

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, August 1, 1962.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****FUNERAL CHARGES.**

**Mr. McKEE:** Arising from numerous complaints I have received, I ask the Premier, as Minister in charge of prices, whether he will inquire whether funeral charges are under price control and, if they are not, will he ask the Prices Commissioner to investigate whether they should be?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD:** Yes.

**GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.**

**Mr. CUMBE:** Some time ago it was announced that the Government was considering plans for resiting the Government Printing Office. Can the Premier say whether a decision has been made, and if so, whether plans are being prepared for this project?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD:** The Government realizes that the Government Printing Office is an urgent job, but it has had heavy calls upon it in other directions, and this project has not proceeded.

**PRICES INFORMATION.**

**Mr. LOVEDAY:** The Combined Unions Council at Whyalla has a special committee investigating price levels and freight charges applying in Whyalla, and it recently wrote to the Prices Commissioner asking what the freight charges were on clothing, foodstuffs and general merchandise so that it could keep a check on prices in Whyalla as compared with prices in Adelaide. It received the following reply:

It is regretted that due to the secrecy provisions of the Prices Act it is not possible to supply the information requested.

The reply outlined some details concerning the position of traders on these matters. Will the Premier see whether the information desired could be supplied to this committee, especially as its work is so important in keeping prices down in relation to the wages in the town and because, without that information, its activities are greatly restricted?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD:** The obligation on the Prices Commissioner to maintain secrecy on costs is imposed by Act of Parliament and follows the Commonwealth regulations that operated during the war. Disabilities would accrue to an industry if

its price structure were known to its competitors, and Parliament has taken the view that an individual industry's price structure should be regarded as classified information for the Prices Department only. The Prices Commissioner has his obligations under the Act. I do not believe it would be desirable to alter this provision, and I do not think that Parliament, after considering what is involved, would alter it.

**TANUNDA POLICE STATION.**

The Hon. B. H. **TEUSNER:** Has the Premier obtained from the Chief Secretary the information I sought last week relating to the acquisition of land at Tanunda for a new police station?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD:** The Commissioner of Police reports that land was recently purchased in Murray Street, Tanunda, for the erection of a new police station, residence and courthouse. A request has been submitted to the Director of the Public Buildings Department for the preparation of sketch plans, and no doubt the building will be proceeded with as finance is available.

**SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE.**

**Mr. FRANK WALSH:** Great concern is felt, particularly in the No. 1 Ward of the Marion City Council area, and to some extent in No. 2 Ward, about delays in work on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. I have been told that the drains will not be placed in position until work on the catchment area is completed. Can the Minister of Works say when the work is likely to be proceeded with and when relief can be expected, particularly in the Marion City Council area between South Road and the Sturt River?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON:** I shall be pleased to refer this matter to the Minister of Roads, who is the constructing authority for the scheme, although I believe the department is dependent on the resources of the Engineer-in-Chief to construct a dam upstream. I will inquire and get this information for the Leader.

**RESERVOIR INTAKES.**

**Mr. LAUCKE:** For the 24 hours to 9 a.m. today, 171 points of rain fell at Chain of Ponds and 69 points at Williamstown. Can the Minister of Works say whether these falls have resulted in appreciable intakes into the Millbrook and Warren reservoirs?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON:** Information so far available is a little sketchy because,

as the honourable member knows, communications were disrupted to some extent last night on account of the high wind and stormy conditions but, in general terms, there have been some useful intakes in metropolitan reservoirs, including the South Para and Warren. I have not yet received the precise figures and, in any case, the run-off is continuing. By this time tomorrow I should have a better idea of what the rain storm has produced in the way of intakes to reservoirs. The intake has been useful.

#### TELEVISION REPAIRS.

Mr. TAPPING: It has been brought to my notice that some firms repairing television sets charge what appear to be excessive amounts. Will the Premier, as the Minister in charge of prices, ascertain whether any complaints have been received of overcharging for these repairs?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

#### OFF-COURSE BETTING.

Mr. HUGHES: An article in today's *Advertiser* states:

The Adelaide North Synod of the South Australian Conference of the Methodist Church last night "viewed with concern" a proposal to introduce an off-course totalizator system of betting in South Australia. The Synod said it believed that a system of off-course totalizator betting would increase the overall volume of gambling and not eliminate illegal betting.

"We urge the Government of South Australia to resist the present pressure for its introduction," it said.

I sincerely hope that the Government will continue to resist its introduction.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not debate the question.

Mr. HUGHES: I am coming to the question now, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member expressed his opinion, and he is out of order in so doing.

Mr. HUGHES: Will the Premier, as Leader of the Government, give an assurance that he will continue to resist pressure to allow an off-course totalizator system of betting in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has had a request for off-course totalizator betting of the nature of the system introduced in Victoria. I have been assured that, if we accept the proposals, financially the Treasurer will be set for life. Cabinet has asked me to obtain some authentic information

and make it available, so that the request can be considered in the normal way.

#### TAILEM BEND WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: I have asked several questions of the Minister of Works regarding the reticulation of water at Tailem Bend. At present the water supply is controlled by two bodies, namely, the Railways and the Engineering and Water Supply Departments. Much worry has been caused to the Meningie Council, to the fire-fighting organization in the town and to others, because certain areas of the town are not catered for by mains. As the Minister has had correspondence on this matter during the recess, can he report on the progress of the suggested scheme whereby the E. & W. S. Department will take over the water supply fully, and if he cannot, will he expedite the matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief is aware of the difficulties at Tailem Bend and has investigated the possibility and advisability of placing the whole of the town's system under the control of the E. & W. S. Department. I think the Railways Commissioner agrees in general with the proposal, and, after it is implemented, the extensions at Tailem Bend to which the honourable member has referred may be considered. There is the proposal before the department now (and the department is actively planning the first stage) for the Tailem Bend to Keith main, which has been recommended by the Public Works Committee. The first part of that project will be the installation of a pumping station at Tailem Bend and the necessary tanks associated with it, which work has a bearing on the water supply to the town generally. However, at present the Engineer-in-Chief would prefer to wait until his headquarters were more precisely planned there. The over-riding problem at present is the extremely heavy demands on our financial resources—we have this always, but particularly so this year—and we are hard-pressed to provide supplies to places that have no water at all. I think the honourable member would agree that under the circumstances we are obligated to serve as we can places without water, rather than to improve supplies to areas that already have water. Under the circumstances I cannot give the honourable member any undertaking that we will be able to take over the reticulation at Tailem Bend this year, but the scheme has been examined and as soon as further progress has been made and as soon as finance permits we will be able to go ahead with the proposal.

PETERBOROUGH COURT.

Mr. CASEY: Would the Minister of Education ask his colleague, the Attorney-General, to examine the possibility of engaging a permanent clerk of court at Peterborough? The volume of work warrants the appointment of a permanent clerk, as this would help the police sergeant, who now acts as clerk of court, to devote his full time to his duties as sergeant-in-charge.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague.

CHAFFEY IRRIGATION AREA.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Irrigation say whether provision has been made on the Estimates for lining the channels in the Bal Ral Division of the Chaffey irrigation area?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS: No.

MURRAY BRIDGE SCHOOL LAND.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Minister of Education will recall that an area adjacent to the old Murray Bridge Primary School was given to the Education Department under lease by the Murray Bridge Corporation. Some conditions were attached, and agreement was reached whereby pipes were to be laid across this area, but when the Property Officer (Mr. Lewis) and one or two others visited the area it was suggested that, as it was an infant school, the playground should be fenced and possibly sealed. The pipeline has been completed, after a long time, and it is now thought by the school committee that the other work should proceed. I have taken this matter up with the Public Buildings Department, but that depart-

ment has no record of the matter; I think it was only at the discussion stage at the time I am referring to. I have spoken about this matter to Mr. Lewis, and he considers that this work is necessary. Will the Minister take up this question with the Education Department to see whether this work can be put in hand?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I shall be very pleased to do so. I shall ask for reports from the Property Officer and the Superintendent, and then take the matter from there.

MENTAL HOSPITALS.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier replies to the two questions I asked last week about mental hospitals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director of Mental Health reports:

With regard to the first request for information about the visit to Parkside of Mrs. Hutchinson, M.L.C., Western Australia, we have had no communications from the lady concerned. She came to Parkside as a private individual on July 18 and saw perhaps a fifth of the total number of wards at Parkside. She did not visit Enfield Hospital, Northfield Hospital or our Child Guidance Clinic. Included among the four wards that she did see was an example of our best hospital building—Paterson House.

With regard to the statistical comparisons, the honourable the Premier is correct when he says that it is difficult to get strictly comparable figures between one State and another, but the attached table supplied by the Hospitals Department shows the overall improvement in all grades of staff since 1952.

I ask permission to have the following table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

MENTAL HOSPITALS—SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

	Medical staff.	Nursing staff.	Others.	Total staff.	Number of patients.	Ratio of total staff to patients.
Parkside Mental Hospital—						
As at 30th June, 1952 ..	7	249	102	358	1,564	1 : 4.4
As at 30th June, 1957 ..	9	290	122	421	1,791	1 : 4.3
As at 30th June, 1961 ..	11	309	118	438	1,698	1 : 3.9
As at 30th June, 1962 ..	11	308	133	452	1,723	1 : 3.8
Northfield Mental Hospital—						
As at 30th June, 1952 ..	1	108	38	147	832	1 : 5.7
As at 30th June, 1957 ..	4	131	48	183	861	1 : 4.7
As at 30th June, 1961 ..	6	198	43	247	1,007	1 : 4.1
As at 30th June, 1962 ..	7	190	58	255	1,034	1 : 4.1
Enfield Receiving House—						
As at 30th June, 1952 ..	1	32	11	44	135	1 : 3.1
As at 30th June, 1957 ..	4	32	11	47	88	1 : 1.9
As at 30th June, 1961 ..	5	32	10	47	126	1 : 2.7
As at 30th June, 1962 ..	5	30	12	47	149	1 : 3.2

NOTE.—The Staff under "Others" includes administrative staff, kitchen staff, gardeners, etc., as well as artisan attendants who may have the supervision of certain patients during the day. All staff, both salaried and weekly paid, are included.

**SAFETY PRECAUTIONS.**

**Mr. FREEBAIRN:** Recently, a serious accident occurred in my district in which two motor cyclists crashed into a goods train at a level crossing. The accident occurred at night. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, consider the fastening of a reflecting tape on goods waggons to increase the visibility of trains to road users?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will bring that matter to my colleague's notice.

**PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL.**

**Mr. McKEE:** Has the Minister of Works a progress report on the Port Pirie Hospital?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director, Public Buildings Department, reports that arrangements have been made with the Hospitals Department for the new laundry to be occupied. Steam will be supplied from the temporary boiler installation until August 22, when the new boiler will be put into commission, together with the water treatment plant. The new kitchen can be occupied following a week's notice from the hospital authorities to enable the final services to be installed.

