HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 27, 1961.

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

QUESTIONS.

MEDICAL BENEFITS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I understand that the Premier has a reply to the question I asked last week about the Australian Medical and Accident Insurance Company Ltd., which is generally known as A.M.I.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have been supplied with the following statement concerning this matter:

I am advised that the Australian Medical and Accident Insurance Company Limited is a company incorporated and registered in South Australia and registered as a foreign company in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. The manager has stated that a majority of the shareholdings of the South Australian company were acquired by K. Rees Emporium Limited.

Following certain statements of the manager to the police regarding the proposed removal of such of the books and documents of the company as were at the Adelaide office to Melbourne, and the possible result of such movement, the police took the available books and documents into custody. They have been, and are, investigating matters in relation to the company, but their investigations to date have not revealed the commission of a criminal offence.

In these circumstances, on the representations of the company's solicitors that claims being made against the company could not be dealt with satisfactorily unless the books and documents were readily available at the offices of the company, these have been handed over to the manager on the company's undertaking in writing that such books and records as relate to the South Australian business as a company will be retained in this State and will not, without at least seven days' prior notice in writing to the Crown Solicitor, be removed outside South Australia, except under legal order.

On Tuesday, September 19, His Honour Mr. Justice Mayo made an order to wind-up the company, and I am informed that Mr. Alan George Killmier has been appointed as provisional liquidator. I am unaware that K. Rees Emporium Ltd. is in the hands of liquidators in Victoria, but I am informed that a court order was made on August 15, 1961, under the Victorian Companies Act, for the investigation of K. Rees Emporium Ltd., and some seven associated Victorian companies, and that Mr. Nimmo, Q.C., was appointed as the investigator. Any persons who have claims against the company which have not been satisfied, would be well advised to place them in the hands of their solicitors without delay.

WOOLLEN POLICE SHIRTS.

Mr. HARDING: I have been informed that a new summer shirt, which was to be issued to the New South Wales Police Force, was displayed in Canberra this week. The shirt was of the all-wool, drip-dry and non-iron type. It was brought to the attention of the conference of police associations and members of their union in Canberra, and was highly praised by Sergeant L. H. Griffiths, who was in charge. Can the Premier say whether the Police Force in South Australia has any such type of wearing apparel?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. Following on the representations from the Police Association for the adoption of a shirt and trousers to replace the khaki summer uniform, extensive inquiries were commenced early in 1960 to obtain a suitable material for the shirt. Fabrics of all kinds, including cotton and various types of nylon, were examined and it was decided to seek the assistance of the Wool Bureau and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. A non-iron 100 per cent woollen material was produced, which was light, strong and durable. When submitted to the Australian Wool Testing Authority of the Commonwealth this cloth received an excellent report and it was decided to adopt it for police use. South Australian police officers commenced wearing this new shirt in January last, and the fact that it is neat, cool and serviceable has evoked favourable comment from both public and police. Samples of the shirt have been sent to other States and I believe it is likely to be adopted in several Australian forces. On July 14, 1961, advice was received that the material had won the 1961 Australian wool award gold medal for the best shirting in Australia. The honourable member will see that in this matter we lead the Commonwealth again.

LEAVING HONOURS CLASSES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister of Education give any further information regarding the establishment of Leaving Honours classes at Whyalla, particularly whether they are likely to be established this year?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: No. The whole question of Leaving Honours classes or their equivalent, and the proposed changes in the matriculation standards, are now receiving consideration and I am not in a position to make any announcement at present. As soon as the position is clarified an announcement will

be made one way or another in the interests of the children concerned and their parents, particularly in country areas.

ADELAIDE OVAL.

Mr. COUMBE: My question concerns the Adelaide oval, which happens to be in the electorate of Torrens. At present negotiations are on foot regarding the renewal of the lease between the South Australian Cricket Association, the South Australian National Football League and the Adelaide City Council, and some confusing statements have been made on the matter. In view of the fact that authority for leasing and the administration of the park lands, of which the oval is a part, are vested by the Crown in the Adelaide City Council, can the Premier say whether in the event of an agreement being reached it will have to be ratified by this Parliament?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure on that matter. I saw a report that the Chief Secretary said the matter had to be placed before Parliament. Whether that is to be by way of a by-law, or the formal consent of Parliament is required, I do not know but I will make inquiries and let the honourable member know.

MURRAY BRIDGE TO TAILEM BEND HIGHWAY.

Mr. BYWATERS: The main highway from Murray Bridge to Tailem Bend has been given much attention by the Highways Department on many occasions, and in an announcement recently the Premier said that the crossing four miles out from Murray Bridge would have a bridge placed over it. Because of the ever-increasing traffic and many rises and dips the road has presented a problem to people using it and particularly to the Police Force. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads how long it will be before work will commence on this section of the road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask for a report from my colleague.

BLACKWOOD ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think my question can be best explained by my reading a short paragraph from a letter I received from the secretary of the Blackwood and Districts Chamber of Commerce, dated September 25, the relevant paragraph of which stated:

At the meeting of the Blackwood and Districts Chamber of Commerce held on September 20, 1961, I was instructed to write to you and ask if you could make inquiries of the Highways Department, through the Minister of Roads, about when it proposes to widen and kerb (the business section at least) of Main Road, Blackwood, from the Post Office northwards.

I understand that that is a main road but I am not certain of the line of responsibility between the council and the Highways Department. If it is a Highways Department responsibility, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads when the work is likely to be done?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask my colleague for a report.

TEACHERS FOR NEW GUINEA.

Mr. LAWN: I understand that from time to time there are vacancies in New Guinea for teachers and other personnel as a result of the Commonwealth Government's policy of developing New Guinea with the object of granting its independence in the near future. Will the Minister of Education indicate whether teachers who desire to go there for, say, three or five years and then return to South Australia will lose long service leave, seniority rights or superannuation, or whether these will be preserved to them pending their return?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I think every application would be treated on its merits, but it would be treated most sympathetically because, for example, the South Australian Education Department supplies all the teachers in the Northern Territory. The teachers are not drafted there; they must volunteer. Not only are all the rights and privileges preserved but special inducements are offered to them to go there and they are given somewhat preferential treatment when they return. The same does not apply to New Guinea. The Government has entered into an agreement of some years' standing with the Commonwealth Government regarding the supply of teachers for the Northern Territory, but it has not entered into any agreement in relation to New Guinea. However, we are sympathetically disposed towards the education of native people, wherever they may be, and I would personally give any application the most sympathetic treatment if and when I received one.

BARLEY PAYMENTS.

Mr. NICHOLSON: My question concerns payments on last year's barley harvest. Has the Minister of Agriculture any information about when a second payment is likely to be made and, if he has not, will he obtain that information from the Barley Board?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In reply to a question on September 5 I said that the Barley Board had reported that it would be meeting in September to decide when the next payment would be made. It may be meeting now, and I shall let the honourable member have the information as soon as any decision is arrived at.

HOUSING TRUST RENTAL HOMES

Mr. RYAN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 21 concerning the allocation of rental homes by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not yet received a report.

VICTOR HARBOUR ROAD.

Mr. JENKINS: At the junction of the Port Elliot, Adelaide and Victor Harbour roads there is an intricate system of sandbags for the control of traffic. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, inquire whether the temporary structure will be replaced by a permanent concrete island before the Christmas traffic can be expected?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain a report.

RIVER MURRAY BRIDGES.

Mr. STOTT: The Premier and the Government are well aware of the continual and rapid growth of the Upper Murray districts. Approval has been given for the erection of one new bridge across the river at Blanchetown, but by the time that bridge is completed in a few years further bridges will be required. Much time elapses from the time a new bridge is proposed until the plans for its construction reach maturity and, as the need for further bridges is now apparent, I ask whether the Premier will place the matter before Cabinet for the purpose of referring to the Public Works Committee the question of deciding the most desirable places at which to erect further bridges across the river in the Upper Murray districts?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will refer the question to the Minister of Roads.

PORT MACDONNELL SLIPWAY.

Mr. CORCORAN: Some time ago it was decided to build a slipway at Port MacDonnell to meet the needs of local fishermen. I previously asked the Minister of Agriculture when this work would be completed and his reply was that the date fixed was June 30, 1962. Earlier he told me that money had been made available for the work, that arrangements had been finalized, and that there was no doubt about the slipway becoming an established fact. Since then some survey work has been done on land in connection with the scheme. Can the Minister say whether any further steps have been taken by the Harbors Board in connection with the erection of the slipway? I know that there is plenty of time between now and June 30 next, but there is no time like the present and if the Harbors Board is not getting on with the work it would not hurt to give it a reminder. If the Minister is not in possession of the information will he get a report and inform the House in due course?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The amount on the Loan Estimates this year for the Port MacDonnell slipway is £31,000. I shall be glad to get the details of what is proposed at Port MacDonnell. The honourable member did not say specifically that there was any delay or that the scheme was not proceeding quickly enough, and it was rather a peculiar question to ask.

Mr. Corcoran: The position is a bit confusing to me.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain a full report from the Harbors Board on the proposal.

Mr. Corcoran: That is all I ask.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, except that the honourable member implied by asking his question in the way that he did that something was going wrong there. If the honourable member will just hold his peace I will obtain a report for him as soon as possible.

SCHOOL HEATERS.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently concerning electric heaters for country schools?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: It is not the policy of the Education Department to subsidize heating appliances in classrooms. As I indicated in my reply last Wednesday, modern heating is supplied in all new schools. It is the policy of the Public Buildings Department to supply modern types of stoves in classrooms where the older types become unserviceable. As it occurs, the opportunity is taken to supply the older schools with gas, electric or low combustion heaters in place of older type stoves. School committees are not asked, nor are they expected, to contribute to the cost of these heating appliances on a subsidy basis.

NEW SCHOOLS.

Mr. RYAN: I believe that during the early part of this year a number of proposals for the building of new schools that were submitted to the Public Works Committee were ultimately withdrawn and never considered by the committee. Can the Minister of Education say whether those schools will be proceeded with at the first available opportunity?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: Yes. As I have previously informed the House, the Education Department during the last year or so propounded a programme for the building of about 100 schools or substantial additions to schools. Of that number, 34 have been included in the current building programme (that is, the 1961-62 Loan programme), and the other 66 are in various stages of planning. Although the Treasurer has been extremely generous in increasing the Loan allocation for school buildings from £4,750,000 last year to £6,000,000 this year, it will not be possible for all of those 34 schools to be commenced this financial year. As a result the Director of Education was requested to prepare a priority list in strict order of priority as he saw fit. He prepared that list and supplied it to the Director of the Public Buildings Department and, as far as I know, that department is calling tenders for the erection of these schools, either strictly or roughly in order of that priority; but the schools that have not been included at present are not lost sight of. To reply strictly to the honourable member's question, they will be proceeded with as soon as it is financially or physically within the competence of the Public Buildings Department to do so. There is no suggestion of any change of policy or of decision. It is only from time to time where the one work was considered to be of a high priority because of the change or shift in population, due largely to the large building operations of the Housing Trust, that other localities which were not considered to be so urgent became more urgent, but every one that has been approved will be proceeded with as expeditiously as possible.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Offences Act, 1953-1960. Read a first time.

Mr. HUGHES: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to protect innocent children from the danger caused by the abandonment of refrigerators, ice chests and other similar receptacles. To assist members who are not aware of the seriousness of the position, I will give some statistics to enable them to be aware of the deathtrap that they present to children. I have been advised by the Australian Council of the Institute of Refrigeration Service Engineers that from 1946 to 1949 inclusive there were 22 deaths in refrigerators recorded in the United States alone. From 1950 to May, 1961, there were a further 163, making a total of 185 recorded deaths. I have a full list of the statistics and, as I do not wish to weary the House by reading them, I ask permission to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Recorded Deaths in Refrigerators.
(United States of America.)

Year.	Boys.	Girls.	Total.
1950	5	2	7
1951	10	2	12
1952	9	5	14
1953	24	6	30
1954	6	5	11
1955	15	3	18
1956	8	3	11
1957	5	9	14
1958	10	7	17
1959	13	2	15
1960	4	2	6
1961	6	2	8
	115	48	163

Mr. HUGHES: After honourable members have had an opportunity to study them, I do not think there will be any need further to stress the desirability of a measure of this kind. Since the statistics chart was prepared, three more children—two brothers and a playmate—were trapped in a home freezer in Concord, New Hampshire, which brings the total to 11 this year and nearly double the number of deaths reported during the entire year of 1960. Keith and Glen Loughry and their playmate, William Anderson, were found in the freezer which had been in the Loughry apartment for only a week and had not been put into operation. The ages of the children were six, four and four years, respectively. I might digress here and say that I contacted a member of the New South Wales Government yesterday. It appears that statistics are not available for New South Wales but there two cases of deaths from this cause have been reported.

This Bill will be the first major step in a campaign to remove, as far as possible, the potential danger to young children caused by

the abandonment of refrigerators and other similar receptacles. I repeat the warning: don't let a child become a statistic in this State! I have introduced this Bill in the hope that its effect upon adults will be such that South Australia will continue to remain accident-free. Should it be acceptable to the House, it will serve two purposes: first, to require all refrigerators, ice chests and ice boxes sold in future to be fitted with locks easily opened from the inside; and, secondly, to prevent refrigerators, ice chests and ice boxes from being abandoned and discarded with their locks and doors intact. The first purpose will be achieved by inserting a new section (58B) in the Police Offences Act. Subsection (1) will provide that, where a person sells or hires a refrigerator, ice chest or ice box containing a compartment of a capacity of one and a half cubic feet or more, he shall be guilty of an offence unless the compartment is so constructed or equipped that every door or lid of the compartment can be opened easily from the inside when any lock or catch that can be operated from the outside is fastened.

I have been in touch with a representative of one of the largest manufacturers of refrigeration hardware in the southern hemisphere. These same people assisted the N.S.W. Government in its endeavours to bring in an Act to give the necessary protection. I understand that all the hardware to comply with the Act is readily available to all cabinet manufacturers. If this legislation becomes operative in South Australia, there will really be no added cost to the industry at all because the big domestic cabinetmakers are already using this safety hardware. The same applies equally to the makers of deep freeze cabinets and cold-rooms. With the coming into force of this legislation, this practice will become general as otherwise the article will not be allowed to be sold.

Subsection (2) provides that the refrigeration trade will be given reasonable time to adjust itself to the new requirements of the law. I understand that in this State there are many obsolete refrigerators, ice chests and similar articles that are no longer saleable. These are being discarded. Subsection (3) will endeavour to render harmless such articles, and make it a misdemeanour for any person to abandon or discard a refrigerator, ice chest, ice box or similar closed container from which the door or latch mechanism or hinges have not been removed. It provides that where a person places any refrigerator, ice chest, ice box, article of furniture, trunk or other similar article upon any dump, tip, sanitary depot, public reserve, public place or unfenced vacant land, and the article has in it a compartment of a capacity of 1½ cubic feet or more, unless before so placing that article that person has removed from the compartment every door and lid thereof or the locks and hinges thereof, or has otherwise rendered every such door and lid incapable of being fastened, the penalty is £25.

This subsection will not apply to a person who places any such article upon any public reserve, public place or unfenced vacant land for his own use while he is residing on that public reserve, public place or unfenced vacant land. The Bill should achieve the result I am sure all members would desire, and I commend it for favourable consideration.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

PORT PIRIE ABATTOIRS BOARD REGULATIONS.

Order of the Day No. 1: Mr. Millhouse to move:

That the alterations and additions to Port Pirie Abattoirs Board regulations made under the Abattoirs Act, 1911-1950, on January 16, 1961, and laid on the table of this House on June 20, 1961, be disallowed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move that this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill makes a series of alterations to the existing legislation and has been drafted with the intention of bringing our Industrial Code more into line with present-day conditions in industry. The Bill, as drafted, was presented to the Parliamentary Draftsman for perusal and also his advice was sought to ensure that some of the more complicated amendments did achieve the changes we sought. This Bill has only been introduced after long and careful consideration by the Advisory Committee of Industrial Legislation which, as its name implies, is the committee set up within the Labor movement to deal with industrial matters at legislative level. This committee includes members of the Trades and Labor Council, the Australian Labor Party and the Parliamentary Labor Party, and its very existence is, among

other things, a striking example of the complete harmony and sympathy of interests between the industrial and political wings of the Labor Party in this State. The industrial wing is, of course, intimately and constantly associated with industrial developments and conditions and is therefore in the best position to supply suggestions for industrial reform.

It was first intended to introduce only those amendments which were of major importance, but, after a series of conferences, it was considered desirable to introduce many other amendments in an attempt to bring the Code into conformity with practices that have grown up in industry over the years. One of the things we have kept in mind in providing these amendments is to make them remedial, that is to legislate against abuses which are possible under the present provisions of the Industrial Code, and we are hopeful to legislate for positive improvements in the actual conduct of industry. The Industrial Code is really a set of rules for the orderly conduct and regulation of industry, and the fundamental principles should be a just determination of all matters which come within its scope. It often happens, however, that the spirit of the legislation is avoided because some imperfection in the original drafting makes evasion possible, or because times have changed and the relevant provisions, although perhaps quite fair and reasonable when enacted, have ceased to be the safeguard they were originally intended to be.

I point out also that the Industrial Code was first enacted by an anti-Labor Government and, as a result, many of its provisions were unacceptable to Labor members and they strenuously opposed them at the time. Notwithstanding our efforts then and subsequently, the Code still contains several undesirable features. The Liberal and Country League Government has adamantly refused to accept our suggested amendments over the years and in spite of the tremendous progress and expansion in industry during the last 30 years, there have been no compensating amendments to the Code in order to keep it up to date and suitable to cope with modern developments in industry. One particular development comes to mind, and that is the failure of the Code to effectively provide for piece-work conditions and subcontracting. This is a practice which has developed appreciably in the last 10 years, and, as a result, some employers have been able to engage workmen on piece-work rates contrary to the terms of an award. The Code makes it illegal for an employer to engage a person on piece-work if the industry concerned is working under an award that fixes a day labour rate of wages, and the object of this provision is to ensure that employers observe awards in connection with hours of work, wages, etc., but in certain industries, especially the building industry, employers can evade these provisions by resorting to subcontracting.

A firm may contract for a job including the supply of materials and then sublet portions of the work to others to whom it supplies materials and for whom it may supply transport from job to job: for example paint suppliers contract for the painting of premises, but sublet the painting work to persons, who, because they are allegedly subcontractors, are not employed within the meaning of the award. This type of evasion is serious because it has at least three undesirable results. The first is that it generally results in inferior work being performed which reflects on the reputation of all tradesmen throughout that particular trade, and the second is that the inferior workmen leave a train of dissatisfied customers. The third undesirable result is that this method has the effect of breaking down award provisions as to hours of labour, wages, and the employment and training of apprentices. In other words, it destroys the very standards which the trade union movement has striven to establish and which the Industrial Code was intended to protect.

I will now deal with the various clauses of the Bill. Clause 4 is purely a consequential amendment to headings to bring them into conformity with subsequent amendments which will be sought to sections 314 and 327 of the Code to bring it up-to-date in relation to the painting of, and the use of polishing wheels in, factories, respectively. Clause 5 (*a*) seeks to delete reference to "agriculture" in section 5 of the principal Act. The object of this amendment is so that all persons engaged in primary production are capable of being covered by the appropriate award. At present, the persons working in the occupations mentioned are prevented from applying to industrial boards or courts.

The member for Gouger said that he was a member of a union. I do not know exactly what he meant by the remark, but I assume that he is either a member or a potential member. If he is a member he will agree that a union creates unity of strength, and that he joined the union willing to observe its conditions. Does his union have the right to apply to the court for an award covering the industry in which it is engaged? In the

primary producing section of the community only shearers and employees in the dried fruits industry have awards. All other persons working in the primary producing industry cannot get one. If the Government believes that the Long Service Leave Act of 1957 is in the interests of all persons who are employed there should be the possibility of establishing a rate of pay for all those persons. I believe that when the Government made its proposals about long service leave it intended them to apply to people in all industries, irrespective of type. Employees in any industry should know to what they are entitled in wages and long service leave.

