

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 9, 1962.

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

QUESTIONS.**GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Urgent Need for Change", appears the following:

The whole future of Broken Hill Associated Smelters Pty. Ltd. at Port Pirie could hinge in the next few months on the urgent need to standardize rail gauges, the company's Assistant Manager said last night.

Other matters, associated with production costs, were mentioned and the Assistant Manager said that the company's annual production of lead was equal to 10 per cent of the world's demand. In view of the already known need for standardization between Port Pirie and Broken Hill, together with this statement from an important company, and the number of persons engaged in the industry, will the Premier take up with the Prime Minister the need to implement a plan to enable the commencement of this standardization forthwith?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A reply I gave yesterday related to this very matter. The Commonwealth Government informed me that its other commitments were so great that it was not prepared to decide to do the work at present. It stated that this was not a permanent rejection of the project and that it would be re-examined in the future. Later today I will have the copy of the Prime Minister's letter that I promised to obtain for another member yesterday. Under those circumstances I do not believe any useful purpose would be served in taking up this matter with the Prime Minister at this stage.

Mr. McKEE: In view of the publicity given to the need for rail standardization in this State recently by the Wentworth Committee when it visited Port Pirie, and the urgency of the matter, will the Premier reconsider the reply he has just given to my Leader?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: For the reason I have given the Leader of the Opposition, I do not think at present it would be useful to re-open this matter with the Commonwealth Government. I point out to the honourable member it has now been the subject of intense investigation and submissions for five years. I feel at this moment that no good purpose would be served by re-opening it. In

fact, I do not think it could be re-opened at this particular time. I do not want the honourable member to misunderstand me: that does not mean the Government is content with the present position or intends to rest on it. The question the Leader asked me was whether it would be feasible to take up this question again with the Prime Minister. I do not believe that any useful purpose would be served because the decision was given only after the matter had been submitted repeatedly to the Commonwealth Government. In those circumstances, I think we have to look at other things.

Mr. Lawn: A change of Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member has his views on that, and they may not coincide with mine, but that does not help the issue at the moment. It does not mean that the Government accepts the position that there should be permanently a narrow gauge line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill, because that is not the Government's view. The Leader asked whether it would be feasible to go to the Prime Minister again. My answer is that at this stage I believe it would be a waste of time.

Mr. RICHES: According to an article in today's *Advertiser* the Assistant Manager of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Pty. Limited at Port Pirie is reported as saying:

The whole future of Broken Hill Associated Smelters Pty. Limited at Port Pirie could hinge in the next few months on the urgent need to standardize rail gauges.

Later, he states:

The tremendous cost loading of transportation is the reason why standardization is so vital to us in cutting transport costs.

Does the Government consider that, when the diesel-electric locomotives are placed on the Port Pirie to Broken Hill run, the Railways Department may charge lower freight rates to the smelting company if that is shown to be necessary to keep it in operation at Port Pirie, and has the State Government considered proceeding with the standardization of that line irrespective of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The reasons for the delay in the standardization of this line are well known to the honourable member and I do not think it is necessary to go into them during question time. However, we would obviously be able to pass on some of the benefits of standardization to the industry concerned. The answer is "yes".

SLEEPER BOOKINGS.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 25 about sleeper bookings at Naracoorte?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, has informed me that at one time the station master at Naracoorte had allotted to him a small number of berths for the "up" South-East night passenger train, for issue as required. However, it was found that there was a tendency for the station master to retain berths until the last moment for possible passengers, and in these circumstances, if the Mount Gambier allocation had been all issued intending passengers at Mount Gambier would be advised that accommodation was not available. This resulted, on a good number of occasions, in sleeping berths being vacant while intending passengers were turned away. To overcome this, Mount Gambier has been made responsible for all allocations, and the station master at Naracoorte simply telephones the station master at Mount Gambier when he desires an allocation. Little time is involved in the telephone inquiry, and this is in accordance with current practice.

CUSTOMS PREMISES.

Mr. TAPPING: An editorial in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, July 31, headed "Long-sighted Planning at the Port", states:

At Outer Harbour, however, accommodation compares favourably in certain respects with Port Adelaide's newer facilities. There is plainly an obligation on the Federal Government, for example, to improve or replace the existing Customs inspection premises, where many visitors and migrants gain their first close impression of the State.

A brief letter in this morning's *Advertiser* on the same subject from Mr. E. J. Cork, Collector of Customs for South Australia, states:

In connection with your leading article of July 31, 1962, regarding long-sighted planning at Port Adelaide, I wish to point out that the provision of "Customs inspection premises" is the responsibility of the South Australian Harbors Board and not the Commonwealth Government.

In view of the difference of opinion expressed, will the Minister of Marine consider the provision of a modern Customs inspection hall at Outer Harbour in the Harbors Board's proposed improvement scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I did not see the letter from which the honourable member has quoted. I understand from my colleague

that there was a good deal more to the letter than the part quoted by the honourable member. I do not know whether that has any bearing on the matter in hand, but if it has I should like the privilege of seeing the whole letter, at the honourable member's convenience. It is a fact that some few weeks ago the Commonwealth Minister responsible—with, I think, other Commonwealth authorities—was in Adelaide and took the opportunity to inspect the Customs premises at the Outer Harbour, in company with the Chairman and, I think, other officials of the Harbors Board. I understood that the Commonwealth Minister expressed the view that the provision made there for disembarking passengers was adequate and satisfactory. I point out that although the property is under the jurisdiction and ownership of the Harbors Board, the Chairman of the board indicated that he would be quite willing to consider any requests from the Commonwealth authorities for improvements. I have not heard, subsequent to the Commonwealth Minister's visit, of any request for improved facilities, and I assumed therefore from that, and also from my reading of the statements which he made at the time of his visit, that he did not desire any further improvements. If that is not correct, and if requests have been made, they will certainly be considered, but so far such requests have not been brought to my notice.

MODBURY-SMITHFIELD ROAD.

Mr. LAUCKE: Recently I asked the Minister of Works if he would seek of his colleague, the Minister of Roads, a report in respect of the Government's intention regarding the Modbury-Smithfield main road, which is an access road to the Para Wirra reserve. I understand the Minister has a reply.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the section of the Modbury-Smithfield road referred to is unsealed, and is maintained by the District Council of Tea Tree Gully with grants provided by the Highways Department. A survey has been made, and the design for a more satisfactory route is under investigation. As land acquisition will be necessary, and as a traffic count taken in August, 1961, shows only 52 vehicles a day, it is unlikely that funds will be available for this construction in the immediate future. In the meantime, it is intended to provide safety fencing at several of the worst curves on the existing road.

MINISTER OF WORKS' REPORTS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In August, 1960, I asked the Minister of Works a question about the Department of Public Works' publishing an annual report. At that time the Minister replied that he had discussed the matter with a Mr. Botting and hoped that the report would soon be available. A recent search leads me to believe that no report has appeared since 1953. Can the Minister assure me that a report will be available in the near future, as I believe these reports are most valuable, at least to members of this House?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member has stated today and in a previous question, it has been the custom of the department to compile a report which is both useful and should be provided. At the time of answering the question, I had asked Mr. Botting, the Chief Clerk in my office, if he would devote his time to preparing such a report or assisting my Secretary to prepare it. Mr. Botting subsequently applied for and was successful in obtaining a higher position in another department, so his services were almost immediately afterwards not available. For some time my own personal office was working shorthanded without a Chief Clerk until an appointment was made only a few months ago. Unfortunately, despite good intentions, the report has not been produced. Mr. Knee-bone, my Secretary, has been working on it in his private time at home in order to get something produced, but I regret that up to this point we have not been able to complete it. The matter has not been forgotten and I agree that the report should be available as soon as produced, and we are taking steps towards that end.

POULTRY CONFERENCE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture any further information following on the question I asked yesterday regarding the forthcoming poultry conference in Sydney?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I told the honourable member yesterday that some officers were going to the World's Poultry Science Association's conference, but I did not know the exact number. The Senior Poultry Adviser (Mr. A. A. McArdle) and a veterinary officer (Mr. J. H. Bray) are travelling to Sydney to attend the conference as our nominees. As well, a number of other officers have taken their recreation leave and are getting to Sydney under their own resources. They will be allowed to attend the conference

and while it is on they will receive their living expenses. I do not know the number of these other officers, but there are several.

OFF-THE-COURSE TOTALIZATOR.