**THIRD PARTY INSURANCE.**

**Mr. LAUCKE:** Further to the question I asked the Premier yesterday concerning the protection of the insured and the injured under compulsory third party insurance in the event of the bankruptcy of the insuring company, will consideration be given to making such provision under the relative Act or regulation as would enable the remaining approved insurance companies and render them liable to meet the commitments of an insolvent insurance company? A precedent has been set in this matter in respect of claims arising from hit-and-run accidents.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The precedent the honourable member has mentioned is in Victoria, where the Government has passed legislation to say that, if one insurance company defaults where third party insurance is concerned, other insurance companies shall be liable for the default. Looking at the matter fairly and squarely, I must say that it seems to me to have many grave defects. To make one person liable in law for another's debts seems to me to be something that this House would have to examine closely, particularly as in this case the insurance company concerned was, I believe, a New South Wales insurance company.

I have looked at the matter, but must confess I considered that there was in equity good ground for not proceeding with it. We do not normally make another person liable for a competitor's default, as we would be doing here.

**Mr. Riches:** It would be better to have a Government insurance office.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is another matter.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not debating the question: I am only answering it. The Government has looked at the legislation of Victoria but we have considered that some vital principles are involved in it that would make us hesitate to introduce such legislation.

**Mr. LAUCKE:** I am perturbed that there should exist in the mind of any insured person any shadow of doubt that a liability he may be called on to meet is not completely covered under the existing law regarding compulsory third party insurance. Further, the system of third party insurance was inaugurated to insure the breadwinner of a family who might be killed in an accident by a person who had no assets to assist the injured party's family, and there should be a means of covering families under those circumstances. Under the present law, insurance companies are not completely guaranteeing that cover and the whole purpose of third party insurance is falling flat. I ask the Premier to review again the matter I have raised in respect of this insurance, as I feel that in the public interest it is important that every liability of a motorist under third party bodily injury requirements should and must be met without any question of doubt.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think it would be wrong for a motorist to assume that no matter what he did on the road his claim would be met.

**Mr. Laucke:** I have never implied that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That would not be a good attitude, and I would not favour it. As far as I know, the companies domiciled in this State have met their obligations well and without hesitation when they have been established by courts of law. As I have already said, I intend to approach the Commonwealth Treasurer to see that the guarantee fund established under Commonwealth law is more adequate than at present. It has been the same fund for many years, and it certainly is not adequate at present.

Mr. Jennings: What about a State insurance fund?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: State insurance funds have lost much money in other States because of motor accidents.

Mr. Jennings: That does not matter. They pay up, don't they?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They pay out of the taxpayers' money. I think our system is the best: it ensures that people are covered by companies with ample means. I cannot take the matter further than that.

Mr. RICHES: I believe the best solution would be to establish a Government insurance fund. I understood the Premier to say that where such funds had been established there had been losses that had been met by the taxpayer, but, although I do not say this is not so, I have not heard this before. Will the Premier indicate which State insurance funds have lost money in their operations and have had to be supported from general revenue?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was referring to New South Wales, where losses on compulsory insurance of motor vehicles have been over six figures.

#### GERIATRIC WARD.

Mr. RICHES: Will the Premier call for a report from the Minister of Health on the desirability of establishing a ward for geriatric patients at the Port Augusta Hospital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that.

#### MAIN NORTH ROAD.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about road reconstruction by the Highways Department to be undertaken on the Main North Road in my district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that the reconstruction of the junction of Main North Road with Nottage Terrace will be commenced as soon as alterations to other public utilities have been completed, which work is in hand. The roadworks will be carried out by the Prospect Corporation. It is anticipated that, when this work is completed, traffic lights will be installed during the current financial year. There are no plans for the immediate reconstruction of the junction of Nottage Terrace and the North-East Road for the installation of traffic lights as the position has improved considerably since the change-over of the "stop" signs following the introduction of lights at the Buckingham Arms.

#### SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMME.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Education say whether plans for this year's school building programme have been finalized? If so, what are the department's intentions?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No; they have not yet been finalized. In due course, the Treasurer will introduce his Loan Estimates, part of which will concern the school building programme.

#### FLORA AND FAUNA RESERVES.

Mr. RICHES: There is a feeling in the north of the State, a feeling which I share, that the Government has not made sufficient provision in the Flinders Ranges area for the protection of flora and fauna and for reserves for future use. Will the Minister of Lands call for a report from a competent officer in his department on the reserves that have been provided and the desirability of enlarging them? Some consist of only the width of a creek, and nothing else. South Australia is lagging seriously, in some parts of the State at any rate, in this important provision. Will the Minister get an opinion from somebody more authoritative than I and with more knowledge of the matter than I can claim to have?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS: Recently, the Government has provided for large areas for flora and fauna reserves. I agree with the honourable member that the area he mentioned has many disabilities, but I will get some information for him.

Mr. BYWATERS: As I am interested in the National Fitness Council I am concerned with the provision of flora and fauna reserves. The Minister of Lands is aware that an area at Deep Creek on the South Coast is wanted as a reserve. It is naturally endowed with native flora and fauna and should be reserved for future generations. Can the Minister say whether any progress has been made with the report on the suitability of this area for a reserve?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS: True, it is an interesting area, and last week I instructed the Land Board to examine it in order to value the property concerned.

#### PEDESTRIAN RIGHTS.

Mr. TAPPING: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on July 19 about motorists turning left and impeding pedestrians?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following report from the Commissioner of Police:

Together with members of the Traffic Division of this department, I am very conscious of the problem existing in relation to pedestrian movement at the main city intersections. Traffic is at all times carefully watched in an endeavour to maintain a free and safe flow of vehicles and to ensure the safety of pedestrians. Each busy point is manned almost continuously by a member of the Traffic Control staff, but to effectively police the intersections, four police officers would be required at each—one at each corner. Most motorists are cautioned and warned where they do not exercise the maximum amount of care when making left and right turns, and those detected disobeying traffic lights are prosecuted. Many of these offences involve late left or right turns and could give pedestrians cause for complaint.

There is also the other side of the picture to consider—pedestrians taking advantage of the amber light and continuing to walk against the red signal rather than seek refuge in the centre of the road. The present legislation (subsection (3b) of section 123 of the Road Traffic Act) provides as follows:

In turning to the right or left at an intersection or junction a driver of a vehicle or animal shall take precautions to avoid collision with pedestrians and if he fails to do so shall be guilty of an offence.

Although the meaning is clear to the average person, the legal interpretation placed on it is that if a collision occurs between a motorist and pedestrian under these circumstances, the motorist is to blame. The following is the section of the new (1961) Act which, when proclaimed, will give pedestrians greater protection and makes it an offence for a motorist to "barge through" pedestrians:

A driver when turning his vehicle to the right or left at an intersection or junction shall give the right of way to pedestrians.

#### WOOL RESEARCH.

Mr. HALL: Recently Mr. Adermann, the Minister for Primary Industry, announced the allocation of funds from the Wool Research Committee. It was reported that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization would receive the greatest share of the research money—£1,062,000 for fundamental research into problems of animal genetics, animal physiology, sheep disease, animal nutrition and the allied fields of plant industry, soils, entomology and wild life. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether funds are wasted through the unnecessary duplication of research work by the State agricultural services and the C.S.I.R.O., and will he advocate that more of this fund money be directed to textile and market research?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Finance is supplied by the Wool Research Committee, which comprises a wide representation of wool-growers and decides where the money will go. The Agriculture Department and Roseworthy Agricultural College participate in the disbursements from this fund and great care is taken to ensure that any overlapping of the research work is not excessive. There may be some overlapping, but I do not know of any instances. Agricultural research throughout Australia is supervised by the Australian Agricultural Council so that research work is not overlapped to any great extent.

#### CANCER.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the campaign for the prevention of cancer?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director General of Public Health reports as follows:

Facilities for the treatment of cancer in South Australia compare favourably with those anywhere in the world. Death and suffering caused by this disease may be reduced in two ways. First by preventing those forms of cancer where means of prevention are known, especially of lung and skin cancer. Secondly by early diagnosis and treatment. The Department of Public Health aims to help in both directions—first by public education about the strong connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer, and about the hazards to fair skinned people of prolonged exposure to direct sunlight; and secondly by encouraging people to seek medical advice when they notice any unusual change in their state of health. The symptoms of cancer in its many forms are so diverse and varied that it would be difficult and misleading to detail them because many of these symptoms often represent much simpler conditions, and because even a broad list of symptoms would not cover all the ways in which cancer may begin.

The watchword of the Public Health Department in cancer prevention is:

No cigarette smoking;

Limited exposure to sunlight for fair skins; and

Report any unusual change in health to your doctor so that its importance may be determined.

The department is co-operating with the Anti-Cancer Foundation of the University of Adelaide in its public education activities.

#### PORT PIRIE FACILITIES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier obtained replies to the questions I asked last week about sales in Adelaide of lost property from Port Pirie and about the transfer to Adelaide of all registrations of births, deaths and marriages?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Regarding sales of lost property, the Commissioner of Police reports:

In the majority of cases the Port Pirie police have been successful in having articles of found property returned to the owner. Consequently, the small amount of property which is unclaimed would not justify the expense of convening a special auction sale at Port Pirie. During the previous 12 months only one article of found property—a bicycle—was forwarded to Adelaide for disposal.

Regarding registrations of births, deaths and marriages, the Principal Registrar reports:

The Births and Deaths Registration Act was amended in 1959 to allow parents to register births by post instead of attending before a registrar of births, but, if parents so wish, they may still attend at an office of a district registrar to register a birth. Registrations of births, deaths and marriages may, therefore, still be effected at Port Pirie. All births, deaths and marriages that occur in the registration district of Pirie and which are registered at the office of the Principal Registrar are also registered with the district registrar at Port Pirie. Copies of and extracts from such registrations are available from the district registrar at Port Pirie. It is still the responsibility of parents to register births, but the voluntary registration in their own time by police officers at maternity hospitals has been discontinued.

#### SCHOOL FIRST-AID EQUIPMENT.

Mr. LANGLEY: As injuries often occur in school grounds as a result of sporting events, will the Minister of Education say whether it is the policy of his department to try to maintain efficient first-aid equipment in all schools under his jurisdiction?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to obtain a report.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption, which Mr. Frank Walsh had moved to amend.

(For wording of amendment see page 182.)

(Continued from July 31. Page 322.)

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I support the motion in its amended form. I do not know whether the previous speaker, the member for Burnside, knew that I was to be the next speaker. The subject matter of her speech was undue noise and the possibility of deafness arising from it. If I was the subject matter of her speech, I shall endeavour not to offend the House. I think members fully appreciate that if they suffer from deafness they will not receive workmen's compensation, as people in some industries do.

Like others who have spoken in this debate, I express my sympathy to relatives and friends of members who have died since the last occasion on which we had the opportunity to express such sympathy. Although some members mentioned are only names to me, one member I knew extremely well and to whose family I extend my deepest sympathy is the late Mr. J. E. Stephens. Mr. Stephens was my predecessor in the Port Adelaide district, and in the long period during which he was a member he was a worthy representative of that district. Because of his services to his constituents and the State, any sympathies extended to his family are merited.

I have spoken and have listened to speeches in all sorts of places throughout the length and breadth of Australia, but I have never heard such filth and utter nonsense emanating from any person as this House was subjected to recently by the member for Gouger. He said on one occasion that he was extremely proud that the sewage farm was going to be in his district. I can understand that, and, if I may make a suggestion to the Minister of Works, if there is ever a vacancy for a person to supervise that scheme, I suggest the member for Gouger, because he is an expert on filth and rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order! Those words are unbecoming under the Standing Orders, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw them.