Clause 5 (*b*), relating to the definition of "child" in section 5 of the principal Act, is a consequential amendment brought about by changes in the Education Act when it was last reviewed. If the amendment is accepted, instead of leaving a "child" as being of less age than 13 years it would mean that the principal Act would be brought into conformity with the present provision of the Education Act, and that any future amendments to this Act would be automatically reflected in the principal Act.

Clause 5 (*c*) relates to the definition of "employee", and the amendment is suggested to bring our Act into line with the provisions of the New South Wales Arbitration Act. The major change to our present Act would be the deletion of particular reference to the Public Service and similar employees. The present definition is an example of the Code being out of date because all sections of employees, as we know them today, are not covered. It is not the intention to make particular reference to Public Service employees or persons employed by boards of trustees and similar bodies, because all these employees are covered in our amended definition, which reads:—

"employee" means person employed in any industry whether on salary or wages or piecework rates, and includes any person whose usual occupation is that of employee in any industry, but does not include a person in the employment of his parent. The fact that a person is working under a contract for labour only, or substantially for labour only, or as hirer of any tools or other implements of production, or as an outworker or as a salesman, canvasser, collector, commercial traveller, insurance agent, or in any other capacity wholly or partly on commission, shall not in itself exclude a person from the definition.

Having had some assistance from the Act which is in operation in New South Wales, I believe that this definition makes it easier to understand, and, at the same time, it endeavours to cover practices which have been in operation in some industries where the employee or the person engaged has not been able to receive his rightful protection from the Code.

Clause 5 (*d*) is an amendment of the definition of "employer" in section 5 of the principal Act, and in addition to the normal definition of "employer" it seeks to provide cover for persons who are employed by subcontractors. This is an example of unsatisfactory practices, which have grown up in the building industry and have been aired from time to time in this House, where employees of sub-contractors have not received adequate protection from the Code. It is the intention of this amendment to make the prime contractor responsible for wage payments.

Clause 5 (*e*) is an amendment to the definition of industrial matters in section 5 of the principal Act and seeks to clarify the position regarding the employment of apprentices, improvers and juvenile workers and the relationship of their numbers to the number of tradesmen employed. Under the present provisions of the Code the Industrial Court has decided that the word "employed" only relates to the time of engagement. This means that the proportions of apprentices, improvers and juvenile workers to tradesmen only have to be correct when any of the three former groups are engaged for employment. After the engagement of the juniors referred to above, the employer may dismiss the tradesmen and the intended proportions are destroyed. Under the metal trades award the proportions are established on the relative strengths in the immediate six months preceding the recruitment of juniors, and I am seeking a similar provision for the Industrial Code. Members will notice that my amendment is not exactly the same as the metal trades provision, but I believe that the proportion should be maintained both sides of the date of recruitment of juniors, and then the intention of the court could be put into effect regarding the employment of the respective proportionate numbers of apprentices, improvers and juvenile workers.

Clauses 5 (*f*) and 5 (*g*) are amendments to the definition of "industry" as contained in section 5 of the principal Act. Under the present provisions of the Code any organization which is carrying on business as a community effort could be making large amounts but could pay any rates of pay. This applies, for example, to community enterprises and laundries, and consequently employees are

excluded from any benefit provided by the Code. Whilst it is not my intention to suggest to community hospitals and others, who may be excluded from the provisions of the Code at the present time, what their business undertaking should be, nevertheless I expect that persons engaged in them will at least receive not less than that which is provided in industrial agreements, awards or determinations in similar industries. Naturally, there are some activities wherein award wages are not paid, therefore I have provided an exemption for these bodies by clause 5 (*g*), which is identical with the exemption provided in section 140 of the principal Act. The exemption covers such bodies as prisons, reformatories, industrial schools, homes for erring women, and institutions conducted exclusively for charitable purposes.

At present, legislation provides that the court has not power to direct that preference should be given to a unionist in employment even though a direction might be considered desirable by the court. All other States have the power to grant preference to unionists, and the onus is on the court to grant a preference or otherwise. By the amendment sought to section 21 of the principal Act, I seek to grant the same right to the court in this State to be able to exercise a similar right. The other amendment to section 21 of the principal Act is contained in clause 6 (*c*), whereby I seek to insert the following proviso at the end of this section:

Provided further that a common rule may be made operative from the date from which any new award or variation order takes effect.

At present, an order may be issued for a new award but only the employers who are before the court are bound by the award and have to pay the new rates from the operative date of the order. Employers and employees who are not before the court in the particular matter are obliged to make application, and the date of operation of the subsequent applications may differ from the original order. I understand that employers and employees agree with the intention of my proposed amendment because it would have the effect of all employers paying the new rate from a common date.

Section 31 of the principal Act deals with slow, aged and infirm workers, and the amendments sought by clauses 7 (*a*) and 7 (*b*) are that the appropriate unions should be consulted before a certificate is issued to enable the aged or infirm worker to work at less than award rates. I do know that, under certain awards, provision is made for aged and infirm workers and, by my amendment, a comparable provision is made in the Code. In most, if not all, Commonwealth awards provision is at least made to cater for aged and infirm workers. The matter goes before a board of reference and an approach is then made to the court.

Section 45 of the principal Act deals with variations of awards and orders of the court in accordance with variations in the living wage. The sole purpose of the amendments sought by clauses 8 (*a*) and 8 (*b*) is that employees, whether adult or junior, who are employed on piecework rates shall receive the increase or decrease in their piecework rates which is proportionate to the increase or decrease which has been made to the weekly living wage. The necessity to provide for piecework conditions is brought about by practices that have grown up in industry since the Code was drafted.

Regarding the returns of registered associations, it is contended that it is not necessary for all registered associations to forward to the Registrar a complete list of members every year, because it is felt that these returns do not serve any good purpose but only cause a considerable amount of unnecessary clerical work. All that is necessary is for the associations to render a list of officers (including trustees), and I have provided that this list shall be submitted in the months of January and July of each year by clause 9 (*a*). Clauses 9 (*b*) and 9 (*c*) are consequential on the amendments provided by clause 9 (*a*).

The next amendment relates to sections 99 to 119 of the principal Act. These sections constitute Part VIII of the Code and provide penalties for strikes and lock-outs. I want it to be clearly understood that the Labor Party's policy is arbitration and conciliation, but at the same time it believes that in the absence of a just system of settling disputes—and it is problematical whether a perfectly just system can be devised or at all times implemented—a workman should not be penalized for withholding his labour if he would otherwise be compelled to submit to inferior conditions of employment. It must be remembered that a workman has only his labour to sell and in the last resort he should retain the right to strike. A lock-out was originally regarded as being the logical and natural counterpart of a strike and it was apparently so regarded when Part VIII of the Code was enacted in 1912.

By clause 10 I seek to strike out the penalties in regard to strikes and therefore it is only logical to provide also for the abolition

of penalties in respect of lock-outs. This provision has been submitted previously but it has always been strenuously rejected by the Liberal Government. However, we still believe that an employee who refuses to sell his labour under unjust conditions should not be regarded as a criminal and punished as such. When a dispute arises, the Employers Federation and all who speak for the employing classes threaten the employees with prosecution and punishment. That is not the way to achieve industrial peace. If these penalties were removed, we could get employers and employees to meet in a conciliatory frame of mind around a table to resolve their differences. I sincerely trust my suggested amendment will be carried.

Section 139 is contained in Part III of the principal Act dealing with industrial boards. At present, it only refers to the metropolitan area unless the employees are employed by the Public Service or councils when it applies to the whole State. The building industry operates throughout the State and it is my view that these employees should be covered by the Code. Therefore, I suggest that the words "and employees employed in the building industry" should be inserted in subsection (1) of this section. This would ensure that building workers throughout the State could be covered by industrial boards and the continuity of employment of building employees who shift between the country and metropolitan areas would be safeguarded in conformity with their particular award or determination.

There is considerable repetition in the Code, and I have already explained the amendments sought to section 5 of the principal Act and its effect on the operations of the court. Clause 12 merely seeks to make similar amendments to section 140 of the principal Act and its relation to the operation of industrial boards, therefore it is not necessary for me to repeat the same explanations to cover these amendments.

Section 167 of the principal Act relates to the jurisdiction of wages boards and it only gives power to the board to fix the proportionate number of apprentices and improvers. Because it is silent on the number of juvenile workers, a wages board does not have the power to fix the proportionate number of juvenile workers. If this matter is disputed, the applicant would have to approach the State court for an award for the sole purpose of fixing the proportionate number of juvenile workers. Apparently this was an oversight when this section of the Act was originally drafted and, by clause 13, I seek to rectify this omission.

The board may wish that a witness appear before it and, at present, section 181 of the Code provides that a member of the board may call a witness, but the witness may refuse to appear. My amendment seeks to give the board power to summon a witness and it is the same power afforded to the court by section 41 of the principal Act. Clause 15 is another amendment caused by repetition in the Code. It is an amendment to section 194 identical with that provided by clause 8 to section 45. The only difference is that the amendment to section 45 dealt with the operations of the court, whereas section 194 deals with the operations of the board. Briefly, the amendment seeks merely to give these workers the same proportionate increase or decrease in their piecework rates as has been made to the weekly living wage.

Section 207 of the principal Act relates to the penalty for not paying the rates fixed, but it has been argued that if the employer does not pay anything no offence is committed. This point is clarified by clause 16 (*a*). The subsection then provides that if an employer refuses to pay, or short-pays an employee, then he commits an offence. Clause 16 (*b*) then becomes a consequential amendment by making any amount not paid recoverable in lieu of any amount short-paid, because it is the view of the Department of Labour that if an employer pays less than the award rate the difference can be recovered, but there is a doubt when no payment at all is made.

Section 208 deals with the time allowed for employees to recover moneys due. The time allowed for employees governed by a determination of a wages board should be the same as that provided under an award of the Industrial Court, and therefore clause 17 strikes out "two months" and inserts in lieu thereof "six months." Clause 18 (*a*) seeks to amend section 209 of the principal Act, which deals with the proportionate number of apprentices, etc., being employed, and is identical with the amendment explained regarding clause 5 (*e*) which amends paragraph (2) (*d*) of the definition of industrial matters contained in section 5 of the principal Act. In other words, it is consequential on the amendment to section 5 and therefore requires no further explanation. Following on this, subclauses (*b*) and (*c*) of this clause are consequential on the amendment

sought by clause 13 to section 167 of the principal Act because provision is required for juvenile workers as well as apprentices and improvers.

Similarly, the amendment sought by clause 19 is identical with the amendment to an earlier section of the Act laying down the procedure as it affects the court. Section 224 deals with aged and infirm workers. In the Federal awards, the union concerned normally makes the application requiring the approval of the inspector, and all I seek by this amendment is that the union concerned is made cognizant of the fact that a particular licence is to be issued. Section 228 of the principal Act, which deals with factory inspections, states that an inspector may be accompanied by an interpreter. At present, a union representative has right of entry to premises, but he faces exactly the same language difficulties as an inspector, and my view is that a union representative should have the same privilege afforded to him as that afforded to an inspector, and it should be possible for the union representative to be accompanied by an interpreter. My amendment in clause 20 achieves this object, and clauses 21 and 22 are consequential on the amendment sought by clause 20 of the Bill.

Section 232 of the principal Act provides a penalty of £10 if an inspector is deterred or hindered from carrying out his duties. This is an appropriate protection for inspectors, but it has been found that the penalty provided has not been a sufficient deterrent. An inspector has an obligation to carry out the duties laid down in the Code, but it has been reported that certain obstructions have been introduced wnereby an inspector, under the full authority of the principal Act, has been unable to carry out his duties effectively, and the nominal fine of £10 has not been a sufficient deterrent. Therefore, clause 23 proposes that this penalty be increased from £10 to £50.

Clause 24, which seeks to amend section 235 of the principal Act, is consequential on earlier amendments sought to sections 167 and 209 in that provision is required for juvenile workers as well as apprentices and improvers. Clauses 25 (*a*) and 25 (*b*) are consequential on earlier amendments sought regarding the definition of a "child" to bring the Code into conformity with the Education Act, and also the matter of seeking to bring activities under the control of the Code when they are conducted either for the purposes of direct or indirect gain. Clause 25 (*c*) seeks to delete the words "or dentist's" from the interpretation of what a factory does not include. When the Code was first introduced there were, possibly, some grounds for making this exception, but with the development of dentists' laboratories, I can see no reason why they should be excluded from the provisions of the Industrial Code, for example as regards ventilation, working areas, doors, windows, etc., and therefore I seek to remove dentists' laboratories from the exception.

Clause 25 (*d*) is another amendment that is necessary because the Code is out-of-date. At present the stipulation is that a young person is a boy or girl between 13 and 16 years of age. This conflicts with the most recent provisions of the Education Act, and therefore my amended interpretation states that a "young person" means a boy or a girl between the statutory school leaving age and 17 years of age. Clause 26 provides for the introduction of two new sections to the principal Act dealing with industrial medical practitioners and safety committees respectively. In the United Kingdom and on the Continent, there is a growing practice of providing for medical officers either to be stationed on the plant, or for an area to be zoned, and then for medical officers to be sustained by the various companies. The Nuffield Foundation is doing much of this work in the United Kingdom, and in the satellite towns there are some good examples of this practice which are substantiated by reports from the industrial medical registrars in England. In the larger enterprises in Australia there are doctors available, but elsewhere the services are supplied by first-aid workers, and, in some cases, trained nurses. However, this is not sufficient for the complex nature of present-day industry.

The use of doctors could economize compensation claims, prevent the contraction of diseases, and be a means of establishing more hygienic facilities in factories. All these factors provide opportunities for a more efficient work force, increased productivity, and increased industrial advancement. Over recent years, all State Governments as well as the Commonwealth Government have given their backing to safety lectures, publications and conventions. All State Governments, including our own Department of Labour and Industry, have safety officers who favour and encourage the setting up of safety committees. All these actions receive a reasonable response from employers, but I still feel that it should be compulsory to set up safety committees, and this is the reason for the suggested new section 281b as provided for in clause 26 of the Bill.

Sections 282 and 288 of the principal Act deal with the registration of factories, and my main concern is that no application should be renewed unless the factory has first been inspected by an officer of the Factories Department. The main contingency I seek to guard against is that a factory which has been deregistered should not be able to operate until there has been some efficient inspection by an inspector of the Factories Department, and this is catered for by clause 27, which amends section 283 of the principal Act. The next matter that concerns me is more serious because it reflects a flagrant disregard of the directions by an inspector in regard to the registration of factories. It is referred to in section 288, which states that a person who is convicted of a third offence under Part III of the Act shall have his factory deregistered. However, I believe that a factory owner who reaches this stage is demonstrating his contempt of the requirements of the Factories Department, and his factory should not again be registered without the approval of the court, and I have provided for this by clause 28.

The question of outside workers is another phase of industry which has arisen in recent years and has not been subjected to any close control. An inspector should have the complete backing of the Code in order to carry out his duties effectively and section 289 provides that if an outside worker fails to properly answer questions he is liable to a fine of 10s. On present-day money values, a fine of 10s. is purely a nominal figure and acts as no deterrent to those people refusing to answer questions, and therefore by clause 29 (*a*) I submit that an inspector will have a more effective backing of the Code because the penalty provided in section 289 will be increased to £10. Clause 29 (*b*) seeks to give an inspector greater power for carrying out his duties, in that an inspector, or any person authorized by the court, shall have right of entry to the premises of outside workers, and there is also provision for the registration and rates of pay of outside workers. Section 292 also deals with outside workers, and by clause 30 I propose that the penalty provided in this section should be increased from 10s. to £10 in order to bring the deterrent more into line with present-day money values.

Section 293 of the principal Act relates to the limitations on inspectors divulging information, and under these provisions an inspector is not permitted to divulge records or factory particulars even to the court. Parties to an action may be aware that a particular inspector could substantiate their claim, but they cannot subpoena the inspector to support their action. The provision of clause 31 is to ensure that an inspector can be made a competent and compellable witness in any legal proceedings to enforce the provisions of the Code.

Clause 32 seeks to amend section 304, which deals with the ventilation and heating of factories. The provisions contained in this clause conform with the recommendations of modern architects and factory designers and are being adopted by most modern managements. I consider, however, that it should not be left to the good offices of the good employer who is already providing these standards, but that there should be some provision to ensure that the bad employers and the out-of-date factories are brought into line with modern conditions, and clause 32 makes various lighting and ventilation requirements obligatory. Clause 33 deals with toilet facilities. Here again, the modern and considerate employers are already providing adequate facilities, but I still consider that it should be obligatory on all employers to provide suitable toilet facilities.

Section 308 deals with doors and passageways in factories. The amendment I seek by clause 34 merely brings this section into conformity with what is being provided in most modern factories at the present time. Factory designers and labour committees would recommend in accordance with the provisions of this clause, and in most cases these recommendations would be adopted, and that is all the more reason why the provisions should be inserted in the Code. It would then ensure that the careless factory owners are obliged to maintain the same safe standard as the modern factories. Clauses 35 and 37 give another indication that the Code is completely out-of-date. The present section 314 dates back to the time when factories were lime-washed, as this was the only covering available, but now modern paints are available and are being used, and the section should be modified to comply with the modern methods of renovating and painting.

Clause 36 relates to welding in confined spaces. The amendments I have suggested are in conformity with the standards which are approved by welding authorities. I admit that the contents of this clause are rather detailed and perhaps could more properly be covered by regulations. Therefore, if the Government were prepared to proclaim regulations consistent with the provisions I have suggested, I am sure that it would be supported by the industrial interests

concerned. We on this side of the House would offer no objection and, in that case, the clause I have recommended could be reconsidered. Section 318 of the principal Act deals with the ventilation of factories and has had no amendment since 1910. This section only relates to dust nuisance, but with the development of modern factories there has also been other ventilation problems such as paint and chemical fumes. Whereas most firms and factories have devices to extract and ventilate where dust is created, there is the need to modify the section to bring it into line with modern requirements and this is done by clause 38, which also retains the provisions that the Chief Inspector shall make the necessary orders for the installation and use of suitable ventilation equipment.

The next amendment relates to dangerous machinery. There have been cases where a sole employee working on a plant has been injured, and I believe in places where there is power-driven machinery excluding hand tools in use, there should be a principle laid down that an employee should not be permitted to work alone, and this is provided for in clause 39. At present there is no provision for regular checks on machinery and clause 40 is inserted to bring the Code into conformity with safe factory practice and is consistent with modern methods.

Division XVI of Part V of the principal Act refers to grindstones, but makes no reference to polishing wheels which are in widespread use in modern factories, and is another example of the Code being out of date. My amendments by clauses 41 and 42 seek to rectify this anomaly, and also make provision for suitable dust extractors where metal polishing machines are used extensively.

A method of increasing productivity is the reduction of industrial accidents, and in the amendment proposed by clause 43 to section 329 it is considered that country inspectors should report accidents to the Chief Inspector, in order that the cause of the accident may be examined with the object of avoiding similar accidents in the future. I also believe that the reporting of these accidents would facilitate the compilation of accident statistics in the central office of the department. Section 333 of the principal Act is antiquated because it provides a minimum wage of 10s. a week in a factory. Clause 44 merely brings this section into line with current usage by specifying the appropriate award payment. Section 340 is also antiquated and the amendment sought by clause 45 is to the effect that overtime payments are to be at the rate of time and a half, with the provision of 6s. tea money in lieu of 1s. 6d. provided in the Code. These amendments are in accord with the present conduct of business. This section lays down the terms and conditions of females, young persons and children. It should have State-wide application and I see no valid reason why the Minister should be allowed to suspend the operation of this section. He is afforded this power by section 343 of the Code, and therefore by clause 46 I suggest that this latter section be struck out.

In my view, the cleaning of any machinery, whilst it is in motion, is a very dangerous practice and should be prohibited. Section 348 of the Code only provides that it is not permitted for any male under the age of 18 years or any female to carry out this work. As I said, this is a very dangerous practice and is prohibited by the provisions of clause 47. Sections 356 to 358 relate to working conditions of Chinese in factories. These sections were inserted in the Code when there was considerable competition from non-unionist Chinese workers, but there is no present-day application of these sections, and therefore by clause 48 I propose that they be struck out of the Code.