Mr. HUGHES: The following is an extract from this morning's *Advertiser* under the heading "Clubs Approach Premier":

The chairman of the S.A. Jockey Club (Mr. Clifford Reid) and the president of the S.A. Trotting Club (Mr. R. J. Grayling) approached the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) on Tuesday regarding the installation of an off-the-course totalizator in South Australia.

Is the Premier in a position to tell the House the text of the discussion he had with the Chairman of the S.A. Jockey Club and the President of the S.A. Trotting Club, and has he obtained the authentic information mentioned by him in reply to a recent question by me on this matter, and, if so, how does he propose to make it available?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Probably six or eight weeks ago a deputation of racing interests waited on me and submitted a request that the Government should introduce legislation to bring into effect an off-the-course totalizator system, similar to that operating in Victoria. I said I would have the request investigated and refer it to Cabinet. It has been referred to Cabinet and discussed on general issues on a couple of occasions. I have also had some information from Victoria. A number of people were sent there to examine the position, so that we would have some factual information about the position there and know what we were considering. The reports from Victoria are not clear cut. No decision has been made on the matter and I do not anticipate one will be made until further information is obtained.

TOWN PLANNING REPORT.

Mr. FRED WALSH: In view of the considerable interest being taken by members and councils in the report of the Town Planning Committee as it affects the metropolitan area, can the Premier say when the report is likely to be tabled?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government approved of the printing of the report at least eight months ago, I think. It is a voluminous document and contains many graphs and maps and much similar information, and I believe the total cost of printing is about £28,000. The report is so voluminous that it has been recommended to the Government that it have printed an abridged version that might be more transportable and more useful

for every-day use, and that recommendation has been approved. So, the report will be presented to Parliament as soon as it is out of the hands of the printer and handed to the Government, and some abridged information is being prepared. Regarding distribution, I believe Cabinet will decide that, as well as having the report tabled, a copy should be provided for each member. The copies will be costly and I do not know how many people will be prepared to buy them. I think the report will be available soon and that the Government will be able to provide each member with a copy.

MORGAN-WHYALLA MAIN.

Mr. QUIBKE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on July 24 concerning the reticulation of water from the duplicated Morgan-Whyalla main to Burra and Booborowie?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Subsequent to the honourable member's question being asked, I called for the docket and for a report from the department about progress on the two projects. I have not the docket with me and am therefore relying on my memory about its contents, but briefly I think that some further work has been done on the project for Booborowie and that work is being done, or is about to be done, on a supply for Burra. Regarding Burra, consideration is being given to using the existing railway main, the use of which, I think, the honourable member suggested at one stage. However, I cannot say whether it would be adequate or whether it would be possible to use it. It will not be possible to do any actual work on either project this year because allocations are being severely taxed for other purposes, of which the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main is a considerable part, but investigations will continue so that at the earliest possible moment we shall be able to bring up proposals for a supply to one or both of these towns.

PETERBOROUGH COURT.

Mr. CASEY: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply from his colleague, the Attorney-General, to a question I asked recently on the appointment of a permanent clerk of court at Peterborough.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have been advised by my colleague, the Attorney-General, that the volume of activity at Peterborough Local Court is insufficient to fully occupy a public servant clerk of court,

but is such as to cause difficulty to a police officer attempting to combine both court and police duties. Consideration is being given to alternative methods of staffing Peterborough and other country courts in similar circumstances.

OPALS.

Mr. LOVEDAY: On November 1 last I asked the Premier a question regarding the opal mining industry and he said that a comprehensive survey, about to be undertaken by the Mines Department, would embrace all aspects of the industry. He also expected that the survey would take several months. Is the report on the survey yet available?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will inquire and advise the honourable member next Tuesday.

BOAT SAFETY.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Premier will recall that last year I asked several questions relating to the control of small boats. Mostly local councils were interested, particularly the Murray Bridge Corporation. I asked at its request subsequently that a committee of representatives of councils should be appointed to go into the matter with the object of making recommendations to the Government on legislation. Can the Premier say whether there has been any report from the committee and whether it is intended to bring down legislation this year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter was considered by Cabinet last Monday on submissions forwarded by the Minister of Local Government. It is not an easy proposition and the experience in other States has been mixed as to the success attending any forms of control that have been attempted in one or two places. Local councils already have certain powers in their areas, and that would apply, for instance, particularly to a place like Murray Bridge where the local council would have the power to control boats in that area if it chose to exercise it. The problem arises, however, from the use of portable boats going from one place to another and to boats taken outside district council boundaries and used in the open sea. The matter is being actively pursued, but I cannot say that Cabinet has a solution of the whole problem at the moment. I have in mind the simple example of a boat being perfectly safe when carrying four people, but who is to say that at any moment three more will not get in? Therefore, the fact that a

boat is safe does not guarantee its use safely. I will see that the honourable member gets advice as soon as firm conclusions are reached.

CIGARETTE PRICES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier a reply to my question of July 18 concerning cigarette prices and the stopping of deliveries to certain business people?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The following advice has been supplied by the Prices Commissioner in an interim report:

Cigarettes are not subject to price control. Inquiries have disclosed that several store-keepers in southern areas, including the store-keeper mentioned by Mr. Langley, have been selling certain brands of cigarettes at less than recognized prices. It has also been ascertained that manufacturers have ceased supplying the brands of cigarettes concerned to each of the stores selling at reduced prices.

However, inquiries do not indicate that any of the stores concerned are without stocks of cigarettes up to the present as a result of this action. The department has been endeavouring to arrange a conference of all parties, including representatives of the manufacturers, with a view to obtaining some agreement which might resolve the matter, but it has not been possible to finalize arrangements up to the present owing to the absence from the State of the manager of one of the stores concerned in the price cutting. Every effort will be made to arrange a conference as early as possible and a further report will be submitted in due course.

ALLENDALE EAST SCHOOL ELECTRICITY.

Mr. CORCORAN: Apparently the present electricity supply to the Allendale East Area School is unsatisfactory because of frequent voltage variations and because the output is insufficient for maximum operation of the adult education class machines, particularly at night. If the machines are operated during the evening the lighting in the headmaster's house is drastically affected. As the electricity powerline from Mount Gambier to Port MacDonnell runs within half a mile of the Allendale East Area School, on behalf of the school committee I ask the Premier to arrange to have the school connected to this powerline or have the priority for this work stepped up. This matter also concerns the Minister of Education and I should be grateful if the Premier would discuss it with him.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have this matter examined but, unfortunately, we frequently find that a powerline passing fairly close to an area is of such high voltage that the converters needed to reduce the voltage so the power may be used in the area

necessitate a costly operation. I will speak to the Chairman of the Electricity Trust (Sir Fred Drew) and ask him whether it is possible to alter the service to provide a more satisfactory supply in this case.

RIVER TORRENS FLOODING.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the effects of the recent flooding of the River Torrens?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The docket has just been handed to me. The Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage has reported to the Deputy Engineer-in-Chief as follows:

After the storm on Tuesday, July 31, 1962, the River Torrens from Silkes Road to the Torrens outfall was inspected and the height of the flood marked at appropriate locations. After the flood had subsided a further inspection was made from the Hackney bridge upstream to Battams Road and the damage caused by the flood was very slight and could be classed as negligible. There were only a few locations where slight under-cutting of the bank or landslides had occurred and these were only of a minor nature. The operations of the sand-washing plants and the activities of the East Torrens Destructor Trust in no way caused any further erosion of the banks.

FISHING LICENCES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture, and I hasten to assure him that, although I read in this morning's press that his position might be challenged, I do not want to be involved in that. I have received a letter from the Fishermen's Co-operative at Coffin Bay asking whether I would ascertain from the Minister the Government's intentions regarding the licensing of amateur and professional fishermen.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I answered this question yesterday.

Mr. Frank Walsh: I am sorry; I did not hear it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I answered the Leader's question yesterday at considerable length. My reply was to the effect that this matter is being closely considered at present.

Mr. Frank Walsh: I mentioned the size of fish yesterday.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If my memory is correct, yesterday the Leader not only asked me about the legal minimum size of fish but about the licensing of fishermen—the question he has asked today.

Mr. Frank Walsh: I am asking about licences now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: To end the Leader's suspense, I can inform him that the matter is being closely considered. The whole question is peculiarly difficult and for every argument in favour of altering the present situation a valid argument can be made against so doing. It is extremely difficult to get a clear-cut and good solution by altering the present circumstances. Under those conditions the *status quo* has a strong case. It should be retained unless one can see a clear way of improving it by alterations. At present we have not the correct solution, but I hope that we will get a clear-cut solution as a result of work being done by the Fisheries and Game Department. Any wrong decision that we make—and this applies not only to licensing but also to the question of legal minimum sizes of fish—could cause a considerable disservice to the industry. Although the decision is certainly taking time, I hope that it will be good when it is finally made.