Mr. RYAN: I withdraw them unconditionally, but I persist in saying that the honourable member's speech was absolute rubbish and filth.

The SPEAKER: I must ask that the word "filth" be withdrawn.

Mr. RYAN: I withdraw the word "filth" and leave the words "utter rubbish". On some matters the member for Gouger was ignorant. He said he knew of no Labor man who had done anything at all, publicly or otherwise, to support Charlie Fitzgibbon, who was successful in winning one of the major trade union posts in this country. I am positive that the honourable member knew nothing of what he was saying, and he should ram the information down the throat of whoever provided it for him. Charlie Fitzgibbon is a great friend of mine. At considerable expense, I travelled thousands of miles and spoke thousands of words to make sure that he would be elected to that important position.

It is not much good going to supporters of the Liberal Party and asking them to support

a Labor man. It was not much good going to the King William Street shipowners and asking them to support that candidate. We had to go to the persons who have votes and who can intelligently record those votes; they are the people we went to, and I am proud to say that we were successful in what we set out to do. The results speak for themselves. Yet, people get up and vilify us and say we did nothing to assist Mr. Fitzgibbon. If that is not utter rubbish, then I have never heard any.

Mr. A. A. Calwell, the number one person today in the Labor Party of Australia and the person who, if it were not for some of the people the member for Gouger runs down, would be the Prime Minister of this country, spoke on numerous occasions and published articles in support of Mr. Fitzgibbon, yet the honourable member said that nobody supported him in any way. The Party he belongs to is in charge of the Treasury benches in the Commonwealth Parliament only because of the support that it received from the Communist Party, the people that we on this side of the House have fought and will fight as long as we have breath in our bodies to do so.

During this debate we have heard much from members opposite of their tremendous victory in March this year, and how they received a vote of confidence from the people, but if there ever was a no-confidence vote in any Government anywhere in the world, it was recorded against the Playford Government last March. It has been said that we of the Labor Party did not have the decency or stomach to go into the various electorates and tell the people what our policy was and what we stood for. If that is true, and if the last election in March, 1962, was only a flash in the pan, let us go back to the past and see what happened. Let us see whether the increase in the numbers of the Opposition has been gained overnight, or whether it is something that has been simmering in this State for a long while. Let me refer to the *Advertiser* of Wednesday, July 9, 1958, nearly four years ago, three days before the Mount Gambier by-election. I will speak of the matter as I know it, and not merely as something I have read about. I will give facts and figures as I know them as a result of my participation in that campaign. The *Advertiser* article stated:

Defeat in the poll would not mean the Government's loss of office, but a victory would give it the backing it needs to govern effectively. The Premier should not have to keep

looking over his shoulder to count the numbers on his side.

The Premier does not look over his shoulder today: he looks straight in front of him and sees where the majority is. The article continues:

It can hardly be supposed that all this progress will be accelerated if the Government's clear Parliamentary majority is withdrawn and the threat of political instability arises in this State.

On the same day, four years ago, the Premier, speaking at Mount Gambier, said:

The main issue of the by-election was whether the Government would have an assured majority or whether its efficiency would be impaired.

Compare the statements then with the position now! The Premier four years ago was talking about whether his majority would be impaired and whether he could carry on an effective Government. Even after that by-election—and the Labor Party won it by a big majority—the state of the House was 20 Government members, two Independents, and 17 Opposition members. The Premier had said he could not govern effectively unless supported by a majority of the people in Mount Gambier. Some members may say that the result at Mount Gambier was a flash in the pan. Let us follow history a little farther. Two years later, in opening the Light by-election campaign on Thursday, April 12, 1960, the Premier, speaking at Eudunda, said:

The numbers in the House are very evenly balanced—

I do not know what he would say of the position now if the numbers then were evenly balanced—

and if we lost Light the balance would be disrupted. Give me a majority to enable me to do the job. The result of a stale-mate can only be detrimental to all sections of the community.

The Government won that by-election and the numbers in the House were as they had been before. As a result of Labor men door-knocking in that electorate and telling the people what the Labor Party's policy was, what the Party stood for and what it would do if it was given the reins of Government, a noticeable swing took place. However, some people say we have not got the stomach to go to the people and tell them what our policy is and what we stand for. That by-election resulted in a prediction that the swing to Labor could be a seven-seat gain. An article published on April 26, 1960, stated:

The Light by-election has brought two clear views now that Party leaders have studied



the result in detail. The Liberals say, "It was the best thing that could happen. It woke our fellows up as never before."

Let us see how far the leaders of that Party woke up in March, 1962. The article continued:

Labor is claiming that the same swing would see Labor members elected in Unley, Glenelg, Torrens, Victoria, Chaffey, Flinders and Onkaparinga.

How true that article was in the case of Unley, and only the Minister of Education knows how worried he was, in Glenelg, prior to the March election: ultimately he had to rely on the preferences of a splinter group before he could obtain a majority. The member for Torrens, if he ever woke up, woke up in March only to find that Torrens had nearly slipped out of his hand. But I have no doubt that next time we face the electors the seat of Torrens will be won by the Australian Labor Party. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) can note that prediction now. I notice that the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) bows. He very nearly bowed out of politics. I do not doubt that the Liberal and Country League with all due respect to him, will put up a different candidate next time in the hope that it will get a better result. The member for Victoria stated at the declaration of the poll at Naracoorte that he could not envisage in the future any more industries coming into that district. Why? It needs only one more industry of any importance in that district and Victoria will suffer the same fate as Millicent: it will become a good solid Labor seat. What happened to the meat works in Victoria? Did that eventuate? Of course not, and it never will.

Mr. Lawn: The Government does not want it there.

Mr. RYAN: The Premier said that he thought there would be a meat works there. He would not have had a Government today if he had put a meat works there, and he knew it. But he talked about decentralization. If ever anyone spoke about decentralization with his fingers crossed in the hope that no-one would believe him, it was the Premier of South Australia.

Mr. Heaslip: You're guessing, aren't you?

Mr. RYAN: I am not guessing at all. It is rubbish that, when 54 per cent of the electors say they want a certain Party to form the Government, 34 per cent can get a Government on a minority vote.

Mr. Harding: Rubbish!

Mr. RYAN: The member for Victoria says, "Rubbish!" That does indeed apply to the electoral set-up in South Australia. Then

what happened to the seat of Chaffey? Here it is, on this side of the Chamber: it belongs to the Australian Labor Party. We have 19 members. Let us consider the seat of Flinders, where the Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson), I believe, about two days after the election had to see a doctor because of a haemorrhage: he could not stand the strain. It was only in the last two days of counting that he won the seat by the slenderest majority he ever had, and that will disappear on the next occasion; so he can be forewarned of what will happen there. I do not think the Minister of Lands (Hon. Sir Cecil Hineks) has seen the latest Liberal and Country League motto. Accept my advice—beware! This is the latest L.C.L. motto (published last Monday morning): "Let him that speaks with or without authority beware, for we will bury him." That is what happened in that election; and yet people still get up and say that we, the Labor Party, are frightened of our policy. If anybody is frightened of the Labor Party's policy it is the Government. Let us look at its policies. Has not the Government over a long period stolen what is decent and good from the Labor Party's policy and brought it down as its own, claiming it as good policy?

The Hon. Sir Cecil Hineks: There is not much good in Labor policy. We have slipped a long way if we have adopted much of your policy.

Mr. RYAN: On the eve of the Light by-election, knowing that the Labor Party was willing to tell the people that it was prepared to give the same rates for electricity in the country as in the city, the Premier promised a 10 per cent reduction in rural electricity charges. Did they get it? The Minister of Lands knows as well as I do that they did not get it until six months later, and then they got a niggardly little piece of what they were promised. Did not the A.L.P. members in this very Chamber last session move the same thing, and what happened so far as the Government was concerned? The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) and other Government members opposed what was moved because the Labor Opposition moved it. The Government is prepared to support it now. One member says—and I place all my emphasis on one word; if one reads his speech, one can wipe that word out of it—that we are not fit people to govern this State. However, anything we bring down the Government is prepared to follow. It is like a little dog on a chain; we are out in front and the Government is the dog on the chain.

What happened in 1959? The Minister of Education knows. The Government knew that free education was something the people of this State wanted, and they were going to vote to get it. Did not the Government come out and say, "This has some merit in it. This could upset us"? Did not the Government bring out the concessional allowance for children in secondary schools? It stole a portion of the Labor Party's policy, and said it was good.

Mr. Jennings: And then it mucked it up.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, it mucked it up; and recently it had to go a little further, although it went against the grain, when it increased the allowance to £8, according to class stages. We said, still say, and will say that we will give free education in this State.

Mr. Heaslip: No land tax?

Mr. RYAN: We have asked for a Royal Commission to investigate land tax, and the member for Rocky River opposes it.

Mr. Heaslip: No.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, the honourable member does, and I will wager now how his vote will go. I will go further and say now how the members for Bidley (Hon. T. C. Stott) and Burra (Mr. Quirke) will vote on the same issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! Betting is not allowed in this Chamber.

Mr. RYAN: I always thought one had to put up some money and get someone to lay some odds before it was a bet. Does anyone think that the Premier of this State would have got up and said that this motion was vital, that his Government would stand or fall by the voting on this motion, if he hadn't been certain how the voting would go? Don't members think that the Premier knew what the voting would be when he made that statement? If the Government had received its just deserts, and the public had been told the real result of the election, the headlines in March would have been "Electoral Reign Comes to an End" and "Will of the People has been Expressed". If members opposite can tell me anywhere else in the world where a similar political situation exists I will go there to examine it and when I return will report on it.

Mr. Quirke: You're holding your own.

Mr. RYAN: I'm holding my own pretty well. As the member for Burra knows, the Government has 18 members, we have 19 members, and there are a couple of misnomers. I don't know whether at the next election the member for Burra will come out as an L.C.L. member. If he doesn't, it won't be his fault for not applying for it.

Mr. Lawn: He has approached the member for Booleroo, and the L.C.L. is considering his application.

Mr. Quirke: You're a liar! That's a lie!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: Let us examine what the member for Burra said at the declaration of the Burra poll on Wednesday, March 14, 1962. He is reported as saying:

The Liberal Party, not the Playford Government, has been defeated at the State election. I will support the Playford Government.

I went to school and my education is as good as anybody's, and I might say that I have the qualifications of quite a number. To be able to interpret that statement, in view of the political situation, I would have to go back to Southern Ireland. "The Liberal Party, not the Playford Government, has been defeated at the State election." Who is the Playford Government?

Mr. Quirke: Where did you get that statement from?

Mr. RYAN: I got it from a paper. If the honourable member says that it is not true, he has not denied it before.

Mr. Quirke: This is the first time I have heard it.

Mr. RYAN: I have read it from the press cutting. The honourable member said that the Liberal Party, not the Playford Government, was defeated. In what way did members opposite fight the election? Did they go out as a team, or as a mob of individuals? They are certainly a mob of individuals now, but did they go out as individuals? All of their pamphlets and advertisements for the election described them as members of the Liberal and Country Party, and contained a photograph of one person, and his head was chopped off on the day of the election. They went out as Liberals. Don't they all pay their affiliations on North Terrace? Could they contest the election if they were not financial members of the Liberal Party? They are members of the same Party that is in power in the Commonwealth sphere.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) lauded the employment position in South Australia. I maintain that we should not have had the unemployment we have had. He spoke about unemployment and the number of unemployed being reduced. That number has not been reduced according to the last two figures released. Unemployment was made by Liberals for an express purpose, and the honourable member knows that as well as

I do. We should not have had unemployment, and we would not if there had been a Labor Government in control in the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. Heaslip: We would then have had a real catastrophe.