Clauses 49 to 52 are similar in principle to earlier amendments because they merely seek to bring the Code into conformity with the improved practices that are already in operation in modern factories, but it is felt that it should be made obligatory on all factory owners to provide the improved facilities. My approach to the Industrial Code has been with the knowledge that it is very much out of date and the amendments I have put forward have been with the intention of improving some of the outmoded provisions as well as bringing it into line with improved methods which are already in operation in many factories. I am sure that if members opposite make the same approach, we can go a long way towards making substantial improvements to the Code. In the first instance we have wages boards to do certain things and then the court to say what shall be done after a matter has been considered by a wages board. Consequently, if it appears that there has been some repetition in my speech honourable members can appreciate that in the Code itself there are many repetitions in the various sections.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUSH FIRES REGULATION: SULPHUR.

Order of the Day No. 3: Mr. Millhouse to move:

That regulation 17 of the regulations under the Bush Fires Act, 1960, in respect of burning sulphur for the treatment of fruit in the process of drying, made on June 1, 1961, and laid on the table of this House on June 20, 1961, be disallowed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move that this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY TARIFFS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Frank Walsh:

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should take steps to assist the decentralization of industry and help retain population in country areas by insisting that the Electricity Trust of South Australia institute a system whereby all country tariffs are reduced to the same as those now operating in the metropolitan area.

(Continued from September 20. Page 820.)

Mr. RALSTON (Mt. Gambier): I support the motion. There is little in this motion that one could cavil at, but some people like to cavil at anything. Then, when they can find nothing wrong with a motion of this type, they seek not to deal with the principle involved but to quarrel with a slight variation from what they think the wording should be. But those who quarrel with its wording have not offered to amend it in any way or seek a change; they merely feel they should not support the reduction of electricity charges in our country areas.

The Premier in opposing the motion said that to carry such a motion would be detrimental to the Electricity Trust and disastrous to its finances. Of course, that is just so much poppycock; it does not mean a thing. This motion seeks to give the people of our country areas the benefit of a State enterprise by a genuine attempt to equalize the charges throughout South Australia. Although several members opposite strongly advocate reducing electricity charges in country areas, today they are meek mice when they have the opportunity of supporting or speaking to this motion. Nevertheless, I draw attention to some anomalies that have arisen in the course of the debate when members opposite have expressed their opinion on certain aspects of the motion.

For instance, the Premier spoke at some length about the effect of the cost of electricity on industry. He said that an amount as small as one-tenth of a penny a kilowatt hour in the charge for industrial electricity would determine the fate of a big industry in deciding whether to establish in this State or in one of the eastern States that could offer slightly lower charges. Later, the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that the investigations of the committee of which he was a member had revealed that industrial electricity charges varied by up to two per cent as a content of production costs, and he expressed the opinion that that would have no bearing on the establishment of industry. Therefore, on the one hand, a member of an important committee says that a two per cent content in the cost of electricity in industry would have no bearing on the establishment of a major industrial concern while, on the other hand, the Premier asserts that an increase in electricity charges of as much as one-tenth of a penny would determine where an industry would establish. That is the sort of rubbish we have heard in opposition to a motion intended to give the country people the benefit of a reduction in electricity charges. We note that all this poppycock came from the other side of the House. Let me now refer to an answer to a question on notice I asked of the Premier in 1960. It was:

The Chairman of the Electricity Trust reports:

1. The trust does arrange special tariff rates for industry where the circumstances justify it.
2. The trust has always regarded any arrangements made as above as confidential between it and the consumer.

We know perfectly well on this side of the House that, where a major industry wants electricity at special rates, there is no question of its not getting it: the Electricity Trust takes no notice of the tariffs as published but enters into negotiations with the directors of industrial concerns and grants a tariff even below production cost.

What is all this story about industrial rates for electricity? The very policy of the trust itself does not substantiate it. The trust will arrange to supply electricity to any industrial concern that can justify a special tariff; and such a request will be granted. That cuts the whole ground from underneath the story as we have heard it from the other side of the House. Some time ago in this House I referred to electricity costs as they affected country areas and I produced evidence taken from the various tariff schedules published by the Electricity Trust. I referred to the tariff that has the greatest bearing on this motion—tariff M, the domestic tariff. At that time

the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) when he had referred to electricity charges a little earlier had mentioned that the consumption of electricity at the domestic level averaged, over a year, 2,520 kilowatt hours. The figures that I presented to the House showed that I considered the average consumption over a 12 months' period was 2,400 kilowatt hours. So there is no doubt that the member for Gouger and I were in almost complete accord on domestic consumption. Our estimates were within 120 kilowatt hours of each other over a 12 months' period so no-one will doubt that our research arrived at much the same rate of consumption.

In addition to that consumption rate, I also mentioned tariff J for domestic hot water services. My figures were taken from actual accounts submitted by the trust to three or four householders and I regard them as accurate for the purposes of this debate. They clearly indicate that for a consumption of 600 k.w.h. of domestic power and lighting and 1,000 k.w.h. of night water heating the householder in the metropolitan area pays £10 7s. 10d. a quarter, whereas at Mount Gambier he pays £14 15s., at Port Lincoln £17 2s. 2d., at Millicent £18 15s., and at Tumby Bay £20 1s. 3d. It costs the man at Tumby Bay almost double what it costs the resident in the metropolitan area. Surely members will agree that there is justification in equalizing charges so that country consumers' charges will compare more favourably with those applied to metropolitan residents. Members opposite who represent country areas should remember these figures. They can be checked with the schedule of rates, but they are correct. Some time ago in this House three or four members opposite spoke of the results of their research. I suggest that they have every right in this debate to ask for an equalization of or a substantial reduction in country electricity tariffs.

Mr. Hall: Do you favour equalization?

Mr. RALSTON: Of course. What does the honourable member think I am speaking about?

Mr. Hall: I thought you were asking for a reduction.

Mr. RALSTON: I intend to refer to this question of equalization in respect of other than domestic rates. Much has been said about industrial costs of power and lighting, but there is not the same disparity in charges for such electricity as there is in the domestic rating. In order to obtain the industrial rate the minimum consumption must be 7,500 k.w.h. a quarter. It would not need to be a big industry to consume that quantity in three months. Based on that consumption the metropolitan industrialist pays £111 5s. compared with £115 12s. 6d. at Mount Gambier, £118 2s. 6d. at Port Lincoln, £128 2s. 6d. at Tumby Bay and £146 17s. 6d. at Millicent. In other words, it costs the small industrialist at Millicent almost £36 more every quarter than it does the metropolitan industrialist for the same small consumption. I ask members to remember that the Premier said that an added cost of as little as one-tenth of a penny per k.w.h. could determine the siting of an industry. Surely £36 more every three months would represent a considerable expenditure to a small industry. It, too, is entitled to some measure of equalization.

During the Light by-election campaign the Premier said that the Electricity Trust would pass on to farmers a great benefit by means of a reduced tariff for lighting and power for agricultural production. There was no suggestion of this reduction causing financial discomfort to the trust. In fact, that aspect was not even mentioned, but the people were told that great benefits would accrue to rural production. Let us examine the rural tariff, which is tariff R. Based on a quarterly consumption of 2,500 k.w.h., which is not a high consumption when we remember that the ordinary household consumpion is 600 k.w.h., the metropolitan charge would be £35 15s. compared with £40 4s. 2d. at Mount Gambier, £38 18s. 4d. at Port Lincoln, £41 10s. at Tumby Bay and £48 12s. 6d. at Millicent. That does not seem to me to indicate a real desire on the part of the Government or the trust to give a benefit to country areas where rural production takes place.

A farmer in the metropolitan zone would pay £35 15s., whereas if he went to Millicent he would pay £48 12s. 6d., yet this rural tariff was designed to promote rural production. Was it a genuine attempt or was it electioneering propaganda? We know what it was all right! Although the charge at Millicent is £48 12s. 6d. and at Tumby Bay £41 10s., those towns are the same distance from the nearest sources of generation—32 miles—and although the cost of generation at Port Lincoln would be about 300 per cent greater than the generation cost at Mount Gambier, the Tumby Bay farmer receives his electricity for £7 2s. 6d. less than the farmer at Millicent. These are matters that should be published in country newspapers to let all farmers know exactly what are the charges.

I think I have made out a good case for a review of the charges imposed in this State. I commend Government members for the research work they did prior to a debate earlier this session. Remarks made then clearly showed the need for an equalization of or a reduction in the electricity charges to country people. I want to clear up a point raised in this debate. The member for Barossa was a little off-beam in his remarks and that was unusual because he generally makes sure of his facts. He first said that there were four zones for electricity charge purposes, and later said there were four major zones, but that was only quibbling with words. I have the zone schedules in front of me, and five zones are listed in the metropolitan schedule, two in the Port Lincoln, and two in the South-East. That makes nine altogether, and they are all major zones when the interests of the consumers are concerned, especially as tariffs are high. I have already said that the domestic consumer in Millicent and the consumer in Tumby Bay pays almost 100 per cent more than the metropolitan consumer for the same usage.

This motion was moved in all sincerity by the Leader of the Opposition. He wants to give effect to a policy that the Opposition believes should be carried out to the full. We want a decentralization policy, but in addition to the establishment of industries in the country we want country employees to have the same amenities as metropolitan employees. Not long ago the Employers' Federation joined with the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufactures and the Government in an attempt to reduce the wage paid to country workers, in comparison with the wage paid in the metropolitan area. When the country worker seeks the same amenities as those available to the metropolitan worker it seems that there is woolly thinking on the part of some people. They do not realize that unless the country workers have the same amenities and charges as metropolitan workers there will not be much success in retaining skilled workers in country areas, where they are so essential to the prosperity of the State. Government members have heard a lot about the activities of workers at Whyalla, but the wives of those workers are completely dissatisfied with the amenities available there and wish to return to Adelaide or go to highly industrialized areas in other States where there are better wages and reduced costs of living in essential commodities, and electricity is one of them. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): The member for Mount Gambier mentioned woolly thinking. I realize that the South-East is a great producer of wool, and that is perhaps why he tried to pull so much wool over the eyes of other members. He joined with other Opposition members in saying that a better service would be obtained from the Electricity Trust if we reduced the sum available to it for operating purposes. I will not dispute the figures quoted by him. I have worked out some comparisons of electricity charges and they are on record in *Hansard*. We know that country charges are higher than city charges, but that is not the matter before us. In effect, the Opposition wants to take £500,000 in revenue from the Electricity Trust, which amount would cover many connections. The member for Albert worked out the cost of electricity to the consumer under the single wire earth return system. I cannot remember what it was, but I think it was about £500. Bearing in mind the £500,000 mentioned earlier, that would mean 1,000 consumers. However, many more than 1,000 people are waiting to be connected to the trust's grid. If the money is taken away, as is proposed, these prospective consumers will have to wait longer for supplies.

Reference has been made to remarks made earlier this session by me. I think I should make it clear just what I did say. At the beginning of the case that I put to this House, I said:

I believe that our goal should ultimately be one price for electricity throughout the State.

There, of course, I have no quarrel in the long term with this motion, but I remind members opposite of the imporant word "ultimately". This motion directs the trust to reduce tariffs immediately, but it is impossible to do this and still maintain the physical operations of the trust. Therefore, I oppose the motion. It is a good example of the two voices of Socialism; one voice says, "We will do without revenue," whereas the other voice says, "At the same time we will spend more." Many members opposite have said in the Budget debate that we are not spending enough, yet they say in this debate that we should do without £500,000! Let them reconcile those two statements if they can. They want us to spend a few million pounds more yet get £500,000 less, but we do not have the facilities of the Commonwealth Government to carry out plans such as those Mr. Calwell would foist on the public. We have only the limited finances of the State yet we are told that we should

do the miraculous—earn less and spend more! I do not think I need elaborate on this; it shows the two faces of Socialism presented to the public.

Mr. Corcoran: You don't know. The salvation of the world may be bound up with Democratic Socialism for all you know about it.

Mr. HALL: Unfortunately, so many creeds in the world place a different interpretation on that. The great error in this motion is bound up in the trust's finances, not in the individual cases members may put up. I trust that in time we shall deal with this matter, which the trust has done in the past as its finances and position have improved. In the Address in Reply debate I said that as finances improved we should reduce outer tariffs, and I put forward an equalization scheme, pointing out the cost to each consumer. I should like to correct, or perhaps remind, the member for Whyalla: I said that the cost to the trust would be £375,000.. He pointed out that the Treasurer's figures did not coincide with mine, but I said that, because I did not have figures relating to industrial consumption, my figure dealt only with domestic consumers and the trust's figure of £500,000 covered both categories. I do not know how much of the £500,000 is for industrial consumption, but neither figure is discredited, as my figure covers one aspect and the other figure covers both aspects.

Members opposite made one other great mistake regarding the trust's finances. I think it was the member for Whyalla who said what a poor State this would be if the trust, with a capital of £84,000,000, could not replace this £500,000 that would not be received as tariffs. He said that it would surely be a failure if we could not find it elsewhere from Loan funds. I asked another member whether the trust came under semi-governmental allocations of the Loan Council in Canberra, and he said that it did not. I am sure members opposite did not know that the trust was bound in its borrowing programme by Loan Council allocations, so their whole case was based on a misconception. As the trust's borrowing comes under Loan Council allocations, its borrowing is strictly limited. No doubt Parliament could vote it more Loan moneys, but what would we reduce? Would we reduce expenditure on water supply or education? We cannot get this £500,000 except by reducing other expenditures.

I do not agree with this motion and my previous remarks do not support it; the motion says "immediately", whereas I said "ultimately" and, apart from this, my objective and that of the motion are not the same. Decentralization forms a big part of the motion, but let us not go overboard in all this talk about decentralization. If it comes about to a certain degree, let us not take away benefits from some workers. I say this because, unfortunately, we have been and are still in trouble over unemployment. If there is one industry in an area and it suffers unemployment (which happens in all countries, because demand is never the same) how can labour be transferred from that industry to another? That is important for the man who owns his home and is well established in an area. Where there are several industries he has a far greater chance to replace his means of livelihood. I do not decry genuine full-scale moves for decentralization and I am sure that what is going on at Whyalla will be an immense success, but let us not go overboard for the small industries that could be established singly in various parts because, unless they produce a stable product that will sell without fear of reduced sales, there will be hardship to the people employed in them.

Mr. Corcoran: You have not given us any information to justify the differences in prices of electricity at Mount Gambier, Millicent and Naracoorte.

Mr. HALL: The trust has a good story to tell about different prices for electricity. Undoubtedly it costs much more to transmit electricity through long lines than through shorter lines, but, as I have said, I want that to be disregarded ultimately. To ask that this be done immediately, however, is to direct the trust into catastrophe. I hope that this type of thinking will not always prevail regarding similar motions. I am sure that members opposite have more business sense than to subscribe to this motion. They know that it is not possible for the trust to satisfy demands for new connections at the present rate and, at the same time, to reduce its revenue by £500,000.

While speaking on decentralization, I omitted to say that even the member for Murray said publicly that there were limited opportunities for decentralization in this State. I have a cutting from the *Sunday Mail* of May 27 last which states:

The chairman of the local committee, Mr. Bywaters M.P., says that his committee considers Murray Bridge is the only country town convenient to the city with prospects of expansion.

Mr. Corcoran: That's bound to be correct!

Mr. HALL: The honourable member will have an opportunity, no doubt, to deny it.

Mr. Corcoran: You don't even know if he said it!

Mr. HALL: Apparently the member for Murray holds out no hope for any decentralization in my district, nor would he agree with the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. Quirke: I wouldn't say he was wrong either.

Mr. HALL: I am trying to point out that it is not only from this side of the House that doubts are expressed on the extent to which this decentralization question can be pushed. I hope that honourable members opposite will ponder the good advice given to them by their own colleague, the member for Murray, and I trust that with those few words I have made my position clear. I ask that members who doubt the veracity of my statement should peruse *Hansard* to find out whether my proposition agrees with their resolution: it is a different proposition altogether. I join with other members in expressing a desire that our constituents will soon have a service from the Electricity Trust's supply but, at the same time, I hope that the trust will maintain and even increase the revenue it has to spend on those connections. I repeat what I said earlier this year: that our goal should ultimately be one price for electricity throughout the State, the emphasis being on the word "ultimately". I oppose the motion.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the motion and shall answer some arguments against the motion that have been stated by Government members. However, firstly, I appreciate that the member for Gouger is a young active man who is full of energy and zoom, but I did not know that he could take such a complete somersault backwards without touching the ground.

Mr. Ralston: He is a trapeze artist.

Mr. BYWATERS: One of the things he made obvious this afternoon was that when things are different they are not the same. His remarks in an earlier debate, to which he referred, obviously need changing to enable him at least to try to convince himself that he is in a spot in this debate. I do not want to put him in a spot because I do not care two hoots how he faces up to his electors on this issue. I have my own electors to represent and I wish to put their case in a few moments.

I was rather amused when the member for Gouger referred to the article in the *Sunday Mail* of May 27 last and I, too, was amused when I read the article because I realized that the reporters had made a mistake. I do not wish to hold it against them but I point out for the benefit of the member for Gouger that the person he is referring to as the Chairman of the Murray Bridge Industries Committee is not Mr. Bywaters at all but a man named Mr. Smyth. Mr. Smyth made that statement, not me, and if the honourable member desires confirmation of that I can show it to him in the evidence taken that day. Had I known that this was to be used in the House this afternoon I would have brought it down for the member to read so that he could appreciate the action taken on that occasion. I did not refer to the decentralization of secondary industries in that evidence. I am the secretary of that committee and my job was to present a case for primary production under intense cultivation, which I did effectively. If members take notice of the argument advanced by the member for Gouger on that statement I can assure them he is off the beam.

It is rather interesting that we should here have another perfect example of the Labor Party in this House endeavouring to bring about reforms to benefit our people. Previously, when we have moved for some reform to benefit the people the Government has rejected those attempts but on a future occasion with a blare of trumpets or through radio broadcasts or television appearances we have seen and heard statements issued that have been practically on the same lines as our former attempts. Although not as much as we would have liked, these things have been introduced by the Government spokesman, the Premier. I shall refer to some of them.

Not long ago we tried to improve the Workmen's Compensation Act but that attempt was defeated. However, we saw some concessions introduced later. The motion of our late Leader (Mr. O'Halloran) seeking an increase in superannuation benefits was defeated because the Premier promised to bring down a Bill to provide for some things for which we asked. We asked that the widows' allowance should be lifted to three-quarters of the pension and in recent weeks we have been told it is to be lifted to five-eighths.

Mr. Jennings: What about hire-purchase?

Mr. BYWATERS: I will refer to that later. Our action in moving a motion, where we were

unable to introduce a Bill because of Constitutional difficulties, has later proved beneficial to the people. The member for Enfield referred to hire-purchase agreements and here again, although the Government saw some merit in what we suggested, it would not give us credit for it. However, eventually we saw some advantage accrue from our suggestion. This afternoon we saw the same thing when the Leader of the Opposition introduced a Bill to amend the Industrial Code. Although amendments to the Code are long overdue, I am tipping that the Government will not accept the Bill in the form the Opposition would like to see, but that eventually the Government will meet us part way. We, as an Opposition, have to move as we do in an attempt to improve conditions and, in this case, equalization of tariffs will bring country consumers into line with those in the metropolitan area. This is the only way to achieve that from this side of the House. We frequently see improvements in our legislation that were originally suggested by the Opposition, because we are the reform Party. The Government members, being members of the Liberal and Country League Party, stand for the *status quo* and maintain that to the best of their ability, and it is only after the Opposition forces these things on the Government or endeavours to bring them to its notice that it agrees in part to what we seek.