AIR POLLUTION.

Mr. McKee: My question relates to the air pollution over Port Pirie caused by the discharge of noxious gases and fumes from the Broken Hill Associated Smelters. These bad fume conditions have increased alarmingly since the shutting down of the uranium treatment plant. As the acid market has been lost, the acid production is low, but with the increased lead production the sulphur input has increased, thereby increasing the discharge of sulphur fumes into the atmosphere. I believe that the refinery gases discharged into the atmosphere carry no sulphur, but they bear into the air about 8 tons of fume a week—fume that is high in arsenic content (33 per cent). This means that two and a half tons of poisonous arsenic is being discharged into the Port Pirie atmosphere each week. In some parts of the town it is impossible to grow the hardiest type of shrubs; vegetables are completely out of the question; and local health authorities have strongly advised against the drinking of tank water. Will the Premier regard this matter as urgent and take it up with the Mines Department and the B.H.A.S. as soon as possible with a view to arriving at a satisfactory solution of this serious condition?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received a letter from Mr. Green, the Manager of the B.H.A.S., regarding this

matter, and it may be of interest to the honourable member if I read it. It states:

We understand from Mr. D. McKee, M.P. for Port Pirie, that he is putting a question to the Government on behalf of certain citizens of Port Pirie concerning the alleged emission of fume from the chimney stacks at the Broken Hill Associated Smelters works.

We are aware that complaints have been made, having been addressed on this matter by the Port Pirie City Council, and we have explained that over the past two to three months there has been a change in our operations which we have to admit has been responsible for a greater amount of fume than usual being passed to atmosphere. The two factors mainly responsible have been:

- (1) A considerable increase in lead production following the expiry of the international agreement under which our production was severely curtailed, and
- (2) Reduction in the demand for sulphuric acid, firstly by the cessation of operations at the uranium plant (11,000 tons sulphuric acid) and secondly by a cut in the requirements of the fertilizer companies brought about by the adverse seasons experienced over the past few years (2,000 tons).

It is difficult, as you may see, to stop the passing of sulphur dioxide gas to the atmosphere under conditions of high lead production when there is only a limited demand for sulphuric acid, and we are very concerned at this position. The so-called "smog" which has been mentioned in complaints has arisen because of the strain on our baghouses at high lead production levels which has led to somewhat less efficient filtering of solids from the gases than before.

We would assure the Government that we are taking all steps possible to minimize discomfort to the citizens of Port Pirie arising from fume emissions from the works, and measures taken that can definitely help the situation are the following:

(1) Our production has been reduced below the level obtaining during the months April to June of this year when the complaints were made.

(2) We have been authorized by our board of directors to spend £75,000 in constructing new baghouse chambers to help improve the filtration of gases before they pass to the atmosphere.

(3) We have been advised by the fertilizer companies that they are prepared to accept a somewhat greater tonnage of acid in the coming year.

(4) We are examining every possibility for increased use of sulphuric acid and, in this regard, have sent our Research Superintendent to England for a nine months' assignment in which one of his chief tasks is to seek suitable new activities for Port Pirie, particularly those which might use sulphuric acid.

We shall continue our best efforts to reduce any discomfort which may be caused by gas evolved from the smelting operations.

I think the honourable member will see from that letter that the B.H.A.S. has an extremely

fair and good approach towards solving this problem. I appreciate the company's viewpoint, and if in its endeavours it can secure some secondary industry to Port Pirie which will be a user of sulphuric acid, it can be assured of every support from the Government.

ENTERTAINMENT TAX.

Mr. RICHES: I am under the impression that when entertainment tax was lifted some years ago, the motion picture interests understood that admission charges to picture shows would be kept within reasonable bounds. Some time ago a film was made in South Australia, with considerable help from the South Australian Government, and this film is one which has earned praise overseas for its production and its colour and one which naturally all the people in the districts in which it was made would wish to see. I have been informed by the Combined Unions Council at Port Augusta that the charges for admission to see this film—*The Sundowners*—are in some instances 50 per cent and in other instances 200 per cent higher than the normal charges. I believe that this has been opposed by the local exhibitors, but their hands are tied by the film distributors who have dictated not only the number of nights that the film can be shown but the prices to be charged throughout, and who get a percentage of the takings instead of a straightout hire for the film. I understand that they take about 70 per cent or more of the total takings at the door. As this is a practice which is likely to be adopted for other films, will the Premier call for a report from the industry concerned, perhaps through the Prices Commissioner, on whether this is considered to be a reasonable approach and reasonable treatment of those people whose chief avenue of amusement is still the cinema?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not at all sure that the honourable member is quite right in his first assumption. My memory of the position is that the Commonwealth during the war virtually took over entertainment tax in the same way as it took over the collection of income tax, but that later it handed the matter of entertainment tax back to the States, to be imposed if the States desired to do so. Some of the States, notably Victoria, imposed it until quite recently, but when the Commonwealth relinquished the field of entertainment tax South Australia did not re-enter that field. Therefore, there was no negotiation between any entertainment industry and the State Government about the

relinquishment of entertainment tax in this State.

Regarding the second part of the question, nearly 20 years ago an argument arose between various sections of the motion picture industry concerning the very matters the honourable member has raised today—the number of days on which a picture would be shown, the type of advertising, the type of contract that would govern the displaying of the picture, and such like. A request was made to the State Government at that time for legislation to provide a code that would govern those things. After some considerable negotiation, I was able to arrange an agreement between the distributors and the producers. That agreement, which is still in force, provides for a council in South Australia of representatives of both sides of the industry, under the chairmanship of a Government nominee (Sir Edgar Bean), to whom I shall refer the honourable member's question.

CLARENCE PARK STATION.

Mr. LANGLEY: On September 27, 1960, a constituent of mine received the following reply to a letter he had forwarded to the Railways Commissioner:

Clarence Park—complaint *re* condition of station platform and shelter accommodation. The Commissioner had already decided to construct new buildings at Clarence Park, but because of the heavy programme of building entirely new passenger station accommodation elsewhere, the work has been delayed. However, you can be assured that the new buildings will be provided next financial year.

Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, ascertain when this project will be started, as this work was promised during the financial year 1961-62?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Railways for a report.

PORT PIRIE DAMS.

Mr. McKEE: Yesterday I asked a question about the liquid waste dams at the rear of the uranium treatment plant at Port Pirie. In reply, the Premier said that parental control appeared to be the most likely method of keeping children clear of the area. While I wholeheartedly agree with the Premier on that, it is often much easier said than done. Most of us who have small children know from experience that children will slip under the guard of the most cautious parents. This area is likely to remain dangerous for many years, and I do not think any honourable member would oppose the expense of fencing

the area because, after all, no amount of money can replace children. Will the Premier again consider this serious matter and discuss with the Mines Department the question of putting a safety fence around this area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As regards the first observation made by the honourable member, I myself have noted that sometimes naughty boys come here from Port Pirie; but, seriously, I will find out just how grave this danger is. I doubt whether the danger is any greater than, for instance, occurs at the wharf or at many places where children sometimes play; but I will see just how great it is. I personally feel that children should not play there. They are certainly trespassing if they are there. The danger now is not so great as it has been over the last five years.

WALLAROO HARBOUR.

Mr. HUGHES: I understand that recently the General Manager of the Harbors Board was accompanied by the Assistant Chief Engineer and the Traffic Manager on a visit to Wallaroo and had talks with the local harbour master. Will the Minister of Marine state whether the visit was just routine or whether it was in connection with investigations into the deepening of the berths and channels at Wallaroo? If so, can he state what progress has been made in the investigations?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I did not know precisely whether the visit was routine or whether it had some special application to Wallaroo and the deepening project. I rather think it was a combination of the two. I can say that much work has been done in taking soundings and ascertaining the nature of the sea bed, both in the swinging basin and in the approaches to the jetty at Wallaroo. That work commenced almost immediately, or as soon as it was physically possible to commence it, after the honourable member brought a deputation to me some time ago. I have looked at the chart that has been prepared as the result of the surveys, and it is an interesting one to study. It shows that there are distinct possibilities of a better channel in an entirely new location.