Mr. RYAN: The only catastrophe is that members opposite have 18 members and we 19, and the honourable member will never recover from that. When they put water into Booleroo, they should have put the honourable member four feet under it. The member for Burra, who is only a misnomer in South Australian politics—and he cannot deny it—said that he would support the Government whether it was good or bad and whether its legislation was fair or detrimental to the State. I must confess that I agree with his statement during a television interview that the days of the Independents are over. The next elections will prove that statement. The people have heard him say that he, an Independent—and Independents are supposed to be independent and divorced from Party politics—will support the Government whether it is good or bad and give it his vote.

Mr. Shannon: You are approaching the danger stage in decibels now.

Mr. RYAN: I wish that the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) could accelerate some of the reports that he is supposed to bring to the House. He goes like a snail on some of those reports. Patience is like a motor tyre—it can be worn out. The patience of some of the people in this State has certainly been worn out. Let me now refer to the member for Rocky River. Is he still with us?

Mr. Heaslip: Yes.

Mr. RYAN: He won't be much longer. During this debate he said:

The Leader of the Opposition, strange to say, also brought up the matter of the mode of transport used by trade missions. He advocated the use of Australian ships.

I interjected, "Why shouldn't they be used?" He did not know we had them until I told him. He then said:

If anyone wants to add another burden on to the primary producer, by all means use them.

Mr. Heaslip: That's right. That is a fact, too.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member admits saying that. We are getting somewhere at last.

Mr. Heaslip: We depend on ships.

Mr. RYAN: I shall refer to the Australian National Shipping Line. Don't ask the member for Rocky River who created it.

Mr. Heaslip: Who got rid of it?

Mr. RYAN: The Liberals, and where do their interests lie? In shipping companies.

Mr. Heaslip: The waterside workers are always on strike.

Mr. RYAN: I'll give the honourable member a strike. Don't let him get close to me or I might carry that into effect.

Mr. Shannon: Big, strong fellow!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: In the fifth annual report of the Australian National Shipping Line the following appears:

It was a very successful year. After providing £969,564 for taxation—

and I emphasize that the Commonwealth got almost £1,000,000 in taxation from its own line (and members opposite talk about competitive trade)

—a profit of £1,433,739 has been earned. This compares favourably with £1,314,376 for the previous year.

Although the Commonwealth Government received £985,507 in interest at 6 per cent, which this undertaking is compelled to pay, and the Taxation Department received nearly £1,000,000, the undertaking showed a profit of about £1,500,000. The member for Rocky River said it had never made a profit or gone to work. It is a pity he did not go to work!

Mr. Heaslip: I said that the primary producer had to pay, and that the undertaking made these profits.

Mr. RYAN: That will be the day—when you pay for anything!

Mr. Heaslip: Any shipping line can make a profit of £1,000,000, and primary producers object to this.

Mr. RYAN: A conscientious objector! I will deal later with the point raised by the honourable member. The total tonnage carried by the shipping line in 1961 was 5,991,862 tons. Apparently it worked more than the member for Rocky River! This was an increase of 761,935 tons over the previous year. Overseas tonnage increased from 50,133 tons in 1960 to 56,242 in 1961. The member for Rocky River said, "We haven't a shipping line", but he contradicted that when he said, "They never go to sea." First he said we had no shipping line; then, when he found that we had, he said it was not working.

Mr. Heaslip: Look up *Hansard* and see.

Mr. RYAN: I will go further. The report said:

The Australian National Line vessels successfully undertook overseas voyages to and from overseas countries.

The principle laid down is stated in the report as follows:

It has been the constant endeavour of the Commission to play its part in providing an adequate and efficient service on the Australian coast and, whenever overseas freight rates have made it practicable, to engage in overseas trade.

Unfortunately, this principle has never been followed. It would be followed if the Labor Party had one more seat in the Commonwealth Parliament, as this shipping line would be restored to what it was—a line owned and worked by the Government for and on behalf of all the people of this country, whether they work in secondary industry or primary industry. In a report to a Liberal Commonwealth Government, it was shown that in 1957 revenue was £3 4s. 9d. a ton and the costs were £2 12s. In 1958 revenue was £3 3s. 5d. and costs £2 14s. 5d. a ton—still a profit. In 1959 revenue was £2 14s. 4d. and costs were £2 6s. 4d.—still a profit, despite the obstacles placed in the way of this important Government scheme, not only by the Government but by the very people who should be using the line.

It did not reach the stage where some people could say, "It is not making a profit; let us get rid of it." The member for Rocky River cannot stand it any longer! He realizes he has been filling this House with fallacies and a pack of lies, and, now that he cannot stand it any longer, he has left the Chamber. In 1961 the revenue was £2 5s. 11d. and costs were £1 19s. 7d. a ton, so the line, despite obstacles, is still operating at a profit. The member for Rocky River said that the Opposition never considered primary producers and that it never wanted to introduce legislation granting amenities to assist them in any way, yet in a period of four months in 1956-57 this line carried 124,883 tons overseas. The records relate only to a four-month period because in that year the name was changed from the Australian National Shipping Line to the Australian Shipping Commission. In 1957-58 the line engaged in overseas trade to the extent of 213,915 tons, yet the member for Rocky River said there was no national shipping line and that it would not assist if it were operating. This tonnage was carried by that line to help support this country.

Unfortunately, because of Government interference and lack of support from the people owning the line, cargo carried overseas dwindled and dwindled until last year it was only 56,242 tons. This undertaking provided the means to assist primary pro-

ducers to a greater extent than they had been assisted in previous years. Would it matter if it did no more than meet running costs from the revenue derived, provided that it enabled us to compete with foreign countries by carrying overseas at a reasonable rate the products we grow and manufacture? This line can and will do that. When there is a change of Government it will be run for and on behalf of the people of this country. The Commonwealth Government is certainly not going to allow a national line owned by the Government to show a profit, because the greater the profit the greater the inroads into the profits where their interests are centred.

For the benefit of the member for Rocky River, who, although he did not seem sure whether or not the line existed, then said that it did not work, I point out that in 1961 this line had 44 ships of a total tonnage of 267,112 tons. However, we see that people such as primary producers, who are in a position to help others, are willing to charter ships under foreign flags, which are run by people who have no stake at all in this country and who will exploit us as much as possible. Let me come back to the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: That might be a good idea.

Mr. RYAN: I hope the member for Mitcham will tell the people he represents that he is denying them an opportunity to put forward evidence of land tax anomalies. The Leader's amendment reads:

We desire to inform Your Excellency that in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission, consisting of five members of the House of Assembly—

We do not say how many Liberal members and how many Labor members should be appointed to that committee—

should be appointed to conduct a review and to inquire fully into the incidence of the land tax legislation.

Is the member for Mitcham afraid of his own opinion? We know that if three Liberal members were appointed to a Commission there would really only be one: it would be the Premier, and the others would merely be voicing his opinion. Irrespective of what evidence was given before a Royal Commission we would still get only the Premier's viewpoint. The Government is afraid of Labor Opposition members; irrespective of what the Government members reported to this House, a Commission of five members would contain at least some Labor members who would also be able to submit a report to this House. Irrespective of what was decided and what was reported to this House, at least there would be some

freedom of expression by members on this side of the House about what evidence was tendered to that Commission, and members opposite are afraid of this. They are afraid that some of the people they represent would give evidence before this Commission that might demand a change in the present set-up. Although members opposite say they represent the people of South Australia, in actual fact they represent only 34 per cent.

Mr. Shannon: Keep saying that and you may believe it some day.

Mr. RYAN: I see that the truth really hurts.

Mr. Shannon: It does not hurt me: it makes me smile.

Mr. RYAN: I shall make the honourable member smile! The honourable member went up to Frome; it was very much against the grain for him to go, and he did so only on the dictates of somebody else, and he knows who that was. It is recorded that Labor won that by-election by a narrow majority. It is recorded in *Hansard* that on numerous occasions the member for Onkaparinga has said to the member for Frome, "Your term in here is very limited; you are on the way out."

Mr. Millhouse: And that is right, too.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Frome's majority is, I believe, the greatest ever recorded in the district. It was the member for Onkaparinga who on several occasions in this House said, "I will go up there and make sure you are not returned at the next election." What happened?

Mr. Lawn: The member for Frome increased his majority.

Mr. RYAN: I hope they send the member for Onkaparinga up there next time, and I suggest that he will have to look to his own seat, for his days in this House are certainly limited.

Mr. Shannon: You are taking a leaf out of my book now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: I never want to stoop so low as to want to take a leaf out of the honourable member's book. If I want to say anything I will say it in this House; I have a principle and so has my Party, and we will stick to it. The public of South Australia has stuck to the honourable member's principle to the extent of 34 per cent. Give the Opposition the opportunity to go back to the people soon, and we will be willing to accept the majority decision. I suppose the member for Onkaparinga goes to the football and

blames the umpire, claiming that he did not give his side a fair go and that he cheated. The honourable member belongs to a Party that adopts that as its own principle. An umpire makes a decision, and the umpire in the game of politics is the public. The public made its decision, and members opposite refused to accept it: they are cheating.

Mr. Quirke: You won't let me be the umpire, will you?

Mr. RYAN: An umpire is supposed to be absolutely unbiased, and the member for Burra could never be in that category again; he is finished for all time, and he knows it. Unless he gets the endorsement of the L.C.L. his face will not be seen in this House again. When something is introduced by the Labor Party it is said to be no good, but when the Liberal Party revives the very same thing it is claimed to be the best thing that ever happened. Let us have a look at the Premier's policy speech delivered on Tuesday, February 13, 1962. He said he was going to increase the term for house purchase from 30 to 40 years, but the next day he amended that; it sounded too bald on the Tuesday night when he first announced it, so on the Wednesday he had to amend it. In doing so he put so many restrictions on it that not many people can use that scheme. Why were those restrictions imposed? Initially, it was a bald statement that houses could be purchased over a term of 40 years. The Premier then amended it and as a result only people up to 25 years of age can receive any advantage from the scheme. Why? Because in the main those people would be voting for the first time. The Premier put out a bait to catch these people and induce them to vote for his Party. The amazing thing is that some years ago, I believe, money could be borrowed on house properties over a term of 40 years, and this was reduced to 30 years by the Liberal Party itself. It was increased to 40 years on the eve of an election to catch the young elector voting for the first time, whereas borrowing money on a 40-year term has been Australian Labor Party policy for many years.

Mr. Quirke: Do you think that is good?

Mr. RYAN: Of course it is good. Why burden young people with a financial burden they will never get rid of?

Mr. Quirke: I will tell you when I speak that that is the worst thing in your policy.

Mr. RYAN: What will you speak on?

Mr. Quirke: In opposition to Paddy Ryan!