There have been two major suggestions why we cannot at this stage achieve this equalization of electricity tariffs between country and city. The member for Gouger said that ultimately that was his aim. The sooner "ultimately" comes, the better, but in the meantime we have to press on to get all that we can for the people, because, after all, we as the Opposition are here for that purpose. We do not have to know whether or not these things will pay, for it is the Government's job to do that; but we can introduce these things and bring them to the Government's notice and it in turn can do what it thinks is right. We must impress upon the Government the need for immediate action. That is what we have done in this case, and we offer no apologies for it. One of the main arguments has been that the time is not ripe, but according to some people the time is never ripe.

Mr. Jennings: They said that when the abolition of child labour in the coal mines was advocated.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, and when pensions were suggested. The other argument has been that such a step would curtail country extensions. We on this side of the House, together with Government members, do not desire that. I make that perfectly clear. We are happy with the workings of the Electricity Trust. We would never have seen extensions to country areas under the administration of the old Adelaide Electric Supply Company. Some former members of this House (and perhaps some present members) were opposed to the taking over of that utility by the trust. All power to the trust for the way it has developed country areas. I particularly commend it for its introduction of the single wire earth return system which has enabled a supply to be given to consumers in remote areas who otherwise would not have had an opportunity, because of the cost structure, to be serviced. As a country member, I am grateful that that is taking place. I do not wish country services to be curtailed, but I do not believe that that would be the case if the motion were carried. I consider that such a suggestion is simply a red herring designed to create a doubt in some country members' minds, and apparently it has created a doubt because some country members have used that argument as a basis for their opposition to the motion. Apparently, that was why the member for Gouger "about turned" on this subject.

By interjection the Opposition was asked whether it favoured equalization. Naturally we favour it. We know that in some cases it is not altogether practicable, but in the main the policy is there and we believe it is an ideal that should be sought after. All people in the country should have the same privileges and the same electricity tariffs as the people in the metropolitan area. This applies not only to electricity but also to water reticulation. The Mannum pumping station, which the Minister of Works says will soon resume pumping at a cost of £20,000 a week, provides water from the River Murray for the metropolitan area. This is a life line. Water is the life blood of any country, and because we need water so much we are to have another pumping station at Murray Bridge soon. This will cost more to install, and it will cost at least as much (if not more) to pump the water to the metropolitan area, but because it is required the scheme must be proceeded with. The people in the metropolitan area are paying the same charges for water as are the people on the River Murray, and that is as it should be. Labor members agree with that, just as we agree in principle

that electricity charges should be the same in Murray Bridge and Mannum and elsewhere throughout the State as they are in Adelaide. That is a principle with which I believe most members of this House agree.

The Premier said that if this motion were carried it would cost the trust about £500,000 a year. I accept that statement, but I do not think that country extensions would be curtailed as a result of that expenditure. The press recently published a photograph of a building being erected close to Adelaide for the trust's administrative offices. That building will cost £1,000,000, so it will therefore cost twice as much as would be incurred in one year because of the equalization of tariffs. The trust made a profit of more than £400,000 on its operations this year. The trust is efficiently managed; it is providing a service; and it is showing a profit. However, I consider that those profits could be used to provide the equalization of tariffs we seek. Those profits go back into the undertaking, and it will take a profit of that size in each of the next three years to pay for the administration block. The money for that project will come either from the trust's profits or from borrowing, but whether it is an administration block or power lines in the city or country the money still has to come out of the funds the trust raises, whether by way of Government loans, semi-government loans, or Government grants.

An Act on the Statute Book provides that the trust may be subsidized by this Government, but such a subsidy has not been availed of by the trust because it has been able to finance its own operations. In effect, if the trust were £500,000 down as a result of equalizing tariffs it could get that sum from the Government as a subsidy, so the argument that country extensions would be curtailed because of an equalization of tariffs fails. I cannot accept what the Premier, the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) and others have said in opposing this motion, namely, that it would be to the detriment of the extension of power lines in country areas. I do not think that is a valid argument, and I consider that the Premier is not accepting the motion because it has been moved by the Opposition.

If I am correct, I trust that the Premier will, for the sake of country people, continue with his usual pattern and say, "We will meet you somewhere along the line and provide some reduction in tariffs for you." Mr. Ralston, in a fine contribution this afternoon, went to no end of trouble to prove the differences in tariffs in country areas and the various tariffs people have to pay if living in the city or in the country. I agree with everything he said. I took out some figures and this affects me personally. All members who use electricity, and particularly country members, will have noticed the same thing.

I have with me my electricity account for the most recent quarter, and the total charge amounts to £19 8s. 5d. I am in Zone 3. The first 40 units cost 9d., the next 90 cost 3.6d., and all additional units 2.05d. If I lived in the city I would be called upon to pay for the first 40 units 6.6d., the next 90 units 3.3d. and for all additional units 1.9d. Whereas I will have to pay £19 8s. 5d., if I had lived in the city the amount would be £17 12s., a difference of £1 16s. 5d. Naturally, I should like to see equalization. If I happened to live in Zone 5 I would have to pay £22 1s. 7d., an increase of £4 9s. 7d. compared with the city tariff—about 25 per cent more. I do not think that the Government's arguments have been factual: they have been brought down for a purpose. If the Electricity Trust considered more extensions were needed, it would have the money provided.

This year the Government made £1,000,000 available to the trust for a new power line to Mount Gambier. That is a good thing, and the money is being wisely spent. The only thing I have against it is that much of the money will be going out of the State because most of the contractors for extensions are people in other States, and this also applies to some employees. The question of unemployment was mentioned this afternoon. This work could be made available entirely for our own State employees if the trust used its own men and materials. The Premier referred to the South Australian Gas Company as being a keen competitor of the Electricity Trust. I recall that, when I first entered this House, Mr. Laucke, the former member for Light (the late Mr. Hambour) and a few other new members, were all of the same mind as I. We advocated the abolition of the surcharge on electricity and the Premier then said that that was not possible and that because of competition prices would have to rise in the metropolitan area and the trust would lose a certain number of consumers because of this competition. He also said at the time that dieselization was a factor. Time has proved that this was not the case, because we have no surcharges today, but a form of standing charge which is much fairer to the

people in these areas. They are getting the facility now and paying portion of the cost of the original installation. This is much fairer than the old method of surcharge under which a person paid all the time, and the more power he used the more surcharge he paid. The surcharge was eventually abolished despite what the Premier had said at the time that the extra cost would be paid in the metropolitan area.

On this occasion we find a similar argument with the Premier saying that with the competition of gas and diesel operated plants the same thing could happen again. It did not happen on the other occasion, and I do not think that is really an argument. This argument was rather exploded in the debate when Mr. Heaslip followed the Premier and, of course, he knew more about this matter than did the Premier. He mentioned the Grosvenor Hotel, in which he is interested. It is a good place to stay at and its accommodation has always been to my satisfaction. He said that the hotel's experience over a number of years was that gas was far more economical than electricity for cooking and heating. Therefore, where does the Premier's argument come in when he says that the South Australian Gas Company would become a competitor if electricity prices were raised in the metropolitan area? We do not advocate this, but that is the argument he advanced. In replying to a question by the late member for Light the Premier used practically the same argument. Mr. Heaslip has said that gas is cheaper than electricity, so the Premier's argument as to charges would not matter one iota. People in the country can have gas today, but whether it is cheaper or dearer than electricity I do not know; and whether it is a competitor with electricity or not is no argument. Although Mr. Heaslip says that gas is far cheaper for heating and cooking, metropolitan consumers in the main prefer electricity. I do not think that people stop to consider the charges associated with the use of gas and electricity. They use gas or electricity, whichever they prefer. I believe that applies to most people in the city and also in the country.

Mention was made this afternoon of the establishment of country industries. The Premier was correct when he said that even a decimal point of a penny additional in electricity charges could discourage industries from coming to this State. That plays a major part in their final decision whether they come or not. My Party has no desire under the motion for electricity charges to rise in the city, so I do not see where the Premier has any basis for his argument. If they are interested in going to Murray Bridge or some other place in the State (for there are many other places in the State and all members do their best for their own electorates), every member has the right to push the claim of his own district and, if other districts have a bigger claim, they are the ones to be considered. But, wherever the place is, if an industry is interested in coming to a country area, the price of electricity would be just as much a factor to be considered as it would be for an overseas firm or a firm from another State coming to the metropolitan area. The same argument applies. If price equalization applied throughout the State, it would tend, in spite of the member for Mitcham's saying that only a few firms would be interested in this, to attract industry to the country.

There is a difference of opinion on the Government side. I hope it does not cause a split in the Party opposite. Possibly, it would be classed as a split if it happened on this side of the House. In this instance there is a difference of opinion between the Premier and the member for Mitcham. The position is that people who are interested in establishing in the country are coming to the country, and even a small industry is just as vitally concerned about the price of electricity as a large concern coming to South Australia would be. That is the only point that emerged from the Premier's reference to this: it lent argument to our case. If any industry already established in the country areas has to pay more for its power (whether or not it is 2 per cent more), it is a recurring loss. That industry has to compete with industry in the metropolitan area so, in turn, it is at a disadvantage.

In Victoria valuable concessions were made to industries in country areas. They went out to places like Ballarat, Ararat, Stawell, Horsham, and country towns along the River Murray, in most cases with the assistance of the Victorian State Government. Their council rates were reduced and many were exempt from council rates altogether for two years.

Mr. Jenkins: But they are great cities.

Mr. BYWATERS: They are country towns, too, and some of them have developed into cities because of the very people I am talking about. That is why we have no cities

here similar to those in Victoria, where industries have been encouraged over the years to go out to the country and build up cities. Also, industry in Victoria received rail concessions on freight going out to the country.

Mr. Harding: Does the honourable member know what it costs the country people in Victoria?

Mr. BYWATERS: I know the position there. Under the Cain Government in Victoria there would have been the equalization of charges that we are seeking today but, unfortunately for Victoria, the Government changed and those concessions were removed. Today in Victoria many established country industries cannot compete with the metropolitan area, so they are taking all their equipment and going to the city. Because of this the country people are being left out. This has happened. I personally know of two or three firms that have shifted out of the country town in which they were interested because these concessions no longer apply. They have moved to the city because of competition. I could not agree with most of what the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) said; he referred kindly to my district and to Chaffey, Stirling and Albert, but the river areas are the places where industry could be established.

Mr. Clark: They have natural advantages.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes. That being the case, concessions should be allowed on electricity, freight and water charges to entice industries to come out into those areas. If that were done, they in turn would save that money in pumping charges from the Mannum and Murray Bridge pumping stations for providing facilities close by. I do not want to develop that argument now but, in all sincerity, I say it would appear that this motion will not be carried. I appeal to the Government to consider the representations made by members both on this side of the House and opposite for a reduction in the country charges. If the Government cannot go all the way, perhaps we could get somewhere along the line towards that goal. The Premier said that zones had been taken out. First, Zones 4 and 5 should come out and the other zones should shift down a little nearer to where they were to bring these charges at least somewhere nearer to what they should be. If it meant half-way between them, it would be an advantage to country consumers, the idea being that eventually what we ask for will come about. If the Labor Party were the Government, it would find a way to bring about, in essence, just what this motion asks for. It would find that it was possible to do what was sought to be done, in spite of what has been said.

Mr. King: It has been happening all the time.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, but very slowly. I am sure the member for Chaffey (Mr. King) will agree that the principle of charging country people more than people pay in the metropolitan area is wrong. If we on this side of the House were in office, there would be no doubt about it at all: the charges in the metropolitan area and in the country would be the same, with no extra charge to the city people. There are ways and means of doing it.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOUNT GAMBIER BY-LAW: PARKING METERS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

That by-law No. 47 of the Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier in respect of metered zones and metered spaces for vehicles, made on June 23, 1960, and laid on the table of this House on June 20, 1961, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 30. Page 659.)

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): I support the motion. I had not intended to enter this debate because I thought it was a normal local government motion until the member for Gouger drew the attention of the House to his objection to parking meters in country areas. The Premier also drew the attention of the House to the mis-use of parking meters in the metropolitan area. The members for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) and Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) accused the Premier of entering the debate merely to attack the Adelaide City Council. Whether that be so or not, the Premier drew the attention of the House to the mis-use, or over-use, of parking meters by the Adelaide City Council.

Parking meters were first used to alleviate traffic problems in heavy business areas but, when we see the extent to which the installation of these one-armed bandits has been carried in the metropolitan area, it is a good warning to honourable members to disallow future by-laws that will perpetuate this nuisance in country towns.

Mr. Millhouse: Haven't you been presiding officer of a corporation?

Mr. JENKINS: Yes, and I have a high regard for council members and for the job they do, but they are individuals and can

carry things too far. Initially the Adelaide City Council installed parking meters sensibly where they were required, but then it saw that this was a good means of obtaining revenue and spread parking meters almost throughout the entire city. Spokesmen for that council have denied that the meters were installed to obtain revenue, but I can see no justification for their installation in so many streets. I am not particularly concerned about the Mount Gambier by-law, but I suggest that when similar by-laws come before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, instead of accepting them and enabling councils to have such vast powers, it should examine them more closely. If a by-law specified streets or areas where the meters were to be installed, I should be prepared to approve of it, but I do not favour granting a blanket authority that will enable a council to install meters haphazardly.

I assume that when the Mount Gambier by-law was laid before the Subordinate Legislation Committee the council, which is comprised of excellent persons, was apparently unanimous. However, subsequently at the council elections it became apparent that the ratepayers and councillors were divided on the question of parking meters. Three councillors who supported the by-law were defeated at the polls by persons who disagreed with the by-law and subsequently at a council meeting one of the new councillors moved to rescind the by-law. The voting was five all and the mayor declared the motion lost. That was in order, but I think the mayor should have voted. I realize that for a motion to rescind to succeed there must be a two-thirds majority of the council, but the mayor could well have voted.

Mr. Ralston: His ruling was right.

Mr. JENKINS: Of course.

Mr. Millhouse: The Premier said the opposite.

Mr. JENKINS: The mayor could have voted, although it would not have affected the position. The point I make is that before a by-law is submitted to the Subordinate Legislation Committee in future, the council concerned should be unanimously in favour of it. That would reflect the feeling of the ratepayers.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you amend the Local Government Act to that effect?

Mr. JENKINS: Probably, if the honourable member could be sufficiently persuasive. A leader in the *News* of August 24—the day after the Premier spoke on this motion in the House—expressed the position clearly. Under the heading "You're dead right, Sir Tom" the following appeared:

> The Premier used strong words yesterday in charging the Adelaide City Council with installing parking meters "where there is not the slightest justification for them." . . . Sir Thomas Playford, in his statement to the Assembly, voiced the thoughts of a great majority of the State's motoring public when he said: "To put parking meters far and wide merely for collecting revenue cannot be justified by any circumstances whatsoever. In some instances you will see a street almost vacant waiting for some unsuspecting motorist to come along and pay his fine."

The leader concluded:

> This whole matter of meter parking came up in debate on the Mount Gambier City Council's proposal to install parking meters in Mount Gambier. This would be utterly flagrant. There is justification for parking meters in their right positions in a city the size of Adelaide. There is none in country towns.

That was the objection raised by the member for Gouger. If by-laws that come before the House in future specify the areas where parking meters are to be installed, I will be prepared to support them, but now I support the motion for the disallowance of this by-law.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore): I oppose the motion. I was amazed to hear some of the sentiments expressed by the member for Stirling. He served for many years in local government and the reflections he made must be reflections on the Local Government Act which his Government has supported for years.

Mr. Jenkins: I made no reflection on any local government body.

Mr. TAPPING: It is abundantly clear that this move of the Mount Gambier council is in accordance with its powers under the Local Government Act. The procedure was, as in all cases, that the by-law went to the Crown Law Office for examination to see whether it was legally correct (the necessary certificate was given) and the by-law was placed before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. As far as I know all members of that committee believed there was no legal objection to it. I am prepared to admit that in some instances abuses have been made of councils' powers, but I believe it is the Government's duty, in such cases, to amend the Local Government Act. The member for Stirling suggests that by-laws of this nature should specify certain streets and areas. Coming nearer home, last year the Port Adelaide City Council adopted a by-law for the

installation of parking meters in the Port Adelaide streets, and the move has not been abused. It was essential to control parking in the Port Adelaide streets, so that each motorist would have the opportunity to park his vehicle for a limited period. If we were to take a vote amongst the areas concerned the people would oppose the installation of parking meters because of the expense involved. I hope that the cost of parking will not be increased. The Port Adelaide City Council has shown that it is sincere in its move to install parking meters, for it charges only threepence for half an hour and sixpence for one hour. Before parking meters were installed in Port Adelaide and parts of Semaphore some people parked their vehicles for a considerable time, which prevented other people from getting a chance to park. Now everybody has an equal chance. I think the member for Gouger failed miserably because in presenting his case he relied on press reports from Mount Gambier showing what the mayor and others had said. He presented a very weak case and the Premier had to come to his aid.

Mr. Bywaters: He took advantage of it and had a shot at the Adelaide City Council.

Mr. TAPPING: I was coming to that. Some days previously there was a controversy between the Premier and the City Council regarding the parking of vehicles. It seems that the Premier and the member for Gouger introduced a little spleen into the matter by attacking the City Council during the move to prevent Mount Gambier from having parking meters. Mount Gambier is a progressive town and I believe that in the main street meters are necessary to provide better parking conditions. I visualize the time when meters will be necessary in the main street at Balaklava, and at Victor Harbour and Strathalbyn. I cannot follow the argument put forward by the member for Stirling.

Mr. Jenkins: Let us deal with the matter specifically, as I said.

Mr. TAPPING: That matter is related to the Local Government Act and I think that the Government should amend the Act so as to specify the streets to be associated with parking meters. Let us look at this matter soberly and not because someone is sore at the Adelaide City Council. The Premier said there was no need for councils to have the power to install parking meters, but I think they should have that power for busy streets. I ask members opposite to allow the by-law to operate and then amend the Local Government Act to specify streets. I oppose the motion.

Mr. RYAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand total, £91,544,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 26. Page 910.)

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £12,417.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I want to refer to a matter that was raised in the Address in Reply debate earlier this session by both the member for Port Adelaide and myself. It relates to the building now occupied by the Land Tax Department and the Migration Education Office. As the result of our remarks there appeared in the *News* of August 17 a report of interviews with people, so as to get their opinions about the statements made in Parliament. Under the heading of "Not an Eyesore, say Architects" there appeared the following:

A suggestion in Parliament yesterday that the old Legislative Council building on North Terrace should be pulled down because it was an eyesore brought a sharp reaction from Adelaide architects today. They agreed it would be a great pity if it were pulled down. The suggestion was made by Mr. Ryan, M.P. The Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, said architectural experts did not consider it an eyesore.

Then there were references to comments by Alderman J. C. Irwin, Mr. R. E. Greenway, senior lecturer in architecture at the Institute of Technology, and Mr. R. V. Boehm, vice-president of the Institute of Architects. The article continued:

Mr. G. Herbert, reader in architecture at the Adelaide University, said that while the building was not a gem of architecture it was not offensive, although the western side did present a chaotic appearance.

Mr. Ryan: In other words, it was an eyesore.

Mr. LAWN: It can be claimed that Mr. Herbert regarded it as an eyesore.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Read what I said about it five years ago.

Mr. LAWN: This is not the first occasion that I have referred to the matter in this place. I have done it a number of times and so has the member for West Torrens. The views of people interviewed, which I did not read to members, agree that an improvement could be made to the part of the building used by the Migration Education Office.

Mr. Ryan: They should go around the back and have a look.

Mr. LAWN: It is bad enough in the front. I will not debate whether or not the building is an eyesore, but I think it could be improved. My main argument against the present building is that it is ridiculous to have such a valuable site left as it is just to retain some form of architecture, which may or may not be an eyesore. This valuable site is alongside Parliament House and it could be used for a multi-storey building. I still hold the same views as before the people were interviewed, as reported in the *News* of August 17. At this moment the Land Tax Department building is being given a clean. I suggest that that is the result of the criticism offered by the member for Port Adelaide during the Address in Reply debate. There has also been a controversy in the press since then and I believe that it has all resulted in the cleaning of the building. I am interested in the matter only because it is a valuable site which could be used to a greater extent than it is today.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It could be used for an underground parking site.