The Wallaroo approaches are difficult because shallow banks extend at almost every angle from the jetty seawards for a considerable distance. Shoals occur, then there is a little bit of deep water, then shoals recur and extend for quite a long way seawards from the jetty. This will make the cost of any project for

substantial improvements high. However, the cost involved is not only the cost of the channels but of the swinging basin as well. A great amount of money would be required to give added depth to the swinging basin that would line it up with the proposed deeper draught vessels.

Mr. Lawn: Is the Minister speaking on the Address in Reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am attempting to give the member for Wallaroo some information that he wants his district to have. If the member for Adelaide does not want me to give that information, I shall be quite happy. I understand we are to hear the honourable member later this afternoon. I hope he observes his own rules then. The Harbors Board is examining the charts and has produced some possible alterations to the channel. The whole project is being costed and, as soon as I get a complete report, I will bring it down for the honourable member's information.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

(For wording of amendment see page 182.)

(Continued from August 8. Page 450.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I rise to support the motion as proposed to be amended by the Leader of the Opposition. I notice that the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), one time Independent, one time member of the Labor Party, one time Independent, one time D.L.P., one time Liberty League supporter, one time D.L.P. supporter, one time—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. QUIRKE: Mr. Speaker, I raise exception to that. I never intended to do this but, when the honourable member says I was a member of the D.L.P., that is untrue.

Mr. LAWN: I didn't say that.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Burra is taking exception to that remark?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes.

Mr. LAWN: He has taken exception to a remark I did not make.

Mr. Shannon: You did.

Mr. LAWN: If you like to call for *Hansard*, I will prove it. I said, "D.L.P. supporter".

Mr. Quirke: That is incorrect, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: In the Barker campaign.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Burra has taken exception to that remark and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr. LAWN: I will withdraw it and say this: that the honourable member supported the D.L.P. candidate in the Commonwealth Division of Barker by-election.

Mr. Quirke: That is incorrect.

Mr. LAWN: He wrote an article in the press for Barker. I continue: one time Liberty League supporter in the Frome by-election, one time Independent, who has now placed the Liberal Party upon his visiting list. I will come back to that subject later.

Whilst so many Ministers are in the House, I am taking this opportunity of referring to certain matters that concern their departments, complaints I have taken up on behalf of constituents, and other matters. I will refer, first of all, to a question asked in the House last week of the Treasurer who, in his reply, said that all State Government insurance offices were showing losses. I have taken the trouble—because I know the Premier's form, as we all do—to prepare a statement from the Auditor-Generals' reports and Year Books pub-

lished by the various States, to see whether or not these State insurance offices are showing a loss or a profit. I ask permission to have this statement incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Mr. Shannon: What value would it have? It is wasting good print.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member desires leave to have that statement incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

STATE INSURANCE OFFICES.

Tasmania:

Profit £32,208—1960.

Profit £31,109—1961.

Reference—*Tasmania Journals and Printed Papers*, Vol. 165, 1961.

Western Australia: It is the practice to limit the credit balance in the Fund at the Treasury to £50,000 by transferring to Revenue, after the close of each year, the sum in excess of that amount. The balance in the Fund at June 30, 1959 was £140,631 of which £90,631 was transferred to Revenue.

Parliament has not appropriated any moneys to meet expenditure incurred in the operation of the Fund.

Reference—*Volume II, Printed Papers* 1960.

Victoria: Reference—*Victorian Year Book* 1962.

The following table shows the trading results for each of the five years 1955-56 to 1959-60:

Victoria—State Motor Car Insurance Office: Premiums Received, Claims Paid, Etc. (£'000).

Year.	Premiums Received Less Reinsurances, Rebates, etc.	Additional Unearned Premium Provision.	Claims Paid and Outstanding.	Expenses.	Underwriting Profit.
1955-56 . . .	1,258	207	1,262	88	299*
1956-57 . . .	1,541	103	1,222	109	107
1957-58 . . .	1,812	135	1,365	122	190
1958-59 . . .	1,967	54	1,751	134	28
1959-60 . . .	2,153	102	2,018	145	112*

* Loss.

The following table shows the trading results for each of the five years 1955-56 to 1959-60:

State Accident Insurance Office: Premiums Received, Claims Paid, Etc. (£'000).

Year.	Premiums Received Less Reinsurances, Rebates, etc.	Additional Unearned Premium Provision.	Claims Paid and Outstanding.	Expenses.	Underwriting Profit.
1955-56 . . .	1,913	129	1,563	128	93
1956-57 . . .	2,011	234	2,078	148	449*
1957-58 . . .	2,462	72	1,918	155	317
1958-59 . . .	2,656	62	2,005	167	422
1959-60 . . .	2,606	172	2,251	242	285

* Loss.

Queensland: Reference—Auditor-General's Report 1960-61.

Results of all departments for the year—Surplus £15,854.

N.S.W.: Reference—Auditor-General's Report, year ended June 30, 1961.

Total surplus £697,336.

Mr. LAWN: The statement shows, first, that in Tasmania in 1960 there was a profit of over £32,000 for State insurance offices, and in 1961 over £31,000. In the statement I have given the references to these figures and will not take up the time of the House with reading them out. I notice that the Parliament of Western Australia has not appropriated any moneys to meet expenditure incurred in the operation of the insurance fund in that State. It is operated solely on its own, and the Act provides that any sum in the fund at the end of the year in excess of £50,000 has to be transferred to revenue. For the year 1960 there was an amount of £140,631 in the fund, so all the balance over £50,000—a total of £90,631—was transferred to revenue.

In Victoria they show the items of their funds—State Motor Car Insurance and State Accident Insurance—and we see that the State Motor Car Insurance Office showed a surplus for three years out of the last five years, the other two showing a deficit. In the State Accident Insurance Fund in Victoria, the report disclosed that for four years out of the last five there was a surplus. Over the last five years there was a surplus of over £600,000. In Queensland the Auditor-General's Report for 1960-61 shows the results of all departments for the year—a surplus of £15,854; and in New South Wales the Auditor-General's Report discloses that for the year ended June 30, 1961, there was a total surplus of £697,336. I leave it to members to judge whether the statement made last week that all Government insurance offices are losing money is correct. As the Treasurer needs income to balance his Budget, I commend to him this opportunity to receive some income into general revenue by the operation of a State insurance office. Like other members, last session I referred to a certain insurance company that had operated here, in other States and, I think, in New Zealand. I understand that someone was robbing the till, according to press reports, with the result that the company has gone into liquidation. I had some constituents involved in a motor car accident. They had a considerable sum to pay in the way of damages and the final result was that they had to make the payment themselves, after having insured themselves with a private insurance company. So as to give our people a greater sense of security, in addition to the suggestion that might commend itself to the Treasurer, the Government would be well advised to open a State insurance office.

Mr. Ryan: That would be against policy if it did.

Mr. LAWN: Members opposite believe in private enterprise. Even to the extent of robbing the primary producers they would sooner see private enterprise carry their production overseas at a huge profit than have a Government-operated shipping line. Representatives of vested interests sit opposite me, and they have a broad grin whenever they think of the profit private enterprise can make. That is why they have a gerrymander in this State, with the second House being gerrymandered; to look after people who have something—vested interests, the wealthiest section of the community. They are hanging on to it.

I come now to the Housing Trust. I shall make a brief reference to the announcement that the trust intends to build houses for a certain section of the community on a £50 deposit. Last week I received a reply to a question, and the Premier's reply disclosed that there were still 8,000 applicants for rental houses from the trust. When I became a member of this House about 12 years ago (in 1950), there were 15,000 to 16,000 applicants awaiting rental houses. I have protested ever since about the trust's building houses for sale. When formed, its duty was to build houses that could be let to the most needy section of our community—the lower wage-earners. That was the whole purpose of setting up the trust in about 1937. I have persistently protested about the building of houses for sale. We have our State Bank to do that. I do not protest against the Government's making available the opportunity to purchase houses, through a Government institution making money available, but the State Bank does that and the Housing Trust should confine itself to the building of houses for people who want to rent them, particularly when there is no reason for the trust to build houses for sale, and when there is a waiting list of 8,000 for rental houses.