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member has already said, "I will never vote to bring about

the fall of the Government. I will be independent." If that is independence, it is not in accordance with the meaning of the word as we know it. Members opposite talk about the L.C.L. policy. That is not accepted by the public and they said so. The Premier has explained that it is intended to set up a Premier's Department to encourage the establishment of new industries. When they look at Thursday night's television programme and hear the Premier speaking it becomes a horror session.

Mr. Jennings: Worse than Boris Karloff!

Mr. RYAN: Every Thursday the Premier comes up with a new industry and the following week he forgets that one and creates another.

Mr. Shannon: Do you think what you are saying is good tactics? Won't it advertise the Premier?

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member has a doubt about the representation in this House of 34 per cent as against 50 per cent. Members opposite do not even trust us. Does the honourable member doubt that 50 per cent is greater than 34 per cent? There is an element of doubt. He should ask the "boss", and he will tell him! Every Thursday night over the television we get a new industry suggested. Sometimes it may involve an expenditure of £2,000,000, and even go as high as £150,000,000. They are only fairy tales. When the Premier creates another industry the following Thursday, the public forgets about the previous one. The suggestion to create a Premier's Department to encourage the development of new industries is in the same category as the demolition of temporary houses. The Government—the whole 18 of them—is guilty of a misnomer when it says it will build a new main road as far as possible on the route of the old Glenelg railway. How many times has the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) suggested this very project to the Government? His suggestion has been ignored, yet on the eve of an election the Government announces that it will build something that has been suggested over the last 10 years by Labor. It will never do it. If the Labor Party had been in power it would have been done.

What about Harmac, which involved an expenditure of £14,000,000—a beautiful industry? It came and went. It got caught in the credit squeeze and disappeared. It is like the proposed Premier's Department for the setting up of new industries. It will come, but it

will also go. The Premier has also said that courses at secondary schools will be widened and that the same courses will be available for country children as for those living in the metropolitan area, but has not the Labor Party advocated this very thing for many years? Since becoming a member four years ago, I have heard Labor members suggesting that this be done, but on the eve of an election it is put before the public by the Premier as a bait; yet members opposite say that all the Labor Party does is to submit promises that cannot be fulfilled. These thin balloons that were sent up on the eve of an election by the Liberal Party were burst by the electors on election day. On the day following the delivery of the Leader's policy speech (February 14), appeared an editorial in the *Advertiser* saying that this policy could not be implemented. We hear talk about the freedom of the press and its unbiased comment, but I draw members' attention to the following which appeared in the editorial in referring to points in the Premier's policy speech:

Some of these are of immediate and wide public interest. In housing, the Government will extend the term of guaranteed loans from 30 to 40 years, thereby reducing the borrower's payments. In so far as this will apply to existing loans, as well as new ones, older people now paying off mortgages will benefit. Half of the points in the policy speech were pinched from the Labor Party. The following day, after the Premier had got over the first hurdle and collapsed at the second, he said that these loans on houses would apply to people of a certain age and that there would be certain provisos for applications to be considered under this scheme. These people will be so old when they get the benefit of this scheme that they will have to wait for a Labor Government to assist them.

Mr. Shannon: That will make them very old indeed!

Mr. RYAN: It will be asked by the Liberals, "What have you fellows ever put forward that is good?" Labor last year suggested an amendment of the Industrial Code, but the Premier said that his Party could not accept it, the reason being that the Bill was introduced by the Opposition. However, the Premier has foreshadowed an amending Bill. Evidently, our proposal was not good enough. Labor has also suggested concessional fares for pensioners travelling on private transport. I do not know how many times I have raised this question, and also other members of my Party, but on

each occasion we have been told by the Government that the answer is "No". Our minority Government would be in very serious jeopardy in the event of another election. It knows what the result would be and is prepared to offer any bait whatsoever to electors in an effort to redeem itself, but that is not possible.

Mr. Jennings: They are irredeemable!

Mr. RYAN: A truer statement was never made. The answer has been given. On numerous occasions the Opposition has suggested that the privilege of concessional fares for pensioners should be granted, but when the Government finds itself in serious danger of defeat it is prepared to come out and say, "We are prepared to grant this concession." Evidently it hopes that the public will forget where the original request came from and is seeking votes on the promise of the ultimate granting of the privilege.

I now come to a matter commented upon yesterday by my colleague, the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping). I refer to something that the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said. The honourable member is as conversant with this subject as I am and I feel sure that he will support me in my comments on the proposed causeway linking Port Adelaide with LeFevre Peninsula. It is a matter of grave concern in my district. It is reaching the stage where the people themselves realize that their own safety is involved. Every day of the week they are expressing their opinion and demanding that something be done.

We have been told that the Government is a Government that gets things done, but it never says how many years it takes it to do something that it is forced to do ultimately. For seven long years it has been considering a project of vital concern today—the replacement of Jervois bridge.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Everyone agrees on that.

Mr. RYAN: Seven years has elapsed. Unless the Public Works Standing Committee is prepared to over-ride a certain Government department and bring down a recommendation irrespective of the objections raised by that department, another seven years will elapse before we get any report. The members of the committee know to which department I am referring.

Mr. Shannon: The honourable member will see the committee's recommendations shortly.

Mr. RYAN: We have had one report on it. In January, 1961, eighteen months ago, the Public Works Standing Committee wisely brought down an interim report, accepted by

this Parliament, that a causeway be built linking Port Adelaide with LeFevre Peninsula until such time as a final recommendation about the replacement of the Jervois bridge be brought down in this Parliament.

Mr. Fred Walsh: That is the end of the committee's responsibility.

Mr. RYAN: But what happened to its recommendation? The Government ignored it altogether. I have raised this matter many times. In January, 1961, a report was brought down. One Thursday evening the Premier made this the subject matter of a telecast. He said it was of extreme importance and that the Government would implement the recommendations of the committee and commence this important project. That telecast took place in the middle of last year, and now we are in the middle of this year. Where is the progress, where is the causeway? It does not exist. I shall keep on raising this matter until the will of this Parliament is upheld and the recommendation of the Public Works Standing Committee is proceeded with; because the committee can be dispensed with if the Government is to ignore its recommendations.

On July 26, 1961, I asked the Premier what was happening to this project. This was the answer I received:

That report has been accepted by Cabinet and has been submitted to the Highways Department with authorization to proceed with the work.

When I asked him whether the finance for this work would come out of the Loan Estimates or out of the Roads Fund (for I realized that, unless it was on last year's Loan Estimates, there was no possibility of the work being proceeded with that year), the answer I got then, over 12 months ago, was that the finance for this important project was not necessarily included in the Loan Estimates because it would be provided out of the Roads Fund and, therefore, any consideration of supplying the finance out of the Loan Estimates was not necessary.

Cabinet made another decision 12 months ago, and a Government Department was instructed to proceed with the work; the finance was there for it to be done. But what do we find today? There is still no work on this important project. This is an important matter for the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee. Irrespective of the committee's recommendation on the replacement of the Jervois bridge, this causeway must be completed before any further considerations or recommendations, whatever they may be,

can be proceeded with by the Government. We shall be receiving the Loan Estimates in a few weeks' time. The Public Works Standing Committee has come to no final decision yet. Therefore, the Chairman will agree that that amount of money, whatever the committee's recommendation is, will not be included in this year's Loan Estimates; so, at the very earliest, this job of replacement cannot be proceeded with until August, 1963. I am not satisfied with the answer I have received from the Minister of Works and from the Premier himself, irrespective of the fact that Cabinet has been authorized to proceed with this important project and that a Government department has been told to go on with it.

The Premier on another occasion advised me that the finance would be included in the Loan Estimates for this year. How contradictory can one get? First of all, it is not necessary to provide the finance out of the Loan Estimates because it is coming out of the Roads Fund. Then at some later stage the Premier says, "I am going to include it in the Loan Estimates." Where is the money to come from and when is this job to be proceeded with? The action of the Government is holding up the implementation of whatever recommendation will come from the Public Works Standing Committee on the Jervois bridge. My colleague, the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping), mentioned this matter yesterday. The Minister of Lands knows all about it, for he uses this bridge every day, five days a week. A serious catastrophe will occur if it is used much longer. The Jervois bridge can never be closed until such time as the causeway is completed, unless a catastrophe to that structure happens, because the only other link in that area now is the Birkenhead bridge. The strain that that bridge is bearing cannot be borne much longer. No doubt, unless some replacement in some shape or form is built in the near future, the next project that the Public Works Standing Committee will have to consider is the duplication of the Birkenhead bridge because, if anything happens to it, with the strain that it has to carry today, all the industry centred upon the peninsula, of which there is much, will be rendered idle, as no other access is available.

The Government can hoodwink the public as much as it likes, but I ask it to proceed with this authorized project. Is it going to be dictated to much longer by various Government departments, in spite of its authorization for the work to be proceeded with?

Members of the Public Works Committee know that the Harbors Board is doing all possible to prevent the commencement of any additional link between Port Adelaide and LeFevre Peninsula. The board does not want the link and will do all it can for what it wants, but it is out of step with everyone else. The sooner it is placed in step with the Government proposal the better it will be for all concerned. I know that the committee is considering the matter, and I ask the committee members to proceed at better than a snail's pace, which is the pace now. Seven years is too long a time to wait for a decision on a Government project. I do not know how much longer my patience, and the patience of my constituents and those in the Semaphore district, will last.

Tremendous publicity has been given to the activities of the Housing Trust, which has done a good job, but criticism should be levelled at the Government's intentions regarding future trust policy. The trust was established for an express purpose, but its good work will be affected tremendously by the Government's future housing policy. Recently the Premier said that the rental scheme would disappear with the implementation of the low deposit scheme for house ownership. I agree with the principle of a man owning his own house, because it provides an equity for him. If a person pays rent all his life he has no equity in the house in which he lives. Unfortunately, many people are unable to own a house, irrespective of the terms offered. Although only a small deposit will be required under the new Government housing policy, many people will be unable to avail themselves of the scheme. During 1957, 1958 and 1959, the number of applications for rental houses built by the trust was 16,262, and the number granted in the period was 7,362. Rental houses could not be provided for 8,900 people, yet we are told that the rental houses will disappear because of this low deposit scheme. The trust will build the same type of house under the new scheme, and the cost will be the same as that of the rental house. Under the old scheme a rent was paid, but under the new scheme there will be a small deposit. The Premier was not sure of the amount. On one occasion he said that it would be a minimum of £50 and that there would be a means test. The other day he said that if people could make their financial arrangements outside they would not be able to join the low deposit scheme. These people will be thrown back on to private enterprise.



Under the low deposit scheme the rates and taxes will be paid in the first year, but what will happen about the payment of them in the following years? Reports by the Auditor-General and the Housing Trust show that in 1961 the trust paid about £500,000 in rates and taxes on its rental houses, and that the cost of maintaining them was about £500,000. Altogether, about £1,000,000 was paid out in this way, and people buying houses under the low deposit scheme will have to find this £1,000,000. The Premier said that the purchasers will pay on the same basis as occupants of rental houses. He also said that eventually the trust rental programme would disappear. When that happens this huge expense will be transferred to the house purchasers.