Mr. LAWN: I have heard enough about parking this session, and I will not be dragged into a debate on that matter. I am astounded to hear some of the statements made in this place from time to time by members opposite and Ministers. My Party has advocated for many years (at least, ever since I have been a member, which is almost 12 years) that we should have a Minister of Housing. We know the capacity for work of the Treasurer and that he has occupied practically every Ministry at some time, if not as Minister, as Acting Minister during a Minister's absence. However, I was astounded when, in reply to a question asked last week by the member for Port Adelaide about the Housing Trust, he showed his lack of knowledge by saying, in relation to the waiting time for a Housing Trust house:

I can answer the latter part of the question simply by saying that there is no normal waiting time. I could not say that a person who applied today for a trust house would get one, say, in 18 months.

I then interjected by saying:

Six or seven years!

The Treasurer replied:

In some instances where a person is well housed and is able to pay the rent it might be quite a long period before he could get a house.

Mr. Quirke: I suppose that refers to a rental house and not to a purchase house?

Mr. LAWN: It refers to a rental house. What an astounding reply! In his reply he also said that he got periodic reports from the trust of the persons to whom it had allotted houses, the dates of their applications, the number of their children, whether they had had any war service and what rents they were paying. All that information is supplied to him, yet he obviously thinks that it is possible to get a rental house in a little over 18 months. The Housing Trust tells other members (not only me) that the waiting time in the metropolitan area is six or seven years and that at Elizabeth it is four years. We are told in correspondence that the waiting time is years, yet the Treasurer says there is no waiting time! I do not ask members to accept my word; I shall read some extracts from letters I have received from the trust in the last couple of years (I do not want to go back to 1950). In a letter dated January 14, 1960, the General Manager (Mr. Ramsay) said:

Because the trust has never been in the position to build anything like sufficient rental houses in the metropolitan area to meet the demands made upon it, there is now a waiting period of several years for its permanent rental houses there.

In his reply to the member for Port Adelaide the Treasurer said:

I can answer the latter part of the question simply by saying that there is no normal waiting time.

However, in this letter, the General Manager of the Housing Trust said there was a waiting period of several years for its permanent rental houses in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Quirke: The Treasurer's statement could have been correct. There is not a normal waiting time; it is an abnormal waiting time.

Mr. LAWN: The waiting time is six or seven years. In a letter dated January 21, 1960, referring to an application lodged in November, 1959, Mr. Ramsay said:

Because of the great number of applications for rental accommodation in the metropolitan area, the waiting period for the trust's permanent rental houses is a matter of years.

In a letter dated April 29, 1960, Mr. Ramsay said:

The trust has never been in the position to build anything like sufficient rental houses to meet the demands made upon it in the metropolitan area. The waiting time for one of its standard rental houses there is considerable, and Mr. X's application will not be in line for consideration for quite a long time to come.

The words "for quite a long time to come" appear in much of this correspondence. In a letter dated June 28, 1960, he said:

The applicants made application to the trust for rental houses in 1958 and 1957 respectively, but, as the trust has never been in the position to build anything like sufficient houses in the metropolitan area to keep pace with the demands upon it, there is a long waiting period for applicants. Many of those who approached the trust before these two families are also in urgent need of accommodation. As neither would be in line for a house for quite a time, and they had received notice to quit the properties they are occupying, the trust had them listed for consideration for emergency dwellings as suitable vacancies occurred.

Even though both these people had notices to quit the premises they were occupying, the trust said they would still not be in line for consideration for quite a long time. On February 7, 1961, Mr. Ramsay wrote the following letter:

Although Mrs. X's application for a "cottage", or pensioner's flat, is a long-standing one, having been lodged in January 1956, the trust is unfortunately unable to indicate just when it will be in a position to help her. The trust has never been able to build sufficient houses to keep pace with the demands made upon it, and the number of pensioners' flats it has completed since 1955, although considerable, is not enough to house more than a relatively few of the cases which it would like to assist.

In all these letters it is said that "the trust has never been able to build sufficient rental houses". Members on this side of the House have, for 12 sessions to my knowledge, been advocating a greater grant to the Housing Trust for speeding up the building of rental houses for the people who need them. We have criticized the State and Commonwealth Governments for not building sufficient houses for our people.

Mr. Shannon: What item in the Budget would you reduce to do this?

Mr. LAWN: Someone told me the member for Onkaparinga was out touring the mulga with the member for Frome (Mr. Casey). I was told that the member for Onkaparinga had become a bosom pal of the member for Frome. I did not know he was here. Today, as in 1951, but more particularly today, many people are unemployed. We know from our contact with employees in the building trades that employers have put off, and are still putting off, employees who are quite willing to accept work if it is provided. The member for Port Adelaide will probably have more to say about this, because only today he was in touch with the authorities regarding builders and what they are doing about dispensing with labour. They have done work for the Housing Trust in the past and are capable of doing it now and in the future. In a letter dated February 10, 1961, Mr. Ramsay said:

The trust has never been in the position to build sufficient rental houses in the metropolitan area to keep pace with the demands made upon it, with the result that a waiting period of several years is inevitable. Many of the cases of long-standing are also extremely urgent, and all applications are considered as far as possible in accordance with the date of application.

The letter I read a short time ago said that the application was a recent one, and we are told over the telephone that all applications have to take their turn, that when allotments are being considered applications are dealt with in accordance with the date of application. The normal waiting time is six to seven years. The next letter dated June 27, 1961, states:

Unfortunately, the trust is able to provide only relatively few of these flats for elderly women living alone and many women whose applications were lodged a considerable time before Mrs. P's. are still waiting to be assisted. I regret, therefore, that much as the trust would like to help Mrs. P. there is little likelihood that it will be able to provide her with accommodation for quite some time to come.

On another occasion I wrote to the trust twice and the first reply, dated January 23, 1961, states:

Mrs. T's. case will continue to have consideration when circumstances make it possible, but unfortunately the trust is able to provide relatively few of the "cottage" flats and there are many applications which are also of long standing from persons whose need is no less urgent than hers. I regret that the position is such that I am unable to give any indication when it might be possible for us to assist Mrs. T.

The next letter, dated, August 8, 1961, is as follows:

Mrs. D. and her late husband applied for a rental house in the metropolitan area in July, 1956, but thought it advisable, because of Mr. D's. health, to refuse the house which the trust offered them at Seaton in October, 1956. In August, 1956, some time after her husband's death, Mrs. D. asked to be considered for a pensioner's "cottage" flat. The trust will take Mrs. D's. 1956 application into account, but the difficulty is that it is able to provide only relatively few of the "cottage" flats and there are still many women waiting for them who applied in 1955, the first year this type of housing was made available.

I have several letters containing a similar statement, "The women who applied when these cottage flats first became available are still awaiting accommodation." Members in the metropolitan area know of the problem. Some of these ladies who come to us from day

to day made their first application for a cottage flat when the flats became available for single women living alone. This type of accommodation was introduced after I became a member, but some of the first applicants are still waiting for the trust to build sufficient flats to provide them with some sort of accommodation. Some of these people are living in pretty terrible circumstances.

Surely the Treasurer must realize that there is a considerable waiting time for Housing Trust houses, whether a cottage flat, a pensioner's flat, or a house. I trust, now that we have shown him that he is labouring under a misapprehension regarding this position, that he will have a discussion with the chairman of the Housing Trust to ascertain the true position for himself to see if he can do anything about it. My colleagues and I will offer him full support if he can make money available or get the trust to engage more builders to speed up the programme, because more houses are badly needed.

Members have already referred to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department and I raise the matter again. Owing to the unemployment which commenced late last year a number of people have found difficulty in existing on the unemployment allowance provided by the Commonwealth Social Services Department. Some of them applied to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department for additional help and many of them were accommodated. I have no criticism to offer in that respect, but in many instances it was found that applicants for additional relief possessed a motor car, television set, radio or some other article for which they were still paying under a hire-purchase agreement. In those cases the department told them that they would first have to sell the motor car, television set, or radio set or give it away. At least they had to get rid of it before the board would assist them.

In some cases when we describe a vehicle as a "motor car" it is really a "bomb" and if the owner had to sell the vehicle he would probably not get any more than £50 or £70 for it. Some would be lucky to get that much, but to that family that vehicle means the world because the husband is able to take the family out for a trip during week-ends and on public holidays.

Mr. Quirke: To Cross Roads on a Sunday afternoon.

Mr. LAWN: It doesn't matter where they go. They may go to the Botanic Garden, to the beaches, to Clare or the Barossa Valley to see some of the near-north sights. It means much to a family to have a car, but the actual cash value of the vehicle, if it has to be sold, may be practically nothing and it is wrong for a Government institution to insist that the vehicle should be sold. I was approached by one of Adelaide's largest retail firms, and I ask members to remember that the company did not approach me for my assistance on something that was of particular benefit only to the company. I was approached about television sets, radios and other electrical appliances that the company had sold under hire-purchase agreements to clients who had sought assistance from the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. The applicants had been told that they must get rid of these articles, but the company suggested that it was prepared to suspend payments on those articles until the people were re-employed. Firstly, it gave letters that it was prepared to suspend payments for three months. I telephoned the then Chairman of the Public Relief Board (Mr. McNally) and told him that I considered it a hardship that these people, who were thrown out of work—according to the newspapers for only a short time—should be forced to get rid of their television sets, etc., and I suggested that, where a company provided an individual with a letter to take to the board indicating that payments were suspended for a definite period, the board should not insist on that applicant disposing of the article in order to obtain relief. Mr. McNally said that there would be a meeting of the board the following morning and that he would put the suggestion forward at that meeting, and I am pleased to say that after the meeting Mr. McNally telephoned me to say that the board had agreed to the suggestion. As a result, the board agreed early this year to continue issuing relief to applicants even though they had wireless or television sets or such things as that, provided they produced a letter from the company concerned stating that the company had suspended payments.

Unfortunately, that is not the whole situation. Other difficulties have occurred with the board concerning women whose husbands have been sent to gaol or have died. In a Christian community, which we claim to be, one can hardly believe the policy that this department is carrying out. The company that I mentioned has forwarded me a statement which I shall read to members to let them know what the Children's Welfare and Public Relief

Department is doing in cases of extreme hardship. The credit manager of that company has interviewed me at the House on several occasions, and we have discussed particular cases over the telephone. Extracts from the letter are as follows:

It is found that immediately a member of the community becomes unemployed, unless the person terminates any existing hire-purchase agreement covering a "non-essential" article the application for assistance from the Children's Welfare Department is rejected. It is the policy of my employers to avoid the unpleasantness of repossession, and for this reason I approached the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department with the following suggestion, that provided my employers agreed in writing to forgo payment of the monthly rentals during a period of unemployment, the unemployed would receive assistance from the Welfare Department and retain possession of the deemed "non-essential" item.

Both the manager and I made representations to the Chairman of the board, with the result that I have already indicated. It goes on:

The department agreed to this suggestion and in doing so virtually saved hundreds of honest people from losing their equity in costly appliances. A decision to reject the suggestion would have created an enormous amount of repossessions, plus the after repossession legal proceedings. Court actions relating to terminated hire-purchase contracts are at present swamping the various local courts in South Australia, and it is difficult to realize how the courts would have fared if the suggestion had been rejected.

We now find that any person applying for relief cannot continue to house the goods classified as "non-essential" irrespective of whether a letter concerning the deferment of payment is forthcoming. This is quite absurd, and allow me to submit you an example. Mr. and Mrs. X obtained a television receiver under contract that provided for monthly payments, and the contract was conducted in a satisfactory manner until Mr. X was sentenced to prison. His wife applied for and received relief from the Welfare Department because she obtained a letter from my office. She then applied for additional relief, and her request was rejected because she had a "non-essential" article housed in her home. A Mr. Y then agreed to take over the payment of the account and same was transferred to his name. My company supplied Mrs. X with correspondence advising that her request for a transfer in order to relieve her of any further obligation had been accepted. Mr. Y then became bound by the various terms and conditions; in other words, Y became responsible for the payment of the monthly amounts, etc., and, because he appreciated Mrs. X's unfortunate position, he allowed her to keep the unit in her home at no expense. The department was again approached for the added relief and the request was refused. They claimed that Y was, in fact, assisting Mrs. X and instead of purchasing for himself a "non-essential" article and leaving same housed elsewhere, he should give the lady a monthly rental in order to assist her to rear and feed her family.

This is the action of the Government that we have in South Australia which some members on the other side boastfully refer to as the Playford Government. They are proud to claim that they are supporters of a Government which tells a woman whose husband is in gaol that a person in the community who is good enough to provide her with a television set, when he is making monthly payments for it—not a cash payment—should give that woman money to assist her to rear and feed her family rather than pay for a television set and put it in the home for her and her family's entertainment.

Mr. Ryan: Perhaps the Government will alter that next year before election time.

Mr. LAWN: What a lousy deal to get from this Government in 1961!

Mr. Bywaters: If such a person did pay something to the woman, the department would probably suggest that he was a *de facto* husband.

Mr. LAWN: It is likely to make any suggestion. Had I, prior to my mother passing away, purchased a television or radio set for her on hire-purchase—as I would have had to do because I would not have been able to pay cash—and put it in her house, and had she had occasion to seek relief, the department would have said, "Get rid of that television set first", yet I would have been paying for it. I would have been told that instead of my paying to provide her with some entertainment to relieve her hours of monotony I should help to keep her and rear her family, and so forth. That is what it means. I thought such days as that had gone. The letter continues:

We should compliment Y for his gracious act in creating a little happiness for the unfortunate family who were facing poverty because of an action carried out by the father. We say that we are not our brothers' keepers, and that we should not be blamed for others' sins. If a husband commits a crime he pays the penalty by serving the sentence imposed by the court. We, as Christians—on this side, at least—say that that man's wife and children should not suffer because of the sins of the husband. Instead of commending the people who were good enough to come to this family's assistance, as this letter suggests, the department criticizes and condemns them. The letter continues:

Having dealt with the family faced with temporary financial embarrassment, now let us cover a family confronted with a different problem. Mr. and Mrs. A enter into an agreement covering a television receiver that gives their children delight and knowledge because the parents select suitable programmes for the family. Mr. A holds a responsible position—

It would surprise members if I were to mention the position this particular gentleman occupied in the city of Adelaide—

but, of course, like many of us, is unable to pay cash for the unit and ensures that he pays regular monthly payments until he is stricken with an illness. The same procedure as previously described is adopted by the wife, and she obtains a letter to secure relief from the Welfare Department. The husband has a relapse and dies, and on being advised of the occurrence the company writes extending its sympathy and defers payment of the account for six months in order to allow the wife time in which to overcome her great loss and to plan the future of her family. We realize how difficult it is for a woman to gain employment and Mrs. A then applies for relief in addition to the social service benefits. My employers have already withdrawn payment for a period of six months, and yet the contract was terminated by "voluntary surrender" on the advice received from Mrs. A's legacy adviser, who wrote a covering letter in which the following lines appear, "You may recall that a fortnight or more ago I rang you requesting that your company should arrange to repossess a television set which was bought under hire-purchase by Mrs. A and her late husband in August of last year. Subsequent to the death of her husband, Mrs. A has been entirely dependent upon a Commonwealth widow's pension for sustenance for herself and her four children with additional help from the Children's Welfare Department. The latter assistance which is essential to supplement the meagre pension allowance will be discontinued if the television set is still in Mrs. A's possession after Wednesday of next week."

Mr. Fred Walsh: I received similar advice last week about another person.

Mr. LAWN: I am not concerned whether Government supporters doubt the authenticity of what I am reading. I know it is correct. I also have the verification from the member for West Torrens, who has just interjected. The letter continues:

Mrs. A. has four children to rear and whilst a television receiver can never replace the loss of a father, its presence in the home could be most beneficial to the family. It is felt that our efforts to assist Mrs. A. deserved far more consideration than was given by the department.

I challenge any honourable member who has not already spoken to oppose the sentiments expressed in this letter, which continues:

During the great depression years it was necessary for the South Australian Government to pass two Acts, namely, the Debt Adjustment Act and the Farmers Relief Act and I suggest that a special board be appointed consisting of members of Parliament, of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department and an outside person to represent the private enterprise companies in order to judge the merits of cases previously described. That is of course if you do not deem my approach worthy of amending the existing additional relief ruling. Proof of these cases can and will be presented should you require and it is hoped that you will receive my opinion as constructive criticism as same is tendered.

According to its advertisements the company concerned is one of the largest of its description in Australia. It quotes its capital investment in its press advertisements. One can see from the contents of that letter that in cases of hardship the company suspends payments, such as where a husband is not too well or where he dies. It has even transferred an account to other people who are prepared to leave a television set in the possession of the wife and children. I highly commend the company, and I am not one in the habit of commending any company, as honourable members opposite know. I very much appreciate its action and the action of any other company that does likewise. However, here we have our State Government nullifying the Christian efforts of private companies and insisting that in such cases the television sets should be taken back by the hire-purchase firm. Although the letter did not indicate it in detail, it mentioned a subsequent happening after an article was re-possessed. There are agents who purchase such sets for a mere song and then the company turns around and says to the woman concerned, "You have to make up the difference between what we have received and the full price mentioned in the agreement you signed." Such cases are going through our courts and there would be more such cases in the courts had the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department not acceded to the request we made earlier this year.

I do not want to make political capital out of this, but the Government should get in touch with the department and say to it, "You must alter your policy and adopt a much more Christian attitude to these people, who need help in times of stress." I sincerely hope that the Government, as the result of my representations today, will adopt a different attitude in future. I may be too optimistic because I know that from time to time other honourable members on this side and I have made representations to the Government without avail. The letter I have read was written

by a company manager who is handling such cases daily. It speaks for itself and puts the case clearly and concisely, and I hope that at long last we may see a change in the Government's attitude.

I now shall deal with the question of equal pay for sexes. During the first session of this Parliament, in 1959, I made reference to this and mentioned that we had two ladies in Parliament, Mrs. Steele, the House of Assembly member for Burnside and the Hon. Mrs. Cooper, M.L.C., and I suggested that during the life of this Parliament some action should be taken by the Government to provide for equal pay for the sexes.

Mr. Fred Walsh: They get it here.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I made that statement in 1959 and I will refer to it further in this debate. To the people of Burnside district it does not matter whether they are represented by Mr. Clarke or Mrs. Steele.

Mr. Fred Walsh: There is no difference between them.

Mr. LAWN: There is no difference in the salary and allowances received by a female or male member of Parliament. If I visit a male doctor or Mrs. Steele visits a lady doctor, both doctors make the same charge and she does not get her treatment any cheaper merely because she is a lady. For my wife and four daughters I have to pay the same charges for them as when I see the doctor, and this would also apply to a specialist's charges. Should they or I have to go to hospital, the same fee is charged. Whether one is a man or a woman makes no difference to the charge. From time to time we find it necessary to consult a lawyer. I know, not only from my own experience but from that of many other people and of the trade union movement, that it does not matter whether the solicitor or barrister acting for one is male or female: exactly the same fee is charged. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) and the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) would verify that. Also, it matters not whether the client is a man or a woman: the charge is the same. But a female client may be working for her living and be lucky if she is earning 75 per cent of the male rate for the job. I said something like that in 1959, and here we are in 1961 approaching the death knell of this Parliament. We are looking forward to you, Mr. Chairman, singing your swan song before this Parliament ends. I was hoping that, because of the action taken by the New South Wales Government, this Government would follow suit. I should not expect it to provide for equal pay for the sexes overnight; I should be content with legislation similar to that passed by the New South Wales Parliament, which allowed a period of three years in which to effect equal pay for the sexes.

I desire now to refer to the trade union policy on this matter, and the policy of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, which represents the trade union movement in Australia. This pamphlet entitled *Equal Pay for the Sexes* lays down the council's policy:

> As a first step towards this objective, the Trade Union Movement has adopted the principle of the 1951 International Labour Office convention: Equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value.