There is another aspect of this matter. I had a constituent in the city of Adelaide for many years, until two years ago, who was employed as a caretaker by one of the large firms. Of course, they provided him with accommodation. Two years ago he retired and on approaching his retiring age approached the trust for a house. When his time came to retire the trust could not help him, but he did not come to me for assistance. His application had not been in very long. In fact, it was made in 1960. It could have been

in only a few months when he retired. He did not come to me. He searched the metropolitan area and could not get a house, so he and his wife went to Morgan, and were content to do so. He found that his wife had to come to the Royal Adelaide Hospital once a month for certain treatment. He approached the trust and enlisted my support. I found that the trust had no intention whatsoever of ever letting him come back to the metropolitan area. I came to the conclusion that they were trying to settle people in the country, and that is the only way the Government has given effect to what it claims is a decentralization policy. Those who apply from the country, and those people who went there, have to stay there for the rest of their lives. Although the trust's attention has been drawn to the fact that the lady must visit the Royal Adelaide Hospital once a month for therapy treatment, the trust will, when the accommodation is available, provide a house at Port Pirie because a private person there can give the treatment to the wife. I think that, if the Government wants to give effect to its decentralization policy, it needs to be sincere, and not enlist the aid of the trust to the extent that any person who lives in the country cannot come to the metropolitan area and get a house from the trust, and must take a trust house at Renmark, Port Pirie or Angaston. In the letter all sorts of country towns have been mentioned, but the people are not allowed to come to the metropolitan area.

I now come to another matter. Members on this side of the House (the members for Semaphore, Hindmarsh and Adelaide) have for years made claims about the dust nuisance. It has been again brought to my attention by a nuisance coming from a Thebarton factory. The council claims that it has no power to do anything about the menace, and I ask the Government to take the necessary action this session to introduce, as has been done in New South Wales, a Clean Air Act. Alongside the dust nuisance that the Government says is the responsibility of the councils, and on which the councils say that they have not got any power, I had earlier this year another matter brought to my notice. It was a public nuisance.

Certain people bought a property in my district, knocked down all the walls inside, and outside they put up a board at which they were throwing a ball in some game competition. I will not say what went on inside the house. The throwing of balls at this board

until late at night created a nuisance because people in the district could not get to sleep, and the big lights there shone into some of the houses. I wrote to the Premier, and he was good enough to have the complaint investigated. The police who carried out the investigation reported that the people had a grievance and that the complaints were justified. This report was sent to the Crown Law Department, which subsequently advised that the police and the Government had no power under the Police Offences Act to take any action. The Premier wrote to the council and said that it had power—I do not know in what way—and offered to make available to it the police report. It seems to me to be odd that people can create a nuisance, which is proved to the police to be a nuisance, yet the police have no power to act, and that the Crown Law Office has to advise the Government that it has no power to act. I think the Government should look at this matter of the powers of the Police Department on the one hand and of councils on the other in relation to the menace created by dust, soot and dirt with the object of straightening out the Acts so that there is a clear knowledge of authority. Another instance is the recent grave doubt about whether at a council election people are permitted by the law to hand out how-to-vote cards. There should be no doubt about these things. Everybody should have the opportunity to know the law, and somebody should have authority to act. I urge the Government to investigate these matters to see if they can be rectified.

I have one or two matters that I wish to take up with the Minister of Education but, although he is the Minister most consistently in the House, unfortunately he has been called away at the moment; however, he will be able to read the *Hansard* report. I recently received from the Thebarton Council a copy of a letter sent to the Secretary to the Minister of Education, and an accompanying letter asking me to take up this matter with the Minister. The council wrote as follows:

The council has received a petition from the parents of the children attending the Thebarton Infants' School, Torrensville, requesting the council to repair the roadway and the foot-path on the western side of Hayward Avenue, between North Parade and Ashley Street, and adjacent to the school property. The council has received an estimate for reconstructing the side of the road and constructing kerb and water table for the amount of £1,450. As the school grounds are unratable, it would be appreciated if your department would give consideration to assisting the council financially to carry out this work.

If this work is carried out it will not be enjoyed to a great extent except by those going to the school. I endorse the sentiments expressed in the letter and hope that, as no rates are paid to the council, the Government will either make some contribution towards this, carry out the whole of the work itself, or find the finance for it. I consider that the Government could well do this, as the whole of this area where the road needs reconstructing and where kerbing and water tabling need constructing adjoins the school. I hope the Minister will investigate this matter and meet the wishes of the council.

Another matter that has been brought to my notice in more than one way this year is that trainee teachers entering colleges have to find a guarantor and, should they leave the service of the Education Department in less than three years, they have to refund all the money paid to them by the department. If they are unable to repay the money themselves, their guarantor has to pay. This is going back to the Dark Ages. At one time—although before my time—a person wanting to learn a trade had to pay someone to teach him. If he could not pay, his parents or guardian had to pay. What I have mentioned is a carry-over from those days—the department saying to trainee teachers that they have to stay three years or refund all the money paid to them.

Mr. Shannon: In other words, you do not want them to be trained and to be paid while being trained? You want to go back to the Dark Ages when they were not paid? That is what you are suggesting.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member is talking as sensibly as he always does! About 12 months ago he was doing exactly the same as on this occasion.

Mr. Ryan: He has deteriorated a little.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: Apparently the honourable member for Onkaparinga does not want to speak himself but merely interjects when we are speaking. About 12 months ago he called us prophets of doom. He can refer to page 945 of last year's *Hansard*, where he is reported to have said:

I could not imagine any Party seeking the suffrage of the elector expecting to get very much of a return for its expenditure if doom is all it has to offer. . . . People in this State are in for as good a time as the people in any part of the world.

A Commonwealth and a State election were approaching and he said that all we were

doing was preaching doom, having our eyes on the approaching election. He said he could not visualize the electors giving us much return for our efforts. Have a look at the result! Who were the prophets of doom 12 months ago? The honourable member is just as sensible now as then.

Mr. Shannon: Who is the Opposition? That is the result.

Mr. LAWN: That is because the Government has a gerrymander. If there were a Communist in this House as an Independent and the Government depended upon his vote to keep it in power, it would take it.

Mr. Shannon: Is your memory so short that you do not remember voting for the present distribution?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: I will let it go; you, Mr. Speaker, would only ask me to withdraw if I replied, and the honourable member could not understand me. Private industry takes not only juniors but men and teaches them, not a trade but a semi-skilled occupation. In many cases it takes two or three months to train employees. Employers have to pay award rates and if the employees leave after six or nine months they do not have to repay their wages. It is only a Liberal Government that would insist on a thing like this. Some of these boys and girls stay perhaps two or two and a half years and then seek employment with television companies or other companies who offer them better money and conditions than they could obtain from a Liberal Government. The result is that they are leaving the department to accept these other jobs. They have not been able to make deposits into a bank because, like me, they are not wealthy. We live from day to day and spend every penny we get. We do not save because we cannot. They cannot make deposits into a bank so that at the end of three years they can withdraw it and refund it to the department. Then the department sends a letter to the father or anyone else who has been the guarantor, asking for the refund. I appeal to the Government not to do this because its duty is to provide the conditions and wages that make the job attractive enough so that a person sufficiently interested to be a teacher should have the opportunity to finish his training course and then be used by the department in the profession he really wants. These people really want to become teachers and start with that intention, but find that the weekly amount paid by the department is very low. Someone

else then offers them double the amount and therefore they have no alternative but to accept it.

Mr. Shannon: There is no bar to his remaining if he wants to be a teacher.

Mr. LAWN: We only know things from personal experience. The honourable member may never have had the experience of being in the same economic position as these young people. They are not wealthy and have not enough money, and are not likely to get it by working for the Education Department at a training college. When something more is offered they take it.

Mr. Shannon: Whatever encouraged them to start training in the first place?

Mr. LAWN: Because they wanted to become teachers.

The SPEAKER: Order! We cannot have a debate between two members at the same time. I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr. LAWN: These young people start with the desire to be teachers and I am appealing to the Government to pay them a sufficient wage and to make their conditions attractive enough to enable them to continue and complete their training for the job they want. It is better to have people interested in their job and to make them happy and contented than to have a turnover like that which the Government must be experiencing. Some of these people have approached me. Often they are offered fantastic wages by outside firms. I am not suggesting that the Government is able to compete with such offers, but it could do better than it is doing.

A boy and girl who started training at the Currie Street Training College in February came to me. I sent the boy to the Commonwealth Employment Service, and apparently they looked up his school record. He had a tremendously good report on English, and he was asked, "Have you ever thought of being a teacher?" to which he replied that he would like to be one. He was sent down to make the necessary application and was told that it was only in high schools that English could be taught exclusively. I believe this boy had a Leaving Certificate, but I am not sure. I know that he had the Intermediate Certificate. He was placed in the Currie Street Training College and was sent for a medical examination. After a month or six weeks he said to the headmaster, "Is it not time that I was getting some money?" and the headmaster replied, "You will have to wait until the

doctor's report is received." He could have paid the money to the boy if he had liked, or could withhold it. He pleases himself; and in this case he withheld it.