I hope the existing trust policy on rental houses will be continued for people who cannot afford to buy houses. If that is done it will assist the people who are in an unfortunate financial position. Every time I write to the Housing Trust on behalf of a person seeking a rental house I receive the standard reply that the trust is not in a position to meet the demands for rental houses nor can it indicate when it can house these people, notwithstanding that their circumstances render it extremely urgent that they should be accommodated. If these people could afford to buy a house they would not be prepared to wait for seven years for a rental house. Now they are to be deprived of rental housing because this low deposit system has been devised to enable the trust to avoid its responsibilities as a house owner. The disappearance of the rental housing policy will aggravate our housing situation.

Governments, irrespective of Party, have recognized that they are responsible for providing housing and so have become big landlords. We know that Government members in South Australia dislike that situation because it is a Socialist policy. It goes against their grain that the Government should be a landlord and they have determined to do their utmost to get out of that position, so this scheme has been evolved.

Mrs. Steele: Don't you agree with people owning their own houses?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and I will do everything possible to assist them, but there are thousands of unfortunate people who cannot afford to own their own houses.

Mrs. Steele: Not under this new scheme of a £50 deposit?

Mr. RYAN: Yesterday a young couple with seven children approached me and sought my assistance in getting a house. The husband is receiving the basic wage. I asked whether they would be able to buy a house on a £50 deposit and they said, "Mr. Ryan, £50 would look to us like a mountain of gold that we could not jump over." It is not simply a question of a person owning a house. I own my own home, but the maintenance costs are colossal. I cannot understand how some pensioners can afford to pay their rates and taxes and other incidentals. According to last year's figures, in Western Australia the average waiting time for a commission house ranges from 18 months to 2½ years.

Mr. Loveday: It is much less than that now: I checked last January.

Mr. RYAN: I am pleased to know that the waiting time has been reduced. In Queensland each application for a commission house is considered on its merits and is given so many points. The points range from a maximum of 100 to a minimum of 40, and each house is allocated on the number of points applying at the time of each application. Applicants with the maximum number of points are allocated houses almost immediately. I do not know what the waiting time is for those applicants with the minimum number of points. Two systems operate in New South Wales. Houses are made available under the 1945 agreement as well as under the 1956 agreement, and the waiting time varies between three years and five years irrespective of the agreement under which they are provided.

Mr. Jennings: New South Wales also has the Government-owned Rural Bank which builds houses for letting.

Mr. RYAN: True.

Mr. Riches: It also has building societies.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and they are guaranteed money by the Government to assist in house building, which is not done here.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you mean by "which is not done here"?

Mr. RYAN: In other States Starr Bowkett Societies are granted assistance in building houses on a no-interest system. The money is guaranteed by the State Governments. I believe that South Australia is the only State where Starr Bowkett Societies are not provided with finance from the Government to enable them to build houses under a no-interest scheme.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you facts and figures on that?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, so far as South Australia is concerned. I have questioned the Premier about this, and Starr Bowkett Societies do not receive Government finance in South Australia. As a matter of fact the Commonwealth Government provides finance for house building provided the State Government becomes the guarantor for the Starr Bowkett Society. Would Government members here want to assist people to buy houses on a no-interest basis? They represent some of the big interests in this State and it would be against the grain.

Mr. Riches: You have not mentioned the waiting time in South Australia.

Mr. RYAN: When I first came into this House four years ago the waiting time was between five and six years, but today it is much longer.

Mr. Jennings: And the position is getting more hopeless.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The waiting time is now about seven years. The position is deteriorating rather than improving. People in needy circumstances requiring a house may no longer desire one in seven years because their family will have grown up. I agree with the principles adopted by the Housing Trust on its inception, but those principles should be carried out and houses should be provided for low wage earners not able to buy a house.

The Premier and other members have spoken of the Parkside Mental Hospital, an institution located in the district of the member for Burnside. Unlike a lady member of the Legislative Council from Western Australia who commented on this institution, I can tell this House what I saw because, in company with other members of Parliament, I went to see what happened there and what the conditions were like. We did not attempt to hide our identities and we were shown not only the good or the bad, but the whole institution. The Premier said this was one of the best institutions in the Commonwealth. If that is true I do not wish to see the worst institution and I refuse to see the worst if that is the best. One must see what is going on in that hospital to realize the conditions under which those people live.

Mr. Hutchens: We could hardly believe what we saw.

Mr. RYAN: True! Our party arrived at the hospital at about 9 a.m. on a Saturday and, after being shown over the premises, we left at about 12.30 p.m. On the following Monday when somebody spoke to me and asked, "Did you eat your lunch after seeing that

institution?" I had to admit that I had not eaten it. Why hadn't I? Because of the filthy conditions I saw there. If members think that people are going to recover under those conditions, I say it would take a miracle to achieve that result. Nothing was hidden from us. We were told not to think of the institution as a mental asylum, because it was an institution for the treatment of people suffering from a sickness and it was the job of those present to assist the patients. It would be practically impossible for patients housed and treated under those conditions to ever recover.

I shall not refer to individual cases but, for the benefit of some members of the Ministry, it should be noted that one recreation room was expected to accommodate 140 people. However, it would have been impossible to get that many people in the room even if they had stood cheek by jowl. The institution has waited 18 months to receive linoleum for the floor of that room, and I believe better linoleum than what we saw could be seen in fowl houses. After a wait of 18 months the institution received the linoleum, but it could not be laid because the hospital authorities were told that no-one was available to lay it. No indication could be given as to when the linoleum would be laid.

One ward that housed 40 patients had no toilet facilities available for them during the night-time. Surely that is an antiquated system, but we saw it. The patients were required to use a toilet system that would have been considered antiquated 50 years ago. If the staff went on strike for better conditions I could visualize no better case than theirs and they should be honoured and receive medals for sticking to their job, which is for the benefit of the patients. I bring these conditions to the notice of members, because, upon making inquiry, I find that the Premier has been in office for about 23 years, which is too long altogether. Last March the people said that was too long, but the Premier refused to accept their decision. I believe, too, that the Chief Secretary has also held his office for about the same period. I am informed that the Premier controls the purse strings of this State and decides whether things will be done, but neither he nor the Chief Secretary has ever visited the Parkside Mental Hospital. If that statement is incorrect it can be corrected and I shall be willing to admit my mistake.

I do not know how the Premier can stand up in this place, as he has done today and previously, and say that this institution is the

best in the Commonwealth. How would he know whether it is the best if he has never seen it? He cannot know if he has never visited the place. He was offered an opportunity to see it because our Leader, who went with me, asked the Premier whether he would open the eyes of members by having a Parliamentary inspection of the institution. We received the usual evasive reply, which ultimately meant "No", because he did not want to be shown the conditions under which these people are treated. The Chief Secretary absolutely refuses to make an inspection and the Premier's answer was on the same lines. I challenge members of this Parliament to visit the hospital, because if they were able to observe the conditions under which these people are treated they would make every possible move to ensure a 100 per cent improvement. I challenge members opposite to make an official inspection and if, having made an inspection, they do not come away promising to do everything possible to improve the conditions they are not the people they should be. I am not able adequately to explain the conditions to the House, but I could explain it in language that would not be acceptable to some members. I believe we should provide a reasonable opportunity for people to get well. The conditions we saw were the worst I have ever seen and I hope I will never see their equal again. I hope, too, that my criticism will be heeded by the Premier and the Government during the few remaining months they are in office.

I shall now point out some anomalies in the legislation dealing with the appointment to the high office of justice of the peace. Since mentioning this matter previously, I have made extensive inquiries and have found that the system of appointment and the conditions of holding office have never been amended. Appointments are made purely and simply on residential qualifications irrespective of an applicant's occupation. On occasions, on the advice of police officers and people interested in civic and welfare matters, I have recommended certain people for appointment only to have the applications refused because too many appointments have been made for the area. There is no requirement that a justice shall notify the Attorney-General's office of any change of address.

Recently a police officer stationed at Kilkenny asked me to recommend for appointment as a justice a person living within 200 yards of the police station. I was told that the police required the services of a justice practically

every day of the week and that no justice resided within two miles of the police station. The application was refused, and on inquiry I was told that it had been refused because the person living next door to the police station was a justice. Next door to the police station is a parking lot for a supermarket and nobody has lived there for three years, yet the records in the Attorney-General's office show that a justice lives there. This happens in hundreds of cases. In some new districts four or five justices live in one street, yet, as the official records show their old addresses, applications made for appointments in the districts in which they previously resided are refused on the ground that sufficient justices live there.

Recently I asked the Attorney-General for a list of justices in my district, and he asked me, "What is your district?" I said, "Port Adelaide." He said, "Yes, but what suburbs does it cover?" Why should it be necessary for me to give this information? Addresses are shown on individual applications and the Attorney-General's office should be able to see in which districts they are situated. I received a list from the Attorney-General's Office of people holding appointment in my district and found that 50 per cent were not living in the district. So much for the record! The list also contained the names of people who had died. I went to many of the addresses shown on the list and was told in many cases that the people had not lived there for years. Some provision should be made to ensure that, when there is a change of address of people holding this high office, the authorities are notified. If this is not done people who could hold office and who want to do something for the community as a whole will be denied the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Quirke: Too many of them want the appointment without being prepared to do court work.

Mr. RYAN: I am not dealing with that aspect; once they are appointed they take on certain obligations. I hope my criticisms and comments will be brought to the Attorney-General so that these anomalies can be rectified. The Opposition, which is the majority Party, has submitted an amendment to the motion. The amendment has a great deal of merit and I point out to members opposite, who are perhaps afraid of the consequences, that the vote on this matter will be made known to the electors when the next State election is held, and that the people will be told the truth about what goes on within the walls of this Parliament.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I gratefully adopt most of what has been said by previous speakers in this debate of personal condolence, welcome and congratulation. Not unexpectedly, I support the Address in Reply as originally moved. I was one of the committee appointed, I think unanimously, by members of this House to prepare a draft Address in Reply, and the committee worked hard indeed at its task.

Mr. Ryan: The whole five minutes?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, the members worked hard and long under the leadership of the Premier and with the kindly guidance and assistance of the Clerk of this House. What did we get for it? Nothing at all! We did not even get thanks, and now, to add insult to injury, we have an amendment moved to it by the Opposition. I think that is very hard treatment, Mr. Speaker. I have had the honour to serve on that committee year in and year out, and I do consider it is tough that our labours should be so poorly rewarded.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Haven't you ever heard of an amendment to the Address in Reply before?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have, but we put so much effort and time into it that I considered it did not need any amending. I should like to say something about the amendment itself. The Leader moved his amendment towards the end of a fairly long and involved speech, and then he made a few perfunctory remarks about it. I confess that I found it difficult to know quite what he was driving at. I have read his remarks in *Hansard*, beginning at page 170, several times since, but they have not made it much clearer. Since the Leader spoke, a number of Opposition members have joined in the debate, but all we know now is that the amendment deals with the subject of land tax and, if I am correct in thinking this, the Leader wants a Royal Commission consisting of five members of the House of Assembly to review and inquire fully into the incidence of the land tax legislation. I pass over altogether the big point of whether there are five members of the House of Assembly who are capable of making this inquiry, or whether indeed a group of politicians is the right group of people to make such an inquiry, because I do not think that aspect is any more than a peg upon which the Opposition wants to hang its amendment. That has not been thought out clearly at all. But what of the substance of this motion? When speaking about it the Leader used various expressions. He said:

Land that is genuinely used for primary production should be the subject of a special rate.