I think that is clear and fair. I have just instanced the equal value, as near as we can estimate it to be, of the work done by male and female members of Parliament. The remuneration for each member is the same; we do not have to argue about it. The work done by a man and a woman doctor or the advice tendered by a male or female solicitor is of equal value. So we say "equal remuneration".

Mr. Clark: That has been studied internationally, hasn't it?

Mr. Lawn: Yes.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Since 1919?

Mr. LAWN: Yes. This pamphlet says:

> At Geneva in 1951, Government and employer representatives abstained from voting on Convention No. 100—equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value—but supported recommendation No. 90, the implementing document which accompanied the Convention.

The conference was debating Convention No. 100—equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value. The Australian Government and the employers representing Australian employers refrained from voting on that, but they supported recommendation No. 90, which was the implementation of equal pay for the sexes. So that the employers and Commonwealth Government of Australia in 1951 supported the principle.

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

Mr. LAWN: The pamphlet continues:

> The A.C.T.U. has led two deputations to the Menzies Government on equal pay. The first in 1957 with a petition containing 60,000 signatures, and again in September, 1960, with demands for equal pay and to give a practical lead by granting equal pay to its own women employees. A similar type of

reply was received on both occasions, viz., that the Government considered this is a matter for the courts, though it is not opposed to the principle.

I will have something to say about what the Arbitration Court has said in that regard later. The pamphlet continues:

Having regard to international obligations, this reply by a responsible Government cannot be accepted.

Dealing with developments in Australia and other countries, regarding equal pay, it states:

The present Federal Government has maintained its inability to ratify Convention No. 100 because of limitations by the Constitution. No positive attempt has been made to bring about agreement by Australian States . . . except with those I shall now indicate. The pamphlet states:

In March, 1958, the then Premier of New South Wales, the late Hon. J. J. Cahill, announced that he intended to introduce legislation to implement equal pay in that State. In May, 1958, the Minister for Labour and National Service, the Hon. H. H. Holt, made a statement in the Commonwealth Parliament in which he reiterated the Government's attitude on the matter of equal pay as stated in October, 1953, and commented unfavourably on the proposals of the New South Wales Government. He said, "It would be doubly unfortunate, in our view, if one State should act on its own in this matter", and then proceeded to give reasons against, based purely on supposition. In spite of these dire predictions and very much to the credit of the New South Wales Government, who undertook the responsibility of pioneering this reform, it is pleasing to report as follows: The New South Wales Industrial Arbitration (Females Rates of Pay) Act of 1958 has ensured that: (1) a full 75 per cent of the male basic wage was restored to women workers of this State; (2) 10,000 women teachers, approximately 1,000 public servants, certain categories of women in local government, 15 extra sections of the Shop Assistants Awards which have affected thousands of women, 400 to 500 women petrol sellers under State awards, 45 "A" and "B" grade cooks under the Hospitals (Metropolitan) Award, and tobacco workers, and others have been placed on the "Equal Pay Formula" pronounced by the Industrial Commission in November, 1959. All of these women will reach the full male rate of pay for the job on January 1, 1963.

Perhaps one of the main benefits to flow from this legislation is that a comprehensive review of women's wages has been necessary. The terms of the Act, which conforms to article 4 of recommendation 90, do not apply to women engaged in work essentially performed by females but upon which male employees may also be employed or those who perform work which may be of the same or a like nature and of equal value to that performed by males, but whose rates of wages are not fixed by the same award or industrial agreement as that which fixes rates for those males.

This year the Tasmanian Premier introduced a Bill to give effect to equal pay for the sexes. As far as I know that Bill has not been determined by the Tasmanian Parliament. The pamphlet continues:

In Queensland during 1960 the female basic wage was raised to a full 75 per cent of the male rate. This was the last State in the Commonwealth where this matter was outstanding. Women radiographers, chemists, dentists, physiotherapists, some meat process workers and others have been successful in claims for equal rates. The Queensland Labor Party promised legislation in its policy speech during the 1960 State election campaign. In Victoria some categories of workers do receive equal rates, but many, including teachers, do not.

It was foreshadowed (the A.C.T.U. had information and so did the Teachers' Federation) that a private member in Victoria would introduce a Bill this session giving effect to the principle of equal pay. The pamphlet continues:

In regard to Western Australia, equal margins have been obtained by teachers, librarians and others; equal pay operates for members of Parliament, journalists, pharmacists, barmaids and policewomen. A deputation to the Premier of this State during 1960 brought the answer that the Government was not unsympathetic but needed to be satisfied that economic difficulties and unemployment would not follow. In South Australia we find that women teachers and others are campaigning for equal pay.

Having a look at the position abroad in the world we find that 32 countries have equal pay provisions in their Constitutions, 34 countries have ratified Convention No. 100, 38 countries have equal pay legislation, 43 countries give equal pay to civil servants, 77 countries have equal pay for teachers. The pamphlet continues:

In the United Kingdom non-industrial civil servants reach full equality on January 1, 1961. Teachers by April 1, 1961. Certain other salaried workers, including national health service, electricity and gas authorities and British Transport Commission are being similarly adjusted. Women employed in the London County Council received equal pay for equal work before the introduction of the scheme under which the afore-mentioned women have benefited.

Women are paid the same salary as men for doing the same work in medicine, dentistry, physiotherapy, radiography, university teaching, journalism, broadcasting, architecture, Ministers of the Crown and members of Parliament, salaried magistrates and solicitors, pharmacists working in hospitals, administrative, professional and technical workers in local government.

In Canada the position is that the Federal Government and seven States out of 10 have passed equal pay laws. In the United States

civil servants have received equal pay since 1923, and 20 States have equal pay legislation. In Italy an agreement was signed on July 16, 1960 on the question of equal pay for women industrial workers numbering 1,500,000. After two years' negotiation it is felt this agreement has the merit of winning a better position for the woman worker in the nation's productive set-up. It is intended to open negotiations now for equal pay in other sections of employment.

In Norway an investigating committee set up by the Government recommended ratification of Convention No. 100 saying, "The measures necessary were not inconsistent with present methods of determining rates of remuneration." Ratification was effected on September 24, 1959. In India, the Constitution of 1949 makes equal pay for equal work for men and women a directive principle of State policy.

In a country like India, which many claim is a backward country and could not be classified with the United States or with the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, provision is made for the principle of equal pay. The pamphlet continues:

In the Federal Republic of Germany the basic law of 1949 entitles women equal rights with men and provides that no person may be discriminated against because of sex. The women's divisions of the German Federation of Trade Unions have done a great deal to help implement the principle of equal pay.

In New Zealand legislation passed in November 1960 provides that every wage fixing authority when fixing the salaries or wages of Government employees shall give effect to the following principles: (*a*) differentiations based on sex shall be eliminated where equal work is performed under equal conditions; (*b*) in cases where work is of a kind which is exclusively performed by women and there are no corresponding scales of pay for men to which they can fairly be related, regard shall be had to scales of pay for women in other sections of employment where the principle stated in (*a*) has been or is being implemented. This elimination of differentiations based on sex shall be effected in three equal stages, becoming fully effective on April 1, 1963.

It appears that South Australia is lagging behind this reform in other parts of Australia and elsewhere in the world. During the dinner adjournment the member for Murray drew my attention to a publication issued by the Institute of Public Affairs in Victoria for July-September 1961, and at page 82 there appears the following:

By 1962 there must be equal pay for equal work by men and women workers. There shall also be "close collaboration" between members in matters of labour legislation and social security.

This is related to the countries of the European Common Market. Also during the adjournment the member for Gawler gave me a copy of the September issue of the *South Australian Teachers Journal*, in which the following appears:

Do you know the full implication of these two words? They do not mean just more money for women, they embody the finest principle of the Twentieth Century—co-operation and understanding between men and women. Those men and women who, during the perils of war, grew to realize that working together was being one, in attitude and objective. Those men and women who, together, love, train and nurse their children and hope that their futures are assured. In many countries of the world they are, because the principle of equal pay has been recognized and incorporated in their economy. Equal pay, according to the I.L.O. Convention (No. 100) means "equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value."

Referring to an interjection by the member for West Torrens prior to the tea adjournment, regarding the 1951 International Labor Office Convention, this journal states:

This principle has been stated internationally in the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, the United Nations Charter in 1945, the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Australia was a signatory to all these. The International Labor Organization Convention (100), in 1951, reiterates the principle of equal pay. Although the Australian delegation did not vote on Convention, it supported the adoption of Recommendation 90, under which they are internationally committed to grant E.P. to their own employees and to consult with the States on the implementing of the principle.

Then follows a list of the countries that have ratified the Convention or given effect to the principle. It also draws attention to New South Wales and says:

At a Commonwealth level an Equal Pay Bill was introduced but defeated, with the Government attitude being that equal pay is a matter for arbitration, not legislation. Yet the Arbitration Court has implied in its 1953 judgment in the standard hours and basic wage case that it has not the authority to grant equal pay for women. The judgment reads:

> The Arbitration Court is neither a social nor an economic legislature. Its function under section 25 of the Act is to prevent or settle specific industrial disputes . . . It is not the function of the court to aim at such social and economic changes as may seem to be desirable to the members of the tribunal.

I do not know whether we have had a statement from the South Australian Government that it believes this is a matter for the court, but from a 1953 judgment of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission we learn that it feels that this is a matter for the Legislature and not for the court. The Commonwealth could not legislate for employees beyond its control. It would have to be a matter for the

Commonwealth Parliament and the various State Parliaments to pass the necessary legislation making it effective throughout Australia. I hope South Australia will not be the last Government to give equal pay to men and women. We were the last to get the 44-hour week, the 40-hour week, annual leave and one of the last to get long service leave.

Mr. Bywaters: We were the first to give women equal franchise.

Mr. LAWN: I have heard the Treasurer boast that South Australia was the first Australian State to do that. Now I want to refer to the unemployment position and to read the 151st psalm to celebrate the publication of the Commonwealth Budget in August, 1961, which Budget played an important part in the Budget we are now discussing. That psalm reads as follows:

The aged and the widows rejoiceth, for there is apportioned to their lot a little more. Their pension increaseth by five bob a week.

The workless, they shall shout the praise of the Budget on high, for unto them that hath not shall be given an extra ten shillings a week.

The home builder shall be glad and multiply, for instead of the mighty eight and one-third per cent, the sales tax now requireth only two and one-half per cent.

Unto they that dependeth on the endowment of the child, there cometh only wailing and gnashing of the teeth, for the Budget hath forgotteneth them altogether. It is as if they were not.

The war-lords in the land, they shall run and clap their hands with joy for unto them that in the past had only two hundred million pounds hath been given four and one-half million more. And no longer shall their hearts faint and fail them for fear least atom bombs and four wheel-drive jeeps be taken away from them.

The company owners of the Order of the High Profit shall wring their hands together with glee and shout loud praise, for nowhere shall they discover words which meaneth they shall have to cut their profits to provide work for their employees during the credit squeeze, which existeth not, except in the minds of the spenders, who hath not what to spend with.

That psalm (and I expected that it would draw some ridicule from the Government benches but because of the criticism Government members have suffered from members on this side this week no doubt members opposite are rendered speechless) was compiled by a minister of religion and spoken in his church at sermon time about three weeks ago. It is not something that would be prepared by Opposition members, or Communists or red-raggers, but it indicates how this religious man felt about the Government's attitude towards the people. It was delivered in a church south of Adelaide. In the *News* on August 16 appeared the following letter to the editor:

It is refreshing to note the optimism of the Prime Minister in giving his views of the economy of this country. We, the Christian leaders of many of the churches in the Woodville district, view with concern the tendency not to regard unemployment in the realistic terms of human hardship and stress. We believe that the right to work is a basic right. It neither butters bread nor buys needful footwear for the family for the breadwinner to be told that he is included in the percentage 2.5 of Australia's work force now unemployed. We call upon all sections of the community—

I hope Government members realize they are included in this—

to accept and shoulder moral responsibility and look to the leaders both in local and State Government to devise essential projects which may absorb much of the strain being felt, especially by recent arrivals to this State. Those of us who are not confronted with the lack of a livelihood may well be challenged to display sympathy and forbearance, and, wherever possible, offer help of a practical nature to those who, through no fault of their own, cannot find work.

That letter was signed by John Hughes, of the Woodville and District Ministers Fraternal, West Croydon. Even though the Liberal Party, whether it be State or Commonwealth, has no sympathy with or interest in the unemployed of this country, Christians (not only those who claim to be Christians but those who preach and practise the principles of Christianity from day to day and seven days a week) are in full accord with the advocacy of the Party I have the honour to represent. They feel we should view this matter seriously, give it the serious consideration to which it is entitled, and see that we do everything within our power to provide as much work as possible for those unfortunate people who are unemployed; yet ever since the credit squeeze started the Commonwealth Government has said that it would not last long.

I quoted articles in the South Australian newspapers earlier this year that contradicted this statement; some articles said it would not last long and others said it would get worse before it got better. The member for West Torrens last night referred to a statement made by Sir Garfield Barwick, who said that the position had become worse than the Government foresaw when it introduced the credit squeeze, but nowhere do we find any sympathy from the Commonwealth Treasurer or the Prime Minister or any of his colleagues,

or any statement by this State Government opposing the Commonwealth Government's credit squeeze or policy.

On Monday last the Treasurer was in Canberra attending the Commonwealth Conference of the Liberal Party, preparing a policy speech for the forthcoming elections. There has been no change in attitude on the part of the Liberal Party, Commonwealth or State, since that function, so the Treasurer cannot claim that he went there and threatened High Court action against the Commonwealth Government unless it changed its policy. Although I did not see this television show, I heard about it, and I then read in the press this report about the exhibition of the Commonwealth Treasurer:

On a Sunday night Melbourne television programme Mr. Holt said the Federal Government would intervene in the next basic wage hearing by the Arbitration Commission. Mr. Holt on the same programme said the present unemployment was only one per cent above the normal requirements.

Mr. Ryan: They charge £5 for a licence to look at that!

Mr. LAWN: Yes, the Commonwealth Government charges £5 to watch an exhibition of the Commonwealth Treasurer making a statement to the effect that the present unemployment is only one per cent above the normal requirements. What are normal requirements? Prior to the advent of the Menzies Government, and since, our policy has been (it has always been) full employment. Members of this House can remember that our Treasurer and the present Prime Minister advocated a policy of a high level of employment. When we challenged them and said they desired some percentage of unemployment, they denied this and said that they believed in a policy of high employment. There is a difference between a policy of high employment and a policy of full employment.

Mr. Jennings: A high level of employment pre-supposes that there is some unemployment.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. The Commonwealth Government claims that unemployment now is no more than 2.5 per cent of the work force, but I can remember when it said that it was only one per cent. Our own Treasurer said during this session that the percentage was not high, that it was only one per cent; however, it is a depression with that percentage. If anyone wants to know what the word "depression" means he has only to be unemployed to know. To the thousands unemployed now, this country is suffering a depression.

The Commonwealth Statistician includes in the work force of Australia people who work for themselves. Part-time workers are regarded as being in employment, as also are the 8,000 now stood off from General Motors-Holden's. When the Commonwealth Statistician's figures are published, they will include these men as being in work. Unpaid workers in rural industries, self-employed people, employers themselves and members of the defence forces (except full-time university students doing national training) are all included in the work force. If we took out employers, self-employed people and members of the defence forces we would find that over four per cent of the actual work force would be unemployed, so we are reaching a considerably higher percentage of unemployment. No wonder ministers of religion are viewing this matter seriously and are coming out and speaking, openly declaring themselves on the side of those who are unemployed. If we are going to remain a Christian country and retain our religious freedoms, we must act as Christians and not just talk loosely about Communism and irresponsibly refer to others as being Communists. If we want to retain our Christian way of life and freedom, we must not merely talk about it and imply that all people opposed to us politically or otherwise are Communists. We must act as Christians. I challenge the State and Commonwealth Governments to scrap their present policy and put into effect a Christian policy.

This afternoon I mentioned the policy of this Government as expressed through the Public Relief Board. Nobody can say that that it is a Christian policy. On Monday evening the gentleman in charge of the recently established St. Vincent de Paul Society's shelter for homeless men at Whitmore Square, Adelaide, telephoned me saying he had two persons at the home, one of whom was over 73 years. That Society provides shelter for the men for one night only. One man had recently been to the Adelaide Hospital, but after one or two days' treatment had been discharged because he was not sick enough to be detained. He was aged and infirm and the Royal Adelaide Hospital does not keep such cases. I was told that both men required medical attention, that neither was receiving a pension, and that neither knew there was such a thing as the Commonwealth age pension. I was asked to call on Tuesday morning to interview the men and see what could be done for them. It would make members' hearts bleed to get around our community from day

to day and see how the other half lives. Nowadays I see people walking out of the park lands early in the morning obviously having spent the night there.

When I saw these two men I found, in fact, that one did receive a pension, but had experienced trouble because he went to Port Pirie having asked that his pension be sent there by the Salvation Army authority. However, instead of sending his pension to Port Pirie they mistakenly sent it to Port Augusta. I straightened that out because the Port Augusta postmaster promised to return the cheque. The other man was aged 68 years and suffered from neurasthenia. He could not write his name, but made a cross. I filled out the documents necessary for him to obtain the age pension, having obtained them from the Sturt Street post office. I asked this man why he had not applied for a pension earlier and he told me that he did not know anything about it. He said that Mr. Johnson, the man in charge of the home, told him of it first. I asked him how he had been living and he said that until he got neurasthenia and had trouble with his hands he was a piano tuner, had his own tools, and earned a little like that. In that way he had been able to obtain a bed in some doss-house and to buy a pie or pasty to keep himself going.

I mention those instances to show that the unemployed who need help and sympathy are not all bludgers. They are not just living and walking around the streets not wanting work. Here was a man, aged 68 who, until his hands reached such a condition that he could not work, was prepared to knock on doors and tune pianos to earn a living. He did that until early this year when he became 68.

Others were deliberately thrown out of work by the Commonwealth Government's fiscal policy known as the credit squeeze. If I were unemployed I would make two wishes: firstly, that I was a big Alsatian dog; and, secondly, that Harold Holt was a tree. Moses said, 5,000 years ago, "Pick up your shovel, mount your ass or camel and I will lead you to the promised land". If the people don't watch out Menzies will take away their shovel, sell their camel, kick their ass and give away the promised land. We are fast reaching the position we reached in 1933. I remember the depression years of 1930-1933. I walked the streets for three years asking for a job and one of the first questions asked of me was whether I was married or single. If the reply was "single" an applicant was out. However, if a man married hoping that would make a difference, the result was no better. Shacks comprising rags, bags and bits of iron were built along the River Torrens and, in those days to the tune of "When your hair has turned to silver", we used to sing this song:

When your hair has turned to silver,
I will still be on the dole.
I will live on the banks of the Torrens,
Where the rats you can't control.
I'll collect my daily rations
And bring them home to you.
When I get the old age pension
I will will it all to you.

After we had experienced the Second World War and had full employment after 1941 I kept those words because I always knew that we would see those days again under the old policy. When the Menzies Government was defeated in 1941—not by the people but by members of Parliament—and the Curtin Government took over, we had full employment within six months. Factories were built and the member for West Torrens referred to them last night. They were established practically overnight to manufacture munitions and they have stood us in good stead since the war. I then changed my opinion and did not think I should ever need those words again. I did not think that I would hear people singing them again, but I regret to say that with the present-day conditions under which over four per cent of the real work force is unemployed in the circumstances I have mentioned there is no doubt that there may be unemployed people in Australia singing the same words that we sang from 1930 to 1933.

Mr. Harold Holt, the Commonwealth Treasurer, is proud to say in a television exhibition that the unemployed represent only one per cent over normal requirements.

Mr. Ryan: And nothing to worry about!