Mr. Ryan: What gave him that right?

Mr. LAWN: I suppose the Education Department regulations and that is what I am protesting against, and I hope that this matter will be reviewed. When it came to my notice I corresponded with the Minister, and told him the story as I have just related it. Some eight weeks after the boy had been at the college, I wrote to the Minister and asked whether the doctor's report could not have been received in less than 10 weeks. The boy was at the college 10 or 12 weeks and was then offered a good job in an outside establishment for which he received more money.

Mr. Ryan: Did he get any money from the department?

Mr. LAWN: I pressed the Minister as far as I could to have the moneys due paid to the girl and boy I mentioned, and he said that the Auditor-General could not approve of that under the Act. So I wrote back to the Minister and said that if he could not pay them the wages, could he pay a gratuity, and I am pleased to say that the Minister arranged for the payment of £50. It was said that the money could not be paid to these people unless they had stayed three years, but they could pay a gratuity. I appeal to the Government to amend the Act so that such boys and girls, or their parents, are not put under a threat. If a father or mother is good enough to act as guarantor, and the child should leave before his time, the money received by the child must be refunded. I suggest that this matter should be reconsidered by the Government, and that it should waive its right to claim for any moneys paid. It should provide wages and conditions that are sufficiently attractive to keep in training all the present teacher students and encourage others.

That was all that I intended to contribute to the debate, but certain statements have been made by members on the other side which demand that I answer them. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) went to no end of trouble to criticize members on this side. He made all sorts of accusations and charges and even went to the extent of lying, and I will prove it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I take exception to that remark and ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member said that the member for Mitcham had lied, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. LAWN: I am not withdrawing it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders provide that if another member objects to the remark of a member he must, in deference to the Chair, withdraw that remark.

Mr. LAWN: I am not withdrawing.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member realizes that I am not responsible for what the Standing Orders contain. I must carry out the provisions of the Standing Orders and if an honourable member objects to any remark I must ask that it be withdrawn. I must ask the honourable member to favourably consider the withdrawal of that remark.

Mr. LAWN: I appreciate your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and I do not object to your asking me to observe Standing Orders. I made the statement that the honourable member for Mitcham lied in this House and you have asked me to withdraw that remark, but I will not withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member refuses to withdraw the remark and I have no course open but to name the honourable member.

Mr. LAWN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member take his seat for a moment? The honourable member realizes that as he refuses to withdraw the remark I give him an opportunity to make a statement or an explanation.

Mr. LAWN: That is all I ask. The statement to which I referred is that the member for Mitcham accused me and the member for Norwood of having carried placards on opening day. I make no apology—I did—but it is a lie to say that the member for Norwood carried a placard, because he did not. That is the explanation I offer. What I am saying is the truth.

Mr. Hall: You cannot say a mistake is a lie. You must prove that.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member, within the Standing Orders, has explained his statement, but as he refused to withdraw in the first place I must ask him to withdraw now.

Mr. LAWN: I consent to your request, Mr. Speaker, and withdraw. There is no hard feeling over your action, Mr. Speaker. The member for Mitcham then said he went to the Australian Labor Party's office and bought a copy of the A.L.P. rule book, for which he paid 5s. The member for Enfield has adequately replied

concerning the 5s. The member for Mitcham said that the rule book contained many amendments and that he had to use scissors and paste to stick the amendments into the book. Dealing with the particular case he referred to, I point out that the whole page was reprinted because of two or three alterations and, therefore, the honourable member did not have to use scissors or paste. Also, the amendments have a gummed back: the member for Mitcham would not have the gumption to know that. He made a song and dance about the words "unimproved" and "improved". Actually, there was no alteration. The printed book and the reprint both showed "unimproved". Members on this side knew months ago that it meant that, long before the honourable member made his song and dance in this House. He tried to prove a difference between our State and Commonwealth policies, but I have pointed out that that was a mistake and no difference exists in relation to unimproved land.

After listening to the member for Mitcham I thought it might be a good idea if I copied his action and went to the Liberal Party office to purchase a copy of that Party's rule book. I did not walk on plush carpets, but plush carpets were laid on the other side of the counter. They were not available outside for the rank and file Liberal Party members to walk on, but the principals of the Liberal Party had plush carpets behind that counter. I found that the Liberal Party rule book was priceless because the girl behind the counter told me that I could have it for nothing—they were free! Therefore, the Liberal Party rule book is priceless.

When speaking of our book the member for Mitcham said he had a copy of the 1958 rule book together with amendments up to 1961. The latest rule book I could procure of the Liberal Party was printed in 1959, but the "1959" was struck out in ink and "1960" was written in. Although the member for Mitcham was able to obtain a 1958 book brought up to date to 1961 I was only able to obtain a 1959 book amended to 1960 from the Liberal Party and, because there has been no subsequent alteration, those rules remain in force. The front of the book states "The Liberal and Country League, South Australian Division of the Liberal Party of Australia".

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not, I take it, going to read the lot?

Mr. LAWN: No. It continues "Constitution, Principles and State Platform". I wish to emphasize this—"Constitution, Principles

and State Platform". The book, from its commencement to the end of page 16, deals with the constitution. It provides that:

This constitution and State platform may be amended only at an annual or a special general meeting of the delegates.

Up to the end of that page it comprises only rules. Page 17 is an application form to join the Liberal Party.

Mr. McKee: Do they deal with transfers?

Mr. LAWN: Page 18 deals with ballot-papers and then, on the inside of the book's cover, the principles and State platform are set out as follows:

Rules for principals of the Liberal and Country League and vested interests.

(1) The principals of the oil monopolies, banking and other financial interests will guarantee Liberal and Country League Party funds and Liberal and Country League candidates' election campaign funds for services rendered.

(2) Liberal and Country League principals, including members of Parliament (both Federal and State) will protect the interests of oil monopolies, banking and other financial interests in return for handsome donations to Party and candidates' funds.

The honourable member for Burra has something to look forward to. It continues:

(3) Should any female member of the Liberal and Country League become a member of the State Parliament (either House) and has (for political purposes) prior to her election, advocated adult franchise for the Legislative Council elections and equal pay for the sexes, she must immediately repudiate her beliefs (if any) on such matters, and give unswerving loyalty and obedience to the master who shall be her guiding star in these and other matters.

(4) Any member of the Liberal and Country League who, before election to the State Parliament (either House)—

This refers to the member for Mitcham—advocates a democratically elected Parliament, or the Australian Labor Party electoral reform proposals, shall, immediately upon becoming a member of Parliament, repudiate such belief and take direction from the Master, as without a gerrymandered electorate the Liberal and Country League will perish.

Mr. LAUCKE: Mr. Speaker, I—

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member raising a point of order?

Mr. LAUCKE: I wish to have clarified just what the honourable member is reading at present. What is the source from which he is reading? It is not part of the Liberal and Country League platform.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in order in asking for clarification. He can only raise a point of order.

Mr. LAUCKE: The honourable member stated that he was referring to and reading from the L.C.L. Party platform, but he was certainly not doing that.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The member for Mitcham quoted the Labor Party's rules last week.

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order, perhaps the member for Adelaide might reply.

Mr. LAWN: I am not going to take up any more time nor will I oblige the honourable member. I sat and listened—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member in order in reading from a document that he purports to be genuine, but which is incorrect?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would not be in order. If the honourable member is quoting from a document it is expected that, in conformity with the decorum of this House, it will be accurate and in accordance with facts.

Mr. LAWN: Members opposite knew how much of what I have said was correct, and if they noticed that some of it was not correct, they were aware of it. Some of it was correct, and some was not entirely correct. I admit that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the honourable member in order in purporting to read from a genuine article and then trying to explain his actions away by saying that members on this side of the House understand what is in it? This is a general debate and I consider that the source of quotations should be accurately supplied by any honourable member who has proper self-respect. No attempt should be made to mislead people as to the truth of the source of any document. No attempt should be made to mislead people who are not closely associated with political life.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would not be in order in purporting that what he is quoting is genuine material from a document, if it is not contained in the official document.

Mr. LAWN: It must be hurting. It stings members opposite. They remind me of Jeremiah vii. 19. They are both angry and confused. They can get up in the House and call us a "lot of Commos" and we have to take it.

Mr. Jenkins: Is the honourable member debating the issue?