Then further down he used the expression, "The exorbitant amount of land tax involved", but he left everybody in a fog of doubt as to what he suggested should be done. As I began to say earlier, since then seven members of the Opposition have spoken in this debate, including most if not all of the big guns of the Labor Party, such as they are, but not one of them has supported the Leader in explaining just what the Labor Party wants by this amendment. The member for Port Adelaide this afternoon spoke for one hour 55 minutes. Several times he was taunted into mentioning the amendment, but neither he nor any other member who has spoken has said anything in support of the amendment or told us what it is all about.

Mr. Ryan: You are afraid of a Royal Commission.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Port Adelaide keeps on saying, as he did during the one hour 55 minutes of his speech, that we are afraid for some reason, but what have we to be afraid of? We do not know what it is all about. What magnificent team work, and what terrific support for the Leader, that not one of the seven members, not even his Deputy (who did not even mention the subject), has given this House an explanation of what the amendment is all about. Sir, either the Opposition does not know what it is about or it does not care, and, of course, that is the position, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Tell us what you know about it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will tell the honourable member this; the only reason for the introduction of this amendment to the Address in Reply is to try to embarrass you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Oh, no!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It does not matter what the issue is: if the Labor Party thinks it can get the vote of a member who is not a member of the Labor Party, preferably you, Mr. Speaker, or the member for Burra, or if it can embarrass another member, then it will raise that issue. It does not matter what it is, and it does not matter whether it conforms with Labor Party policy. This amendment is sheer expediency, and it is typical of the tactics used by the Opposition during this session. It is not only sheer expediency but complete hypocrisy for the Labor Party to start weeping about the incidence of land tax. What does its own

platform say about this? I have here the *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party* as amended to June, 1958, and perhaps it would be wise to remind all members of the House of the Labor Party's policy on this matter. This booklet was sold to me for five shillings.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With the aid of scissors and paste, I have inserted the amendments up to November 7, 1960. Last week I tried at the headquarters of the Australian Labor Party in Morialta Street to obtain the amendments made since that date, but, as so often happens, they were not available. Apparently this little book is to be reprinted. If anything I am going to refer to has been amended since November 7, 1960, it is not my fault; I cannot get hold of the amendments since that date. On page 33 of this booklet, dealing with the Party's State platform regarding land tax, we find, under the heading "Finance and Taxation", the words:

Progressive taxation on improved land values.

That is a straightout statement, with no qualifications about primary production or anything else. That is the Party's policy and its State platform. What about its Commonwealth platform?

Mr. Lawn: What about the Liberal Party?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Adelaide will not put me off.

Mr. Lawn: You haven't got a policy; you only have rules.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let us look at the Commonwealth platform, the one that, according to the Labor Party, is relevant throughout Australia. On page 61, under the heading "Taxation", we see the words:

A graduated tax on the unimproved value of land.

That seems strange, and later members opposite might be good enough to reconcile this. Apparently Opposition members can take their pick; in the State platform it is "progressive taxation on improved land values" and in the Commonwealth platform it is "a graduated tax on the unimproved value of land". In neither of those planks is there the slightest qualification or suggestion of any relief for primary producers, or anything else. Of course, there are other sections of the State platform dealing with rural policy, marketing and finance. However, I have looked through the nine points there and not one of them

contains any qualification at all of the Party's straightout plank concerning progressive taxation on improved land values. The same is true of the Commonwealth platform: there are nine points under "Rural", but not one of those points suggests any qualification or any relief for primary production from this straightout statement about a graduated tax on either improved or unimproved land values.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I say it is sheer hypocrisy for the Labor Party to put up this amendment. Opposition members are bound hand and foot by their platforms, both State and Commonwealth, yet they have the gall to come along here and put up this amendment.

Mr. Quirke: They may all be expelled yet for putting it up!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They may be, too. They have the gall to come here and move this amendment, which is a sham. Members opposite either do not know or do not care. It is sheer expediency to get a tactical advantage. It is an ill wind that blows no man good. As members opposite are obsessed with defeating the Government on the floor of the House, they will support me later in the session in my opposition to the Bills on price control and rent control. That will be one good thing that will flow from these tactics. I have no doubt that there will be many other times during the session when we shall see the sacrifice of all semblance of principle in favour of expediency, because that is what we have in this amendment.

Mr. Riches: You did not do that on the first day of the sitting and sacrifice principle!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member talks about the first day of the sitting and perhaps I can say something about that. I had it in mind. Memories are short. I am sure that no-one on this side of the House or the public generally has forgotten what happened on that first day and the pathetic and rather reprehensible display we saw by the Opposition on that occasion.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You did all your dirty work before the House met!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me remind the honourable member of four matters on the first day, which I have described as pathetic and reprehensible. The first was the refusal by members opposite to wear their medals, and the action of those who did wear them and then took them off. To me that was an insult to the Sovereign and I was amazed at their deliberate action in doing that. Even the new member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) omitted to wear his medals. I cannot believe that his

old father would approve of that. I can only guess what a dressing down he got for doing it.

Mr. Fred Walsh: I have never worn my medals in the House. The honourable member has none to wear.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The second thing which was reprehensible—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not referring to the member for Millicent as being reprehensible?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I was referring to the whole Opposition.

Mr. Bywaters: That is definitely not true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We all saw it. It must have been true.

Mr. Bywaters: That is pure imagination.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Pure imagination my foot! Anyone in the House could see whether or not it was pure imagination. I will pass over that one and ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the next point was pure imagination—the refusal of every member of the Opposition to accompany you to Government House to present members to His Excellency the Governor? Was that imagination?

Mr. Ryan: Who elected the Speaker?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader of the Opposition was seen in the gangway of the House to hold out his hands to prevent his members leaving.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Lies!

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was a disgraceful action. There is much howling and scratching opposite, but I do not know what the members there are saying. The third point that should be mentioned was the utterly childish display of members opposite, particularly the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) and the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), who carried placards for the benefit of those who watched television. What those members hoped to achieve by this infantile display I do not know, but what I know is it had an extremely bad effect on and reaction among the public of the State generally.

Mr. Ryan: Give the public another chance to record their vote.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Those three things confirm my view that the Opposition Party is just not fit to govern in this State, even if it could get a majority on the floor of this House.

Mr. Ryan: We have a majority, haven't we?

Mr. Quirke: No.

Mr. Ryan: Here is the L.C.L. new candidate! Isn't 19 more than 18?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is strange to hear the member for Port Adelaide suggest that the Opposition has a majority. I have noticed that it has never won one division. I should have thought that with his education, which Mr. Ryan today said was as good as that of any other member, he would know whether there was a majority or not, particularly as his Party has not yet won on a division. Apparently things are different in Port Adelaide from what they are in this House. I mention those three points, but worse was to come. The Leader of the Opposition, having told the Government that he desired to move a motion of no confidence, then introduced a Bill to amend the Constitution. The Premier said that it was done by subterfuge, but I prefer to say that it was done by a trick.

Mr. Ryan: Why a trick?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course it was a trick, because the Government was told that it was to be a motion of no confidence. Then we had that extraordinary motion merely to camouflage the fact that it was a Bill and not a motion. The member for Port Adelaide has been extremely vocal this afternoon.

Mr. Ryan: You can't take it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member says that we can't take it. What happened to the Bill that was introduced? It collapsed in a day. Out of the 19 members opposite how many supported the Bill on the floor? Only seven.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Only one on your side opposed it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Only seven Opposition members spoke on it. The result is that the Government is in entire control of the business of the House. I have no doubt that the masters of the A.L.P. who reside at the Trades Hall were not very pleased with the performance. We know that the masters of the Labor Party reside not here in Parliament, but at the Trades Hall. I have already referred to the rules of the Australian Labor Party. May I remind members opposite of rule 64, which shows clearly where the authority in the Labor Party rests. It provides:

- (a) A member of the Party seeking selection for a Parliamentary election shall be required to sign the pledge described by schedule 2.

Then on page 45 appears the Parliamentary candidate's pledge, as follows:

I hereby agree to be bound by the Objective, Federal and State platforms—

I remind members again just what those platforms say about land tax—and/or Rules of the Australian Labor Party and by all decisions of Federal Conference, Convention or State Council that do not conflict with such objective, platforms or rules. I also agree to be bound by decisions of the State executive that do not conflict with the objective, Federal and State platforms and/or rules of the Australian Labor Party or with decisions of Federal Conference, Convention or State Council.

Mr. Bywaters: In other words, we have rule by the majority.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Do you? That is part of the pledge. Also, I have been looking through something else about which I do not hear members opposite talking very often, and that is rule 67 (b), which is most interesting:

The State Parliamentary Labor Party shall supply a copy of its caucus minutes to the State executive of the Party within three days of each meeting.

That applies to members opposite.

Mr. Fred Walsh: That is all right; we have nothing to hide.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for West Torrens says he has nothing to hide. Within three days of a meeting of the caucus, we would see, if we watched him, the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) trotting up to the Trades Hall with a copy of the caucus minutes for the benefit of the members of the State executive of the Party. He should not be later than 11 or 12 o'clock on a Saturday morning or he would have his head chopped off. We do not hear much about these little rules. Members opposite even have to submit the records of their proceedings in a caucus meeting to an outside body, and it has to be done within three days.

Mr. McKee: Outside body! What about your little club on North Terrace?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nothing subordinates the Parliamentary Party on this side of the House to the L.C.L., but the Opposition is bound hand and foot to the Trades Hall. Whom have we on the executive of the A.L.P.? Admittedly, there are, according to this cutting from the *Advertiser*, a number of members of Parliament.

Mr. McKee: They are outsiders, are they?

Mr. Fred Walsh: Nearly half of them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nearly half of them? I notice that the honourable member's name does not appear.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It has been on the list for 30-odd years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member's name is there but my point is that a

number of these members of Parliament are not members of this Parliament, they are members of the Commonwealth Parliament; and some are members of no Parliament at all and answerable to no electorate. Yet the Party opposite is answerable to them. That is all I wish to say about the amendment.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You have said nothing about the amendment.

Mr. McKee: Tell us your views on the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will do so. I shall oppose it for the reasons I have given: it is pure hypocrisy, it is a complete sham and it is completely a matter of expediency to try to embarrass you, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing in it at all. I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. Riches: How will it embarrass the Speaker or any member?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am rather naive but I do not think I am quite as naive as the member for Stuart thinks I am. I am looking forward to the contribution of the honourable member in this debate. However, I desire to raise two further matters of general interest to the State. The first deals with the installation and use of safety belts in motor cars. In this, I feel I must take to task, mildly but ever so respectfully, the Government. I do not suppose that any member of this House would oppose the use of safety belts.

Mr. McKee: Have you an interest in the firm making these belts?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the sort of thing I would expect to come from the member for Port Pirie. I have not heard him make an interjection on any higher level than that. He always seems to think that the best way to demolish an opponent is to impugn his motives. I have no interest in the manufacture of safety belts and, if the thought and mind of the honourable member go no higher than that, he will not be making much of a contribution in this Chamber.

Mr. Jenkins: No higher than his belt!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. McKee: Apparently, a lot below your belt!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the honourable member not to get upset because I gave him a mild reprimand. What I have been trying to say for the past few minutes—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, once again for your courtesy and protection.