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and nothing to worry about. The conditions with which we in this country are faced today Mr. Holt would have us believe need be improved by only 25 per cent. Apparently he wants to leave 75 per cent of the misery where it is today. I am proud this evening to be able to say that the religious fraternity of this State, not only down in the southern part of South Australia but in the districts between Adelaide and Port Adelaide, is on our side, as I have instanced by the references I have made this evening. I hope that the people of this country will leave no doubt in anyone's mind on December 9 just where they stand. I do not know

whether our representations and the other representations being made to the Government on behalf of the unemployed will have any effect upon our Treasurer, or whether we shall during the forthcoming Commonwealth electoral campaign find him going around the State kissing in Menzies' pocket. I still wish I were a really big Alsatian dog and that Harold Holt were a tree. I know that one Government member (who had not intended to speak in this debate) is rearing to go, so I shall make way for him. I hope that at least our representations may have some effect some time this year. I am not happy about the Budget. I am not going to say that I am supporting it or that I am condemning it because, as I instanced earlier, any State Government's finance is to a large extent tied up with the Commonwealth Budget.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): Members have just listened to a speech containing so much repetitive nonsense that I shudder when I think, if the *Hansard* reporters record it all, what a lot of money it will cost the taxpayers to get it into print.

Mr. Riches: He said something.

Mr. SHANNON: He said a lot; he said so much he almost sent me to sleep.

Mr. Ryan: That wouldn't have been very hard.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Port Adelaide's voice would have kept me awake. It appears to me that our friends on the Opposition benches have one ear to the ground and one ear on December 9. They are mainly concerned with crying havoc as a major call for the ear of the unwary elector that he is in for trouble. In other words, the prophet of doom has come to tell the unfortunate electors that hard times are going to be their lot. I could not imagine any Party seeking the suffrage of the elector expecting to get very much of a return for its expenditure if doom is all it has to offer.

Mr. Ryan: It was not created by us, though.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Port Adelaide still implies that doom is their lot. We deny it. Not only do we say that there is no such thing as doom facing the people of Australia, but we say that they are in for as good a time as the people in any part of the world, and that is saying a fair bit these days. The member for Port Adelaide will have an opportunity to say his piece and no doubt he will again weep on the shoulders of the poor unfortunate unemployed. I am just as sorry as he is for the man who has no job, but I ask the honourable member or any other member opposite what the Opposition would have done had they been on the Treasury benches this year and had to prepare a Budget for the coming year's expenditure.

Mr. Ryan: Tell us what you have done.

Mr. SHANNON: If the honourable member keeps his ears open and something else shut for a moment I shall be able to tell him. Perhaps he would have said that the Government did not budget for a large enough deficit. He could have said that, for we are not budgeting for a deficit at all; we are in the happy state that our overall budgetary position gives us an increase of money to spend this current year of about £6,500,000 over and above the previous year. It is an all-time high as far as State expenditure is concerned.

Mr. Ryan: It is an all-time high in other respects, including unemployment.

Mr. SHANNON: Wake up, or, better still, go to sleep! It appears to me that honourable members opposite would not have had anything to talk about on the Budget had it not been for one of our very young and, at this stage, quickly-learning members. I refer to the member for Gouger. I have had a long experience in this Parliament, and it is my opinion that the member for Port Adelaide will never make the grade; he started too late, and old dogs and new tricks do not go together. I do not think he will ever learn the tricks of running this House as well as the member for Gouger is likely to do. The member for Gouger, in my opinion, has the makings of good material, and I am going to take him in hand and train him a bit. It is obvious that he has the ability to get under the other fellow's skin. I do not think I would be far wrong in saying that 75 per cent of the time the Opposition devoted to this debate was spent in attacking the honourable member; they have not worried about the Budget. In fact, the Budget poses a bit of a problem for anyone who wants to criticize it. I think the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) pointed that out when he spoke, and I agree with him. It is a very difficult thing to get up and make some critical comment about something when there is nothing that can be criticized.

The Treasurer, in presenting his 23rd Budget, can claim a very proud record. I am not flattering him because I want something from him; I know I will not get it from him, anyway, because he has the courage to say "No" when one is after something one should not have. As far as his finance is concerned—and

I am not giving him all the credit—I can say that there has been no more astute Treasurer in this State for generations. He certainly has a very good Treasury staff, but I suggest that any honourable member who has had anything to do with the administration of the affairs of the State will know that the head of the Cabinet calls the tune on matters of policy; that is his job. Departmental heads are concerned in carrying out the policy laid down by the Treasurer of the day; that is their job. I do not think that anyone who has had any experience at all of financing the affairs of the State will deny that the Treasurer has done an outstanding job.

I now wish to speak on one or two serious subjects. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) and other members of the Public Works Committee accompanied me on a visit to the Home of the Good Shepherd, known as "The Pines", at Marion Road, Plympton, which is an institution run by the Roman Catholic Church. We met the Mother Prioress there and saw the way that institution was run. We were interested for one reason: the State, of necessity, has to deal with certain delinquents, and when a delinquent is a girl and she happens to be of the Catholic faith, the Home of the Good Shepherd will take her in and look after her. I think that the title "Mother Superior" is the right one because down there they actually mother the children. I have never seen a woman who, in my judgment, has so much influence and I pay a tribute to her good work. Mr. Fred Walsh and I agree that this home is doing a great job.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It is a credit to them.

Mr. SHANNON: I have a comment to make and I hope that it will not fall on deaf ears so far as the Government is concerned. It is not criticism, but a suggestion. We pay the Home of the Good Shepherd for looking after the delinquent girls who are put under the custody and care of the Children's Welfare Department. Those who are of the faith that the Home of the Good Shepherd represents are taken in there. They are paid a weekly sustenance, I believe on the same lines as those unfortunate children who are wards of the State, children who have committed no offence, but who are sent to foster homes; and the people who take them into their homes are paid a sustenance equivalent, I believe, to what the home referred to gets for the delinquent girls. A big service is being rendered not only by this one section of the Christian community. Practically every church has some type of home where neglected and other unfortunate children whose homes have been broken up or who have been left orphans are cared for. I believe that for this social service the State is in debt to these good folk. They provide their own buildings, run them with their own staff and the children are taken into the bosom of these homes. There is no definite obligation on the State for any charge. I believe that this is a field that we could rightly have a look at to see whether or not the State should do something more in looking after these unfortunate children. Most of these institutions receive quite a lot of support from philanthropic people and the affairs of these institutions are attended to fairly adequately even with the modest support of the public. I do not know what this support should be and I am prepared to leave that to the powers that be. I offer that suggestion for what it is worth and I am certain from the remarks of the Mother Superior at the Home of the Good Shepherd that some such gesture would be very acceptable and helpful. That is what we want.

I will now discuss a subject which I consider of some importance. I am glad that the Minister of Education is present, not that it concerns his department directly, although indirectly it is a matter vitally concerning his department. I will deal with the recommendations included in the final report of the Matriculation Subcommittee. This question of matriculation is well-known to all of us and as public people we could not be unmindful of the problem which has arisen in our universities. In some cases young people enter the university when they are not suited for this type of study and they cannot make the grade, and they fall by the wayside. They are really not suitable material and this is a problem. I shall not set myself up as an expert on it, but there are certain factors mentioned in the report of the subcommittee that I consider warrant the closest examination by members of Parliament especially, because we represent the people and it is the people who are involved if these recommendations are put into effect. The first point I take exception to is the exclusion from the matriculation examination of agricultural science. This is what the subcommittee had to say and it sets out clearly its intentions:

The subcommittee felt that this subject was too specifically directed towards a particular occupation to being very suitable for matriculation; and that matriculants should be encouraged rather to study more basic subjects.

It may be noted that this view seems to have the support of the Faculty of Agricultural Science.

I do not speak for the faculty, but I can speak for certain agricultural scientists with whom I discussed this problem, and the recommendation certainly does not meet with their approval; and it should not meet with the approval of our State schools. I have been very pleased in latter years that agricultural courses have been established throughout the length and breadth of the State, at our high schools as well as at those schools originally established for agricultural courses. I have in mind area schools. All our high schools are becoming dual purpose schools with agriculture as a major subject in most cases. Obviously, parents of children attending our State schools should not be shown the back door, as it were, with regard to their children's future in that the children are taking a course of studies which in all probability will make it more difficult for them to matriculate. When any child takes an agricultural science course at any of our high or area schools it handicaps him for matriculation when he comes to the stage in his educational career when he has to decide whether or not he will go on to tertiary education.

The subcommittee has set a standard for matriculation and every applicant who wishes to study must take at least six subjects at the one examination. It sets a pass for matriculation at five subjects. An applicant is allowed to fail in one, but the subcommittee makes a peculiar decision with regard to English. There are foreign languages in addition to English, including Russian, French, German and Italian, and practically any other foreign language. These are all open to a matriculant if he wants to use them. He has to pass any one of these languages on his merits. When it comes to the mother tongue, English, what would Shakespeare or G. B. Shaw say if they were alive today? This is the reason that the subcommittee gives for making certain relaxations in the English Language subject:

A candidate who does not obtain a pass in English but who satisfies the examiners of his ability to use the language as an instrument of expression—

the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) would pass with flying colours!—

should be deemed to have satisfied the matriculation requirements in so far as English is concerned.

Did you ever hear of anything like that? Are we having trouble with our mother tongue?

Mr. Clark: Plenty.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member is an ex-teacher and he should know. I believe he does know and I do not think he is far off the rails with his comment on that.

The Hon. B. Pattinson: I think the honourable member's use of the phrase "final report" is somewhat misleading. At the most, it is a final draft of a report.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes; the Minister is correct and I accept his correction. As a matter of fact, the word "Draft" appears on the front page of the report—"Draft Final Report". I hope that the few comments I have to make will prove efficacious when the final report is produced.

The Hon. B. Pattinson: I welcome them.

Mr. SHANNON: The Minister has encouraged me now to think that perhaps I am not wasting my time. I should have noticed the word "Draft" on the outer cover of this roneoed report. I am a little concerned about the standard of learning of our own language, a language which, after all, we learn at our mother's knee. Surely to goodness we should be proficient at that! If it came to the pinch and we were dealing with a foreign tongue and a matriculant could, as is said in this report, use it as "an instrument of expression", I should be inclined to give him a pass. For instance, if a boy were learning Russian and he could express himself in that language sufficiently well to be understood by a Russian, then I should give him a pass; but I should demand a higher standard in English.

Mr. Clark: I do not think that boys study Russian.

Mr. SHANNON: Apparently, they can. Russian is one of the languages mentioned.

Mr. Corcoran: What is the report that the honourable member is referring to?

Mr. SHANNON: I have already given honourable members its title. Harking back to what I want to stress, what is worrying me most is the exclusion from the matriculation course of agricultural science. Probably man's ability to sustain life will rest largely upon agricultural science, of all the sciences. The denser our population becomes, the more imporant becomes survival. Survival depends on something to eat. Those who are giving us something to eat are the agricultural scientists, if anybody. Of course, I do not deny for a moment that the medical profession serves a useful purpose in keeping people alive and

curing sickness, but it does not feed the people or provide the means of sustaining life. That comes, and always will come, from the soil. It appears to me to be fundamental that we should be pushing agricultural science for all we're worth—and in Australia of all places in the world, for Australia is harnessed to primary industry more than any other part of the world is. We are bound for many years to come to depend largely for all our social services, for the running of the whole country, on the results of what we can win from the land. To deny this as a field for our university graduates to become expert in, or even to discourage them, appears to me to be going absolutely the wrong way about this problem. I feel strongly about this.

I am glad to have the Minister's assurance that the matter has not yet reached finality. That gives me some hope that we can perhaps avoid falling into this trap, as I consider it to be. The State has spent large sums of money in this very field—and, I think, wisely. I applaud the Education Department's expansion of this particular subject throughout our country schools in particular. As all members know, we have an agricultural high school at Urrbrae, where boys come from all over the State to study agriculture. Then we have Roseworthy College, where the same subject is taught and a diploma in agriculture can be taken. Why should not we have people who are competent to replace, when required, the scientific men at the moment employed at the Waite Research Institute? Why should not we have them; why should not our own university train them? Not only "why should not we": it is a "must". We must train them if we are to survive in a highly competitive world. In my opinion, it is a "must" that this particular service be expanded rather than contracted.

I know that the Treasurer is anxious to get on with the legislative programme and I favour facilitating its progress, but there is another matter in this same report with which I want to deal briefly. I do not want to hammer these things because, after all, my major point I have already dealt with. However, there are other things that are in a way allied to agriculture. One is biology. In my opinion, that is a subject related to agricultural science. The two things are so closely connected that we should expect them to have the same treatment—and we are not disappointed; they are getting the same treatment. If I may use an appropriate term, they have emasculated biology. That is what has been done to it in the curriculum. It is unwise. I think they regard biology as being in the same category as agricultural science, but both are important subjects for a country like Australia.

Another peculiarity appears in this report. It reminds me of the old quip that used to be made about some people who spent much of their parents' money going to Oxford or Cambridge, London or Edinburgh, or somewhere else to do a particular professional course. Then they came home "Failed B.A.". It is a nasty sort of quip that we make about certain people who, through the wealth of their parents, go home and become leaders in sport of some sort or other. They do not make very good students. They do not pass their examinations. There is provision in this report for what I call "Failed matriculation". The report states:

> Those who fail to pass a subject at the matriculation examination should be awarded passes at Leaving level if their performance justifies it.

In other words, a person gets a certificate by failure, although I admit that the words "if their performance justifies it" are some safeguard. Obviously they are looking for a standard of matriculation and not a Leaving standard. The person who determines the matter may or may not be able to assess a student's ability to qualify for a Leaving certificate. I have doubts about what the value of a Leaving certificate will be. They have also provided for supplementary examinations.

I have referred to the qualification of five subjects out of six at one examination. That will, in my opinion, deny many useful students, who could ultimately benefit the State, the opportunity of entering the university. I am not a matriculant and never went to a university, but I have many friends who did and they have sufficient confidence in me to discuss their university courses. Some of these successful professional men struggled through their courses. They had the plodding type of mind that applies itself but is not brilliant. Genius is about 95 per cent application and 5 per cent ability. It is the person who—

The Hon. B. Pattinson: Has an infinite capacity for taking pains.

Mr. SHANNON: Those words are most appropriate. Some people have the gift of being able to take pains and have infinite application. They are best suited to restricting themselves to perhaps three subjects at the most. If they are overloaded and given too much to do they will be prevented from doing their best. I cannot see any great disadvantage in permitting a person seeking to

matriculate to do three subjects this year and two next, thus passing. If that is the way a person is built he should be enabled to work along those lines. Some people who have had to fight hard first to get into the university and then to obtain their degrees are among our soundest professional men, because they know what it means to work hard and they did not let up. Some of my personal friends struggled to get their degrees, but have since worked their way to the top of their professions.

I know that the draft report suggests that in certain circumstances the board may grant a student the right to a supplementary examination if he has failed to get his five subjects. However, he can be denied that right. I do not know that I am happy about that, particularly as some people develop slowly. I am not happy about the provision of 17 years as the age for matriculation. However, there are some young people of 17 who have not developed as much as those in a lower age group. Physical variations are common to mankind and they should be considered. We are not all made in the same mould.

Mr. Riches: Do you think the committee is concerned about reducing the numbers at the Adelaide University?

Mr. SHANNON: Perhaps I should comment on the university's future policy, although I must admit that I am out of my depth. I believe there is an upper limit to the efficient working of any scholastic institution, whether it be a primary school, secondary school or university. The stage is reached when efficiency declines with increasing numbers. This is a matter of administration and not of education. The larger and more unwieldy a school becomes the more difficult it is to administer. From the top level administration through the entire academic staff there is a lowering of standards. There will be bright spots here and there, but there will be weak spots too, because the administration cannot keep its fingers on the pulse of the whole institution. There is an upper limit, but I will leave it to better informed people to determine that upper limit. I know that the university is justifiably worried about the student intake. The time is not far distant when we will have to look for a site for a second university.

Mr. Riches: I think the time is now.

Mr. SHANNON: I am not concerned with whether the member agrees with me or not, but I think we have reached the stage in our population growth when we must plan for the future generation of students which wants to take university courses. I know from evidence taken by the Public Works Committee that the best informed opinion is that a medical school should not have an intake of more than 100 students annually. This will allow for an overall medical school of 550 students over six years. That does not allow much wastage. That is what they call the upper limit for efficient teaching of medical personnel. We have reached that stage in Adelaide and they are now attempting to restrict the entry into the medical school because of the difficulties that have arisen from the increased numbers. We should now be planning what we are going to do. I do not care how fast we work it will take us some years. We must decide whether Bedford Park is the site or not, whether the second university should be in the city or country, the standards to be established in the new university and whether they are to be comparable with the Adelaide University.

These questions will have to be resolved before we start, and afterwards we will still have to wait a few years while the university is being built and before it is ready for habitation. We should be getting busy with our planning. I believe that this Budget is so good that it requires no comment. All I can say is that the cook will do me.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): This is the third Budget debate in which I have participated, and I have keenly looked forward to it because this is the Treasurer's 23rd Budget and I believe his last. This is not wishful thinking, for the people will be able to express their will in the near future. In the past most of them have not had the Government they wanted.

Mr. Millhouse: You are singing a swan song.

Mr. RYAN: Someone recently suggested that Ruth Wallis should be invited to sing in the Senate. I do not know whether the Government is now singing its swan song, but Government members have been loud in their praise of the Treasurer. Perhaps it would be better if Ruth Wallis were invited to sing a swan song for the Treasurer. He has had a good innings and up to the present no-one has been able to bowl him out, but all good things come to an end, and I believe the Treasurer has delivered his last Budget speech.

Mr. Millhouse: You admit that he has been good.

Mr. RYAN: He has had everything in his favour, and has been in Government on a minority basis. I will not say anything about the gerrymander, but notwithstanding all the obstacles that might be placed in our path we believe that in 1962 Labor will occupy the Treasury benches.

Mr. Millhouse: What will happen on December 9?

Mr. RYAN: The same as will happen in March next. There will be a change of Government. Members on this side are not financial genii like some members opposite. I will refer first to the member for Torrens—the others I will treat with contempt. The member for Torrens said, "I want to give some credit to the Treasurer." Of course, he does. Mr. Coumbe said:

I want to give some credit to the Treasurer and this Government for bringing down such a Budget. We have had criticism to the effect that a deficit Budget should have been introduced but I believe the Government has shown courage at such a time in introducing a balanced Budget.

That statement was followed by one from the grandfather of the House. He spoke on similar lines to those of the member for Torrens, and said that it was extremely good government to balance the Budget. I am not a financial wizard like some members on the other side, but I want to quote the following from the September issue of the *Monthly Summary of Australian Conditions* by the National Bank of Australasia Limited, which cannot be said to be closely allied to the Australian Labor Party or any Labor Government.

The other alteration of economic import is the intention to have a small cash deficit of £16,500,000 as compared with a cash surplus of almost the same amount budgeted for and achieved last financial year. A cash deficit of this size is hardly likely to shake the economy, although the move from surplus to deficit was a move in the right direction.

The members for Torrens and Onkaparinga are well-known businessmen. I have heard it said often that it is good to run an ordinary business on credit and overdraft, but not good for a Government to do it. Recently the member for Torrens was appointed director of a large public company in South Australia which advertises over the television every night that it is 100 years old, and suggests buying on credit. The member for Torrens does not dispute such a policy for that company but he says that it should not be done by the Government. With him it is a matter of "Don't do as I do; do as I say".

Mr. Hall: Who will give the State the credit you speak of?

Mr. RYAN: There is more credit in this country than we imagine.

Mr. Hall: I am speaking about the State.

Mr. RYAN: There is such a thing as a Commonwealth reimbursement. Earlier we were told that one of the greatest financial steps ever taken was when this State became a non-claimant State.

Mr. Hall: This year where will we get the credit?

Mr. RYAN: I will deal with the credit squeeze created by a Government which the honourable member supports.

Mr. Hall: Where will we get the credit you talk about?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Jenkins): Order!