Mr. LAWN: The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) made a song and dance about members not wearing medals on opening day. I

always wear my medals, not on the front of my coat, but in my waistcoat. As far as I am aware I had them on on opening day, but I changed my suit and had another suit on. I have only one good suit and I keep that for opening days to show my respect to His Excellency and our Sovereign. I do not know whether I will be able to get another suit, but if I forgot to take my medals from the suit I am now wearing and put them in the waistcoat of my other suit, then I apologize. I say that sincerely, because I am proud of my medals. One is a medal which members of my union wear; another is the medal that any member elected to the Federal Council of my union receives; another that I am proud to wear is the medallion that was given to me after I had served a term as State President of the South Australian Labor Party; and another was given to me upon completing a term as President of the South Australian Trades and Labor Council. I am extremely proud of these medals and I always wear them, but if I inadvertently left them in this suit when I put on my Queen's suit, I apologize.

The member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), who did not know what to expect on opening day, said that he left his medals in Chaffey, and when he saw other members wearing their medals he could not go to get his. Although I do not resent what the member for Mitcham said about me—and I did carry a placard, but do not know whether I was wearing my medals—I resent the low-down attack he made on the member for Millicent. We all know—and so does the member for Mitcham—that until Mr. Corcoran was declared elected as a member of this House he was a commissioned officer in the Australian Army serving in another State (I believe Queensland) after having served some years in Malaya and other places. He obtained leave to come down here to conduct the last three or four weeks of his election campaign, and this resulted in his election. He then had to tender his resignation as a commissioned officer. I know that on opening day he told me that all his goods and effects had not arrived and that this had inconvenienced him. I did not know then, but I have discovered since the member for Mitcham's attack on him, that all his medals were in Queensland.

Mr. Jennings: The member for Mitcham was even filthy enough to bring the member for Millicent's father into it.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Not only did the member for Millicent tell me on opening day that he was inconvenienced because all of his goods

and effects had not arrived but that his medals were in Queensland. He told the member for Mitcham that. However, has the member for Mitcham had the decency to get up and apologize for making his attack on the member for Millicent?

Mr. Corcoran: Yes, he has.

Mr. LAWN: No, he has not! The member for Mitcham said that if the member for Millicent made a personal explanation and drew attention to the fact that his medals were in Queensland on opening day, the member for Mitcham would apologize. That is not ethics, as I know the term. Had the position been reversed and the member for Millicent made such an attack he would have risen to apologize and not have expected the member for Mitcham to make a personal explanation first.

Mr. Corcoran: I was satisfied.

Mr. LAWN: I wasn't! I want the record clear. This was the type of low-down attack that the member for Mitcham indulged in when he addressed the House. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) told the member for Mitcham that he never wears his medals, so no affront or insult was intended to the Queen. I have explained the situation as it affects four of our Party members. I do not know the position regarding other members, but there was no concerted action on our part, nor was there any intention—

Mr. Bywaters: We had no instructions.

Mr. LAWN: That is so.

Mr. Jennings: We don't take instructions, anyway.

Mr. LAWN: On page 352 of *Hansard*, the member for Mitcham said:

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

That was a lie!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: No exception was taken to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It was a terminological inexactitude.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would not be in order in accusing the member for Mitcham of stating a lie. Standing Orders provide that when a member speaks it must be in becoming language and not unbecoming. That is unbecoming language.

Mr. LAWN: I could do what I did just now, but won't. I withdraw the remark you object to, Mr. Speaker, as you have asked me to do, and substitute the comment of the member for West Torrens—it was a terminological

inexactitude, which means the same as the statement I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: That is a matter of terminology.

Mr. LAWN: This is my thirteenth session in this House. Every year members go to Government House to present themselves to His Excellency. Out of the 13 years I have been here I doubt whether I have been to Government House more than four times, so it is not my usual practice to go there every year. I always go anywhere I can to get experience and to find out what goes on. I now know what happens when members go to Government House, so I do not make it a practice to go every year. My not going this year was no reflection upon Her Majesty or the Governor. I do not know that I will go over there next year, and it still will not be a reflection upon the member for Mitcham or Her Majesty.

Mr. Laucke: Why don't you go across?

Mr. LAWN: I do not see any purpose in doing so. I am not as young as the honourable member is; I have trouble not with my head, like he does, but with my feet, and I speak from my heart when I say that. My medical advisers have told me to keep off my feet as much as I can, so I do not walk any unnecessary distances. The next matter concerns the placards. I do not know why the member for Mitcham has to make accusations against people who did not carry the placards. We understand that the honourable member has a set against the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), but why make a false accusation in the House that he carried a placard when he did not do so? The member for Mitcham said—and it is on page 352 of *Hansard*—that only seven members of the Opposition spoke on the Bill that we introduced to amend the Constitution Act.

Mr. Jennings: How many spoke from the other side?

Mr. LAWN: That is what I am coming to. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the jokes of the session; there have been a couple more since then. Only seven Opposition members spoke, but only one Government member spoke, and that was the Master; the others were not game to speak. The only other speaker was the member for Burra, who does not know what he has let himself in for; Don Athaldo will break him, just as he has broken all the rest; he will bend him to his will, just as he has done with the others, and I doubt whether we shall hear much more from the member for Burra now that he has gone over to the other side of the House.

Once the Master says, "Don't speak", they do not speak: that is the end of it. Why didn't members opposite get up and speak on our Bill? I was the sixth speaker in the debate, and at that stage the Premier had already spoken. Before I spoke I handed you, Mr. Speaker, a list of speakers which contained the names of every member of the Opposition, and I indicated the order in which they would speak. When I spoke I forecast that there would be no more speakers from the Government side. While I was speaking some discussion took place amongst Opposition members, and their attitude was that if no other Government members spoke they saw no reason why they should speak. However, two of our members—the members for West Torrens and Port Pirie—decided that they would speak; the others asked the Deputy Leader to cancel their names. If there had been only three or four speakers from the Government side, there would still have been 19 speakers from this side of the House. The reason why there were only seven Opposition speakers was that no Government member, with the exception of the Premier, intended to address himself to the Bill. We were not going to let Government members sweat off and then come in at the finish and have an open go at us. Our members made their own decisions: after their names had been handed to the Speaker they withdrew.

Mr. Millhouse: How do you work that out? You said, "The Master had already spoken."

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. LAWN: Mr. Speaker, there is only one astute person on the other side of the House, and when he has got rid of all Opposition members and has nothing to fear, he says to the babes in the wood opposite, "Have a bit of practice; go to town." We have all got a little space up top which our good Lord has put there for brains, but if honourable members opposite had those spaces filled with gunpowder—and the Master knows it—it would not be enough to blow the tops of their skulls off. After having got rid of all his opposition—after we had all spoken—he could let them have a little practice gallop. Then, Mr. Speaker, the member for Mitcham told the House that he had a list of names of all the Australian Labor Party Executive. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) interjected, and the member for Mitcham then said, "Well, your name doesn't appear to be here." That was another terminological inexactitude; he attempted to mislead the House by saying that he had a list of the names and that it did not

contain the names of many members of Parliament. I do not know whether or not he was sorry about that. However, when the member for West Torrens challenged him he said, "Oh, yes, the member for West Torrens' name is on the list." Just what did the honourable member mean when he attacked us about our Executive? Do we have to be on the Executive in order that our Party can be a good one?

Mr. Jennings: Practically all of us have been on it at one time or another.

Mr. LAWN: Yes; I was on it for so long that I was glad to have a spell off it, and since then, because of other circumstances, I have not attempted to get back on it again. I do not have to be on the Executive; we are a democratic society, and any member who wishes to be on the Executive can be nominated. We are not automatically elected simply because we are members of Parliament, but we can be elected by ballot of the delegates who attend our convention. What is the member for Mitcham complaining about, and what has it got to do with State politics?

Mr. Bywaters: The Liberal Party needs only one on its Executive.

Mr. LAWN: As a matter of fact, it has not got a State platform, merely a rule book. Even the press has been telling us that no matter what happens at the Liberal Party's annual convention the Master's will prevails. We have been telling the people that for years, and now the press is saying it, too.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you do what you are told by the Executive of your Party?

Mr. LAWN: I am not told to do anything, but if I were I would do it; I make no apology for that. But the Executive of the Labor Party cannot tell me from day to day what I may do: we have rules, and as long as I act in accordance with the policy of my Party, no-one can tell me I have to do this or do that. I have no Master who stands out there. There is no Master in our Party standing out there holding out his hands. No Master tells us to speak or not to speak.

Mr. Dunstan: We know whether we are going to vote for what we believe in or what we do not, as was told the member for Albert two years ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide.

Mr. Jennings: There is no-one to tell us to shut up, either.