The first thing I desire to say on this point—and I take this seriously—is that I do not suppose that any member of this House would deny that the use of a safety belt in a motor vehicle would reduce the chance of death or serious injury in case of accident. I have here a cutting which gives, for what they are worth, some figures. It has been estimated, by the acting Executive Director of the National Safety Council, that the number of road deaths would be reduced by as many as 600 in Australia, and injuries by 36,000, annually by the use of safety belts. I propose, therefore, in what I am to say, to assume that everybody agrees that safety belts are effective. That is comparatively easy.

What is more difficult, as perhaps the answers to the questions that I have asked during this session show, is to get anybody to do anything about it. All of us, I am afraid, in our heart of hearts feel, "It can't happen to me. The other chap may be killed or injured, but I shall not be." So a tremendous burden of smug inertia has to be moved before we get any action in this field. Frankly, I felt exactly the same way myself until a few months ago. I was prepared to acknowledge that safety belts were a good thing. I proposed to fit them in my new motor car when I could save up enough to buy it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You were rather naive last year when you asked the question. You did not have a safety belt in your car at that time?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. Has the Minister one in his ministerial car?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I shall be able to change his mind on that because I have some information here that could do that.

Mr. Clark: Most Government members will get them fitted to their seats here.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Opposition presses hard that may be necessary, but it has not made much impression so far this session. I felt as so many others felt about it until a man in my own district approached me in this matter. He had been converted to the use of safety belts by coming upon the scene of an accident that occurred in the district represented by the member for Unley (Mr. Langley). What he saw horrified him. It was an accident caused by the driver of one car failing to give right-of-way to another car at an intersection. This is one of the most frequent causes of accidents. One driver was thrown out by the impact and he smashed his

head open against a Stobie pole and was killed instantly. What my friend saw nauseated him. Since he described what he saw I have become interested professionally in this matter, and I have been able to obtain a copy of the police report of the accident. I do not propose to read all of it, nor to say where the accident happened. I will not give the names of the parties involved, but I propose to read for the benefit of all members an extract from the report by one of the constables who described what had happened. I do it deliberately because I want to impress on members on both sides what can happen in an accident when someone is thrown out of a vehicle. The report states:

A third male person was lying on his back, fully outstretched, with his buttocks approximately on a culvert cover at the south-west corner of the intersection, and his head nearer the southern side and approximately near the base of a Stobie pole also at that corner of the intersection. This person actually was between that Stobie pole and a tree trunk immediately west of the pole in the street. This person was covered with a blanket and when removed appeared dead, having shocking head injury. In fact, adhering to the eastern face of the Stobie pole low down was a round patch of substance, which appeared like human skin, flesh, hair and blood. Extending across the southern footpath of the street immediately west of the other street, and using the Stobie pole as an apex, small particles of various sizes of what appeared to be human flesh, bone and brain, were splattered in a triangular shape to the southern fence alignment of the street. It is a descriptive report, but not nearly as descriptive as the statement by the man who actually saw the accident. I have read the report to drive home the fact that if the man had been wearing a safety belt he might not have even been injured. He would not have been flung out of the car.

Mr. Casey: You have no guarantee of that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What does the honourable member mean by such an inane statement?

Mr. Casey: It is supposition on your part.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member think that a properly fitting safety belt would not have kept the man in his seat? I am at a loss to follow what the honourable member meant when he said there was no guarantee. If he meant that the safety belt does not always prevent death or injury he was right, but I am saying that it reduces the incidence of death or injury. Certainly in this case serious injury and death would probably have been avoided. When that accident was described to me I said there was no reason why I should not have belts put in my car, and I had it done immediately. I had them installed because I



thought they should be there. Since wearing a belt I have been "sold" on their use. They are not difficult to fit and they do not restrict movement in any way.

Mr. Loveday: What sort have you fitted?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The type recommended by the Royal Automobile Association. It is the three point type, which is a combination of the lap and sash belts over the shoulders. They are recommended by the association and are most effective. There is an ordinary lap belt and a shoulder belt, but the three-pointer is recommended as the most effective, and that is the one I use. I have mentioned in some detail the facts relating to the accident that converted me to the use of safety belts. I mentioned them in the hope that they might do the same for other members. It is not hard to look at an accident after it has occurred and say that death or injury would have been avoided if a belt had been used. It is not so usual to be able to say after an accident has happened that a safety belt prevented death or serious injury.

When talking to an insurance assessor recently I was able to get three instances where belts had prevented death or injury. In the first case a man and woman were going south in a motor car along Duthy Street. Both were wearing safety belts. The speed of the vehicle was 35 miles an hour. The woman weighed about 18 to 20 stone. Their vehicle went straight into the side of truck going east. Their vehicle was completely wrecked but the injuries were negligible. The assessor said that in the normal course of events the woman would have fractured her pelvis at least. In the second case a man and a woman from Victoria (that is probably why they were driving so fast) were in a Chrysler Royal car. They were travelling at 75 miles an hour along the Darwin to Alice Springs highway. They hit a brumby and lost control of the car, which rolled over five times. All the doors opened but nobody was injured. In the third case a boy and a girl (teenagers) were travelling in a Volkswagen. When travelling down hill they hit a Ford Customline going up the hill. The combined speed of the two cars was 60 miles an hour. Both the vehicles were badly damaged. The girl cut her forehead and the boy broke a rib. These injuries were negligible, but the assessor said he would have expected both the boy and the girl to be killed. They were wearing lap belts. Here are three cases where injury, if not death, was avoided by the use of proper safety belts.

Mr. Coumbe: What happened to the other people?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know, but it would be fair to believe that they were seriously injured. Cuttings from newspapers show that Wisconsin at the end of last year became the first State in the United States of America to require safety belts on the front seats of all new cars sold in 1962. New York State now provides that it is compulsory for safety belts to be fitted to new cars registered from the latter half of 1964. In the United Kingdom the British Government proposes to make a regulation requiring all new cars to be fitted with safety belts for the drivers and passengers. Now, in Australia, Holdens are fitted with safety belt anchorage plates, and Fords and other makes of car are being similarly fitted. I have been, to put it mildly, put off by the Government when I have asked questions on this matter. Other places are in fact doing what I should like to see done in South Australia. If it can be done in the United States, which has the highest vehicle density in the world, and if it can be done in the United Kingdom, and if car manufacturers themselves are putting anchorage plates in for safety belts, there is no reason on earth why it should not be done in South Australia.

Some time ago I approached the Government on this matter. It was after I had had described to me that first accident. I wrote to the Premier and outlined what I had been told and suggested that this matter could be referred to the State Traffic Committee for report and recommendation. I reminded him that the State Traffic Committee had not met for about 18 months—since the Road Traffic Board came into being—despite the assurances that were given in this House that the State Traffic Committee would not be permitted to fall into disuse. I wrote that letter on May 17 and received a reply on May 24 to the effect that the Premier had taken up the matter with the Minister of Roads. I wrote to him again on June 15, as follows:

I am wondering whether you and the Hon. N. L. Jude have been able to come to a conclusion on this important question.

I have not received a reply to that letter. I am not complaining, but I think that this underlines the weight of smug inertia that has to be overcome before any action will be taken on this matter. The Government rightly prides itself on the fact that in many ways it has given a lead to other States on many matters. I can see no reason why this should not be one more matter on which it can give a lead to

the rest of the Commonwealth. I hope that the Government will take a little more seriously what I have said about safety belts.

The last matter I wish to mention deals with education. At the outset I support entirely all that was said by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about the South Australian Public Schools Committees Association. Since I have been a member of Parliament I have come to value most highly the voluntary work done by school committees as well as by the association presided over by Mr. Ray King, and I trust that that work will continue and, indeed, that it will expand. I know that an approach has been made to the Minister of Education for an increase in the annual grant to the association, and I am sure that the Minister will treat that approach as sympathetically as his purse strings permit.

The other aspect of education I wish to mention is one which, strangely enough, has not been referred to so far in this debate: the matter raised by the Returned Servicemen's League a week ago—the influence of Communists and Communism in our State schools. I entirely support the R.S.L. in its campaign to expose Communism and its methods in Australia. We must remember—and this is often forgotten—that Communism gets much of its result by working below the surface: a little twisted suggestion here, an oblique reference there. These, coming from an unsuspected source and said by someone who is not known to be a Communist or a fellow traveller, are used to set a pattern of thought favourable to Communism in the community. If that method of working is understood, and if the people who are doing that are known and recognized, then these methods lose most of their effectiveness and that, of course, is exactly what the R.S.L. campaign aims to do: to publicize the methods and the people who are employing them.

Some members may possibly recollect that last year I spoke on Communism at some length in the Address in Reply debate. If I may say so with all due modesty, I thought that my speech then had merit and that it was on a subject of supreme importance. However, it received no mention in either of the daily papers. I asked a friend of mine, who is a senior and hard-boiled journalist, why that had happened and he merely scoffed at me and said, "Communism isn't news." I am glad that the R.S.L. campaign has not suffered a similar fate now. However, I think that one aspect of the campaign could have been more effectively handled. I believe that an attempt

should be made not only to expose the methods of Communism, but also to set out why Communism is wrong, why it is a false doctrine and why we oppose it. These are fundamental matters that all too often are taken for granted and lost sight of in a fog of fear and dislike, but they are of the utmost importance and I hope that the R.S.L. will perhaps give some attention to them as well as to the exposure of people and methods.

I must confess that two reactions to the original allegations that were made at the R.S.L. sub-branch conference were a little perturbing. With great respect to him, I was rather surprised at the first reaction of the Minister of Education in expressing complete surprise at the allegations. I find it hard to believe that he and his department did not at least have an inkling of what was going on in the department. However, be that as it may, I know now that the matter is being investigated and I am satisfied with that.

The second reaction that I found perturbing was that of Mr. Haines, the President of the Teachers' Institute, who seemed to resent the very suggestion that there were Communists in the teaching profession. That reveals a grave lack of understanding of the way Communism works in our community. We have all been living long enough in the shadow of the threat of Communism to know that its adherents are found in every walk of life and in every profession, trade or calling. The member for Norwood will agree with me that there are Communists in the legal profession. That is known, acknowledged and regretted by most, but, in saying that, I do not in any way besmirch the name of the legal profession. I do not think I could be reproached with starting a witch hunt through saying that: it is just one of those things.

Mr. Nankivell: Elliott Johnston openly admits that he is a Communist.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, he stands as a Communist at State and Commonwealth elections. It is one of those things that we must unfortunately accept in the legal profession and, I believe, the same is true in the sister profession of teaching, of which Mr. Haines is a distinguished leader. I do not think there should be any resentment at the suggestion that there are Communists in any trade, profession or calling. These reactions, to my way of thinking, merely underline the need for bringing Communism and Communist methods out into the open, just as the R.S.L. is doing, and I hope that its campaign will have the backing of every member in this

House and of the whole of the loyal Australian community. I could refer to many other matters—matters which all members bottle up from one session to another.

Mr. Nankivell: Like the member for Port Adelaide?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. He let the cork out further than I propose to do, but I hope that there will be adequate opportunities during the session to air all of the matters

affecting my district which I want aired. I shall content myself now by emphasizing that I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as originally moved.

Mr. BYWATERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 2, at 2 p.m.