topic altogether. The Leader of the Opposition brought a deputation to me on this matter, and questions have been asked by the member for Adelaide regarding free tram travel for pensioners. It is not an easy question because a few anomalies exist regarding what constitutes a pensioner. Indeed, some non-pensioners are actually no better off than some pensioners. We are studying the problems of those people in restricted financial circumstances, whether pensioners or not, who may have to go to the hospital for attention. To a certain extent that matter covers some of the problems associated with the South African war veterans.

Mr. HARDING—An amount of £55,500 is proposed for the line "Rail fares of blind and incapacitated soldiers," and this is £23,940 less than the amount provided last year. I realize that the incapacitated soldiers have their own home in Adelaide, but nevertheless £24,000 represents a lot of money in rail fares. Can the Treasurer explain that item?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No; it is an assistance the Government has given over a considerable period.

Mr. Harding—Did the visit of the Queen Mother have anything to do with the larger amount provided last year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, I do not think so. It is a line that has been provided by the Government, and it is a departmental estimate of what is required.

Mr. COUMBE—An amount of £250 is provided under the line "Civil Defence—expenses." Can the Treasurer tell me if the

£250 now provided is for clerical assistance, or whether it is towards the remuneration of part-time members of the Civil Defence organization? I realize that civil defence is a responsibility of the State, and a liaison officer has to be appointed to work with the Defence Council of the Commonwealth. I think £250 is a miserable sum, considering the importance of this work. The Treasurer recently attended the Civil Defence School at Mount Macedon. Can he say whether, in his opinion, this amount is adequate in view of the importance of this work, and what the £250 is to be expended on?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is for office expenses. On the general question, I do not believe anyone today can give an adequate answer concerning civil defence. We could spend £10,000,000 on this item yet achieve nothing. America has spent fabulous sums on various schemes, but when they have been tried out they have been found to be completely inadequate and unlikely to be useful. I attended the Civil Defence School and know what was suggested at the school, but I cannot feel that what was suggested would give me any sense of security in the event of an atomic war. Any expenditure we could possibly make on civil defence would probably be blotted out if an atomic or nuclear war took place. When the Commonwealth is in a position to signify what steps it desires to be taken, I can assure the honourable member that the State Parliament will have before it the suggestion of the Commonwealth for earnest consideration. So far, we have no adequate knowledge of what to expect. Until we know what the problem is, it is impossible to make suggestions and plans.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

COUNTRY HOUSING BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD CHARGES (REFUNDS) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, 2nd October, at 2 p.m.