Mr. RYAN: I believe that we have had the last Budget from the present Treasurer, and that soon the present Leader of the Opposition will be the Treasurer. Next year our Party will decide who will be the Ministers of the Crown. It will not be like the Government Party where one man says who will be the Ministers. That is why some members opposite think that the Treasurer is a tin god, when actually he is a tin hare with greyhounds chasing him and waiting for any reward he might give them. The following report appeared in the *Advertiser* of September 25, and that newspaper cannot be said to be unbiased as far as the Labor Party is concerned:

The Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) revealed a tender concern for his political opponents, when speaking at an Australian Institute of Sales Management dinner the other night. He said, "I am happy just as long as I can keep the Leader of the Opposition in office."

There will be a reversal of form in March of next year, when the present dictatorial Premier will be in Opposition. The Labor Party will then be happy to keep him and his Party where they should be, in Opposition.

Much has been said by members opposite about the credit squeeze and unemployment, which I think is the greatest problem this country must face. Members opposite say there is nothing to worry about, and they falsify figures to hoodwink the public, but there is more behind this than they disclose. Some ask whether we have the answer; I say that the Australian Labor Party has. One of the answers was the re-imposition of import

restrictions some time ago, as there has been a different development in commerce. The other day a big firm was offered goods on consignment and, although 10 or 20 years ago it would have gone out of its way to accept the offer, it refused because it had such big stockpiles that if it took these goods it would be to the detriment of the company. This stockpile can be disposed of only to the person prepared to buy; that person is, of course, the working man, who, if he is not working, is unable to buy. That is one of the problems we must overcome in the next 12 months so that manufacturers and importers can order fresh goods and so create employment and place people back in their jobs again.

It is in order to offer criticism, but if people criticize they should be prepared to offer a solution to the things they criticize. Because of unemployment, today I asked the Minister of Education a question about the building of new schools in this State, and in reply the Minister said that 100 school projects had been submitted to the Public Works Committee for consideration.

Mr. Shannon: No. Make it 200 and you will make it sound like a decent sized job.

Mr. RYAN: As I previously said, last year the Education Department propounded a programme for 100 new schools and additions to schools.

Mr. Quirke: But they did not go to the committee.

Mr. RYAN: Of the 100, 34 projects are included in the building programme in this year's Loan Estimates and the other 66 are in various stages of planning. The member for Onkaparinga knows as well as I that many references were sent to his committee, but many were withdrawn before it had an opportunity to investigate them. Although the Treasurer was extremely generous in increasing the allocation for school buildings from £4,750,000 last year to £6,000,000 this year, it will not be possible for all of these 34 schools to be commenced during this financial year. That is the very thing about which the Leader of the Opposition made a constructive criticism about the Government's over-estimating and over-allocating the appropriation for this financial year.

The Hon. B. Pattinson: The Leader said the opposite. He said we could not spend the £6,000,000.

Mr. RYAN: That is true.

The Hon. B. Pattinson: The honourable member is giving a different argument altogether now. He is saying that we have not got the money to spend, yet the Leader said we would not be able to spend this £6,000,000.

Mr. RYAN: The Minister said that as a result of the appropriation in the programme put forward a strict priority had been effected by the department. Today I checked on the position in the building trade in this State and found that conditions were absolutely deplorable; "deplorable" is perhaps not a sufficiently strong word to describe it. F. Fricker & Co., one of the oldest South Australian building firms which has built many schools in this State, has practically no work and has had to dispense with much of its staff. Marshalls, one of the first building contractors to receive building contracts from the Housing Trust, was one of the firms which were absolutely neglected in the £2,500,000 building programme for the Housing Trust recently announced by the Treasurer. I believe that at least 100 bricklayers and many more builders' labourers are out of work in this State, yet the programme has been retarded. First there was no money, when there was money there was no material, and when there was material there was no manpower. At present we have everything, but we cannot find work for those offering themselves for employment, yet members opposite praise the Treasurer for the position in this State. The position in this State has never been worse except in the dark days referred to by the member for Adelaide, when people had humpy residences on the banks of the Torrens. I am one of those who in the Second World War heard on many occasions that the dark days of the depression would never appear in Australia again. It was said that no Government would have the audacity to bring back those conditions, as we fought too hard to prevent them, but where are we today? Back where we never believed it would be possible to go. It is no good hiding behind other facts and saying there is not a depression now; we have a depression created by the same Party as that to which members opposite belong. They sent the top boy of this State to Canberra last Monday to attend a conference and, although on many occasions in this House he said that he disagreed with Menzies and did not believe in his policy, we did not see any statement that he disagreed with his policy last Monday.

Mr. Lawn: He will kiss in his pocket in the next election campaign.

Mr. RYAN: He did not disagree. The Treasurer received instructions as to what he was to do in the next few months campaigning on behalf of Menzies and implementing his policy for Australia. If this is not man-created and if the people who are criticizing the Government for its policy do not know what they are talking about and are no-hopers then let members opposite place the New South Wales Chamber of Automotive Industries in the same category. In today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Chamber to Back Labor," appears the following report:

The influential New South Wales Chamber of Automotive Industries tonight announced that it would support a Labor candidate in the December Federal elections. The chamber will back the Lord Mayor of Sydney (Alderman H. F. Jensen), who is the Labor candidate for Bennelong, against the sitting Liberal member the Minister for the Army (Mr. Cramer). The chamber, which represents about 600 motor distributors and dealers in New South Wales, said it had taken this action in protest against the Federal Government's economic measures against the motor industry and its other recent economic measures.

The chamber's decision means that it will give financial and organizational support to Alderman Jensen against Mr. Cramer. The chamber's decision was announced tonight by the president (Mr. L. Cahill) who said:

"The chamber believes that Alderman Jensen has exhibited desirable qualities of personality and leadership much needed in the national Parliament. This decision is a democratic protest at the unhealthy state of the Australian economy, the retardation of national development, needless unemployment and the drastic singling out of this industry for ill-considered Government action."

We criticize the Government but we don't know what we are talking about! We should not voice an opinion because we have no right to! What happened to the New South Wales Chamber of Automotive Industries? That influential body realizes, as we realize, that the present recession is man-created by the Commonwealth Government. The member for Mitcham nods his head but he was one of those who had to push his way into the Centennial Hall earlier this year. The hall was overcrowded! About 500 people were there: it could have accommodated 5,000. They went there to hear the snowy-haired man who had previously criticized the Snowy Mountains Scheme but who now took the credit for it when he came to boost the morale of the flagging Liberal Party in this State.

Mr. Lawn: Certainly the clientele had free tickets.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Mitcham would not have gone had he had to pay. They will be bringing Uncle Bob here again soon to build up their morale. The only mistake that globe-trotting gentleman makes when he goes abroad is that he does not have only a single ticket. He should settle all the international fights! He is the greatest international disruptionist this country has seen for some time and then he has the hide to criticize people who have the cheek to tell the truth.

If I were unemployed I should not know where to turn to get another job and neither do the thousands of unemployed. That is what we are up against. I agree with one statement Mr. Menzies made on a most important matter concerning the next elections and that is in connection with the Senate. The Prime Minister fully realizes that the return of the Senate as it should be returned is the end for the Liberals. I hope the same procedure will be followed in South Australia. While there are unemployed it should be the policy of every member of this Parliament to see that they are provided with employment and earning a decent living without fear of dismissal or want. That is the problem facing us today. One answer is in the hands of the Government. This affects my district and I have often raised the question, trying to rectify the position in this State. I previously referred to a recommendation of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Lawn: The chairman is more concerned with organizing in Frome than he is with business in your district.

Mr. RYAN: Frome is a very sore point with him. Every time he looks at the member for Frome he has a heart seizure because he forecast, when I was in Frome, that the Government would have a representative in Frome. He has never got over the shock of the Government's defeat in Frome. Frome is today represented by a very good member and I agree with the member for Barossa when he says that after the next election the member for Frome will be a member of the Government. Not only will he be a member of the Government but all members of this Opposition will be over there for the first time in 27 years.

The project to which I referred will cost about £500,000, which is a large sum for a Government undertaking when men are walking the streets prepared to do any work for decent pay under good conditions. The Public Works Committee reported that a causeway should be built to link LeFevre Peninsula with Port Adelaide thus allowing traffic to cross the Port River.

That report was made some time ago and I asked the Treasurer whether the job could be commenced or whether money for the project would have to be appropriated in this year's Loan Estimates. I was told that it was not necessary for an appropriation to be made because the project would be financed from the Highways Fund which had the necessary money to start on the work immediately.

Later I again raised the matter with the Treasurer and was told that the project had been authorized by Cabinet and that the Highways Department had been instructed to proceed with the job. Although that was some time ago nothing further has been done. By the time the red tape has been cut through, as far as Government departments are concerned, there will be a change of Government and the job will proceed. When proposals are put before Parliament we have to wait for the finance. Here is a project that has been recommended and authorized by Cabinet, and finance is available for it, yet still we see no sign that this £500,000 project, which would place many men in work, will be commenced. The Government is to be condemned for its failure to start this project. The money has been available for it and if it were started it would relieve unemployment. It is about time this Government faced up to its responsibilities. Members opposite say that everything in the garden is lovely and that there is nothing to worry about, but they are not unemployed and they would not know. The Government is lacking in initiative in failing to start this important work, and the sooner it is started the sooner certain people will be satisfied.

I am concerned about another matter about which I have heard all sorts of praises sung by members of the Government. I refer to the housing position. When I became a member of this Parliament the housing position was anything but rosy; in fact, it was terrible. In the last three years no progress has been made in catching up the leeway. I admit that the position has not deteriorated, but the lag in house building has not been caught up. Like the member for Adelaide, I have received letters from the Housing Trust and from the Treasurer, and the only difference in the letters we have received is the applicant's name. The trust's letter is a standard one telling us that there is no possibility of catching up the leeway, that the housing position is extremely acute, and that it can give no satisfactory answer to the applicant. Knowing that position, I raised the matter with the Treasurer only last week. Since that time I have received numerous letters from people, many of whom have cut out the newspaper report of the Treasurer's answer and sent it to me. Such people, wishing something to be done about this matter, would like to see people in office who are prepared to carry out the duties of a Government.

The Leader of the Opposition, when speaking about a week ago, said that if our Party were returned as the Government after the next elections one of the first things it would do would be to create a Minister of Housing who would be answerable to Parliament for the conduct and administration of the Government housing authority. The Housing Trust as we know it is 99.99 per cent Government, but because it is not 100 per cent Government it is not a Government instrumentality. It should be, and the only answer to the problem is to make it a Government instrumentality answerable to Parliament. I have referred to the Treasurer's answer to the question I asked last week. I should have expected the answer I received to have come from a raw recruit who had only just entered Parliament. He said:

> There is no normal waiting time. It would depend upon the circumstances of the applicant. . . . In other circumstances, where a person was in dire distress he would get a house much more quickly. . . . It does me the courtesy of sending me once a month a list of the persons to whom it has allotted houses, the dates of their applications, the number of their children, whether they have had any war service, their previous housing conditions and every factor that would have some bearing upon their case. I have not always, but quite often, gone through those lists carefully to see whether there was any application that I would consider to be out of step.

The newspaper report of this reply was given to me over the week-end and attached to it was a note saying, "If this is so, our case could not be more desperate." That person wrote to me and stated that he had written to Mr. Playford—he did not even know of Mr. Playford's knighthood—concerning a rented Housing Trust house, and that the Treasurer had replied to him. His letter to me was as follows:

> In this morning's paper I saw where Mr. Playford had told you there was no normal waiting time for a home. But we are really desperate as they have built a shed within about 12ft. of the back door, therefore there is no playing room for the three kiddies. We haven't any conveniences and the place is very damp and the kiddies' health is suffering.

That is the type of letter that members on this side of the House receive practically every day of the week, yet we are told by the Treasurer that if people are in dire circumstances there is no waiting time and they can get a house whenever the circumstances warrant it. This is a letter which the Treasurer himself has considered, but the applicant has been given the normal answer, which is "No". If the next case is not one where a family is in dire circumstances and where it is absolutely necessary that they should be allocated a house I have never seen one. The letter that I received states:

I am writing to you to see if you can help my wife and I get a Housing Trust house to rent. We have had our name down now for four to five years—

Yet the Treasurer has stated that there is no waiting time—

and have been unable to get one. We have three children, one girl who is four and two boys aged 2½ years and eight months. We are living in one room which is at the back of my mother-in-law's house. It is 9ft. x 12ft. The room really belongs to my wife's uncle and he is waiting to take it to his farm down the South-East. When he does take it (which could be any day) we won't have anywhere to go. We have tried to get a flat, but most people won't take children, and those who will want £8 or £9 a week, and I cannot afford to pay this much. My mother-in-law has four girls and my father-in-law, and there is not enough room in the house for all of us. We all have to share the bathroom and toilet. The room is very small for five of us, as we have our double bed, one single bed, one cot, one small wardrobe, and very small cupboard, and the pram at night. The baby is getting too big to be sleeping in a pram at night, and the girl aged four is at the stage where she takes too much notice . . . and should have other accommodation . . . The room leaks in two places and it makes the room quite damp. This is no good to my wife as she had an operation on her hip in March and the dampness affects her leg quite a bit . . . We keep in touch with the Housing Trust practically every week. My wife goes up, and every time she goes they tell her they cannot do anything for us as they are concentrating on 1955 applicants—

That is back in the dark ages (six years ago) yet the Treasurer says there is no waiting time, that people will get a house if they are in dire circumstances and if other circumstances warrant it—

but we know this cannot be quite right.

On behalf of this family I wrote to the Housing Trust seeking some assistance, and I received a reply similar to the one quoted by the member for Adelaide, except that the name of the applicant was different. It said:

The trust would be glad if it could assist without delay the many applicants with young children whose need of accommodation is extremely urgent. It has, however, never been able to keep pace with the demands made upon it for rental houses and at the present time there is a large number of applications outstanding which were lodged much earlier than Mr. X's. Many of the applicants and their families are also living under the most unsatisfactory conditions. I regret, therefore, that at this stage I can hold out no hope that the trust will be able to give early assistance in this case.

Realizing that this was a case out of the ordinary and one that demanded sympathetic consideration from the trust, I was particularly interested in it. Yet, we are advised by the Treasurer that people in dire circumstances may apply to the trust for a house and there is no normal waiting time, that each case is considered on its merits, and if warranted one will be provided. It seems to me that in some cases the trust offers excuses. It knows full well that people in certain circumstances cannot live in the country, and Elizabeth is in the country. This has been stated by the Treasurer, the trust and the member for Gawler. Some of these people are offered accommodation there but, unfortunately, cannot accept it and in nearly all of these cases it is considered by the trust as a refusal and they are not sympathetically looked upon in any future representation. In reference to one case, the Treasurer said he had placed the correspondence before the Chairman of the trust and this is the answer he received:

The Housing Trust is sympathetic towards Mr. X in his difficult housing situation, and it would be glad if it could see its way clear to assist him and the many other applicants with young children who are living under distressing conditions.

It was in a genuine effort to shorten the family's wait for satisfactory accommodation that officers of the trust's letting section suggested to Mrs. X, more than a year ago, that the application could be considered for a house at Elizabeth and the Senior Interviewing Officer discussed the matter fully with her in November, 1960. . . . . If the person concerned considers that housing outside the metropolitan area would be of no help to him, the only other way in which the trust could assist him immediately would be by placing his application before many others, lodged much earlier, which for one reason or another, are also urgent, and this the trust feels it cannot do in fairness to other applicants.

I regret that I cannot, at present, be more encouraging regarding this case, but as it comes nearer in line for a house in the metropolitan area, the trust will examine all aspects of it carefully. Any particular disabilities of

the applicant and his family which are then existing and should be taken into account will receive special consideration.

That represents the housing conditions in South Australia and yet the Treasurer says there is no normal waiting time. Where does it start and where does it end? The Treasurer received a report from the Housing Trust, which is not answerable to Parliament, but in March, 1962, one of the first efforts of the new Government will be to see that a Minister of Housing is appointed and that this department is placed under the strict control of Parliament. Members who are now Government supporters will then have the opportunity to criticize the new Government.

Mr. Hall: Tell us why the house at Elizabeth was not suitable in this case?

Mr. RYAN: If a man has to walk from Elizabeth to Port Adelaide in the morning he certainly would not be long in employment. Not all people are in a position like Mr. Hall and able to drive to work. Some people who are really an asset to this country find themselves in financial stress and are unable to own a motor car. These people who have no means of transport to Port Adelaide are penalized.

Mr. Hall: Is there no public transport to Port Adelaide in the morning?

Mr. RYAN: No. I have made representations for suitable transport for these people. Once I was asked by the Housing Trust whether I would make representations to the Minister of Railways and also to the Treasurer that suitable Government transport be provided, and then applicants to the trust would not have the same excuse for not accepting houses at Elizabeth because there was no suitable transport. I did not get a satisfactory answer to my representations.

Mr. Clark: I was also approached.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member and I jointly applied to the Minister of Railways and to the Treasurer and got a negative answer.

Mr. Hughes: Shame!

Mr. RYAN: We shall hear all the answers tomorrow night over the television in the Playford Phantasy. I saw the Treasurer's television broadcast one night. Once was enough and anyone who wants a second helping is a glutton. Before his broadcast there is placed on the screen a black-and-white magpie. No wonder Port Adelaide did not win the preliminary football final! I suppose the Treasurer got his instructions last Monday as to what he should tell the people so that there could be a return of the Government, which has not done what it should have done on behalf of the public. It is not very often that we hear criticism of the Government by its supporters, but yesterday we had the spectacle of the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) criticizing the attitude of the Government on the treatment of librarians in this State. The honourable member for Burnside said that the reason why there was a lack of staff in this State was the low wages paid. Have we not on this side asserted for many years that this is a cheap State? We are losing qualified personnel because other States are prepared to pay people what they should receive. A low wage standard is of no advantage to this State. We had the spectacle only yesterday of the member for Burnside agreeing with our policy on this and saying that the Government should do something about it. It would put her on the spot if we moved for equal pay for the sexes. She has equal pay already.

I asked a question about a company black-listing people. The answer I got was that the Government could take no action against this company. The first report was that the Government did not agree with it, but then the Treasurer followed it up by saying, "Although we do not agree with it, the Government of this State can do nothing about it". If the Government does not want to do anything about black-listing where companies are concerned—

Mr. Hall: Which company was that?

Mr. RYAN: Beckers. It is one of the most bare-faced cases of black-listing I have ever known.

Mr. Hall: What about the affair at Port Stanvac?

Mr. RYAN: That has nothing to do with it. I was not there. I had nothing to do with it, nor had any member of my Party. It was a trade union matter where the men decided for themselves what they wanted.

Mr. Hall: Does the honourable member approve of that?

Mr. RYAN: I have probably been in more strikes than the honourable member will ever know about. We always took the attitude, "If you want to strike for what you consider is right, make sure that you have right on your side."

Mr. Hall: Does the honourable member approve of the action taken?

Mr. RYAN: Other members will give proof of that; I shall not go into that now. I make no wild statement but sincerely hope that for the benefit of the people of South Australia we on this side, who have spoken for many years as the Opposition, shall have the honour

and privilege of being in power to present the 1962-63 Budget. We on our side have given, and will continue to give, criticism where it is warranted, provided it is justified and constructive. We hope members of the present Government will do likewise when in Opposition. There is a persistent rumour around Adelaide that tomorrow there may be a bombshell, in that the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) may be elevated to the Senate. I do not know where the rumour started but I believe the one hitch in this matter is the difficulty of superannuation. If this does happen, we on this side may even support the elevation.

Mr. Hall: Would the honourable member care to tell us about his third Senate candidate?

Mr. RYAN: I am prepared to have a side wager with the honourable member that our third candidate will be elected to the Senate on December 9.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. RYAN: I offer this as constructive criticism, that it is a good thing on occasions to budget for a deficit rather than for a surplus. Some people say, "Don't do as I do; do as I say, and you will probably get more directorships." They tell other people, "Don't adopt our policy, but live on credit and encourage our product." The housing problem in this State remains serious. The Housing Trust has held sway but has made no headway. Praise can be given when a Government can say, "Not only have we held our position where housing accommodation is concerned, but we have improved it." Even members on this side will give credit where it is due and will back any proposition to alleviate the position of those people suffering hardship in housing.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 28, at 2 p.m.