Mr. LAWN: A former member for Light (the late Mr. Hambour) was speaking on one occasion when the Master sang out to him, "Shut up!", and he sat down without saying

any more. We have heard him tell the member for Albert and other members to shut up, even when they were standing up answering interjections. When the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) was told to shut up he got up and walked out of the House.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You were given instructions once to oppose the Long Service Leave Bill, and you could not do anything about it.

Mr. LAWN: I got no instructions at all on the Long Service Leave Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: I will tell the Minister of Agriculture that during the time we have been here we have had no Long Service Leave Bill. Don't fall for that trap of the Minister! There was a Bill dealing with another week's annual leave to employees with over seven years' service, but that is not long service leave. So I opposed it tooth and nail.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Because you were ordered to.

Mr. LAWN: No; because it came from my heart.

Mr. Nankivell: Shame!

Mr. LAWN: I think we made a decision that we intended to oppose that Bill tooth and nail, and I think we advised the trade union movement, but we do not tell each other what to do.

Mr. Millhouse: It was probably in your minutes that you had to take up to the executive.

Mr. LAWN: I do not have to take them up at all.

Mr. Millhouse: You will be in trouble next time if you do not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) chided us for not having spoken to the amendment.

Mr. Hall: You are in no position to.

Mr. LAWN: The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) said:

You have said nothing about the amendment. Then the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) said:

Tell us your views on the amendment.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said:

I will do so.

He had criticized us for not speaking to the amendment. I will now read to the House what he said to the amendment.

Mr. Clark: Not one member on the Government side said anything about the amendment.

Mr. LAWN: Not one member, but the honourable member promised to do so.

Mr. Ryan: Like the election promises, they never keep them.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member said:

I shall oppose it for the reasons I have given. I do not know that they relate to the amendment. If they do so, then I must be speaking to the amendment. I do not know that I have spoken to the amendment yet but I have spoken about the same things as the honourable member did. He continued:

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.

And that was his contribution to speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Bywaters: He used no arguments.

Mr. LAWN: No, but he made accusations, and then he said he would speak to the amendment, and this is all he said—that it was hypocrisy, a sham, and a matter of expediency to embarrass the Speaker. He did not even attempt to enlarge on or improve his statements. That was his contribution to the amendment. Many members on this side of the House have spoken to the amendment. Every member of this House knows that the contents of the amendment need to be given effect to. Referring to the last remark of the honourable member, that it would embarrass you, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it does or not. The honourable member may be able to speak for you, but I can't.

The SPEAKER: You had better let me be the judge of that.

Mr. LAWN: Yes; but Mr. Speaker, as the member for Ridley, has introduced deputation of people from the farming world to the Premier on this matter, so obviously there are many people who want something done on the lines of what is contained in the amendment. I know many people in the metropolitan area who think that way. The Land Tax Act says that, if a property is sold, whether it is land or a house, then the sale price is usually the measuring stick for the valuation for the properties in the vicinity, and every five years the new rate is fixed on those prices. Close to my home a house was built 2½ years ago, and the land and the house, with a 55ft. frontage, cost under £5,000. The house was sold this year for £10,000 and knocked down.

That will influence the Taxation Commissioner—I am not criticising him now; I am criticising the Act. All the land around will be rated on the selling price on that occasion. The Taxation Commissioner or his officers must be influenced by that transaction in valuing the land around, which includes my property. That is going on all around the metropolitan area. There is something wrong when a big oil company can come along and buy a house for £10,000—a good house with a 55ft. frontage—and then knock it down. It is wrong. That is one of the reasons why we move the amendment.

I crave the ear of the Premier on this matter. When the State was founded in 1836, certain areas were built upon. They have been settled for a long time. There is not a vacant block in those areas. No sale takes place there but on land that has been developed only since the war and is only five miles from Adelaide, going out south and north, people are paying considerably higher rates than on the areas close to the city of Adelaide that were first settled, because there is no vacant land for sale there, and has not been for years. The only sale that takes place is where some industrial concern goes in, buys up a house and knocks it down to build a factory. In other places people are paying lower rates within a mile or one and a half miles of the city, whilst on places five miles away they are paying higher rates because of land sales there at inflated prices. We are asking for a committee to look at these things. The member for Mitcham says we are putting this up only to embarrass you, Mr. Speaker. I have put up two reasons this afternoon why the matter should be looked at.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You would increase land tax on agricultural properties?

Mr. LAWN: I cannot speak for the farmers but can sense what is going on at places within a few miles of Adelaide, such as Elizabeth or the hills, where people are buying up land and subdividing it for housing in the vicinity of a rural lot, thus affecting the rural people. Those people may have a just claim. I am not saying they have, but they may have. I am inclined to think they have, but I do not know sufficient about them. There are people in the country and in the metropolitan area who are protesting about their land tax. I think the only way to solve it is to let us have a review, and if the Minister has any policy to put before the commission he can do so, and so can the Labor Party and the L.C.L. if they want to make submissions, or

individuals, the Farmers Union, or the Wheat and Wool Growers' Association, and let the commission analyse the position.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would you put the tax up on properties worth £15,000 to £16,000?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know the circumstances there. I am not an authority. I think the commission could review the anomalies and make recommendations to the House about altering the Act. If the members were members of Parliament or judges of the Supreme Court they would not fix the rates, but would recommend amendments to the principle. I do not think the honourable member is sincere when he asks a hypothetical question about a building worth £15,000 or £16,000.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What is the commission to inquire into?

Mr. LAWN: I told the Minister that if the space given to him by our good Lord to house his brain were filled with gun powder and it were lit it would not blow off the top of his skull, and he proved that by the remark. He has a printed piece of paper in front of him and he asks me to read it. It has been there for a fortnight.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: The member for Mitcham also said that an attempt should be made to expose the Communists, speaking of the Returned Servicemen's League. I suggest that he could have added "and combat Communism". If the honourable member wanted to combat Communism he could advocate the provision of full employment, a free health scheme, and a decent standard of living for all, because that is the best way to combat it. We could improve our industrial legislation and do no end of things.

I come back now to the happenings of this week. Yesterday I read the *News* and at the top of an article I saw the word "Shock". I wonder why it was a shock to the *News* people. There is one reporter now up there in the gallery. Last week I told them what they printed yesterday, yet they said it was a shock. When the member for Port Adelaide was speaking, he said that the member for Burra had approached the Liberal Party and made a certain advance, or offer, or application to join the Liberal Party. I did not say anything about conditions. It is all in *Hansard*. Yesterday the press said it was a shock to them.

Mr. Jennings: You were called a liar.

Mr. LAWN: I was called a liar. I did not object. I knew what I said was true and

that it was only a matter of time for it to be proved. It has been proved and I take no exception to being called a liar. The press tells us what is in the Commonwealth or State Budget, whether it is there or not. It said that the Treasurer would introduce the Loan Estimates on Tuesday, and that the Address in Reply debate would end today. Then yesterday it said it was a shock to find that the member for Burra was going over to the Liberal Party. We knew a fortnight ago what moves were being made. When the member for Burra spoke on Tuesday he said he had reached the stage when he had to consider the matter, or words to that effect. We said that his application had been accepted. The next day he knew where he stood. He was over there, on the opposite side. The press said that we were angry yesterday because the honourable member went over there. If the press were up to date it would know that I said 12 months ago, which is a long time ago, that the member for Burra should be over on the other side. We were hoping that he would go there. I said 12 months ago that he had consistently supported the Government.

The Premier is not as dumb as other members on that side. He bought the honourable member's vote when he put him on the Public Works Committee. Now he has got him tied up. There is a joke in this morning's paper. I do not know whether it is correct or not, but the press reported that the Premier said something about having the responsibility of helping in forming policy might be an education to the member for Burra. I know the Premier, and I can read behind what he said. He was saying that the honourable member would probably think he was going to have some say in the policy, but he has a shock coming to him when he attends meetings. When I came into this House there were four Independents. They all claimed to be Independents, and I think one or two of them were real Independents. I think that the member for Ridley was one of the most independent. He came in here when he wanted to. He used the House on behalf of the Wheat and Wool Growers' Association, whom he represented, and I do not blame him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: There were some Independents. Upstairs they have a room for Independents. One by one they have left until this year we had only two, the members for Ridley and Burra.

Mr. McKee: They were gobbled up.

Mr. LAWN: I think they were both gobled up. The member for Burra used to have a square mirror on the table in the room so that when he had a meeting with himself he was able to see if he was all there. Since the member for Ridley has deserted him, the strain has become so great that he said in the House, and on television last night, that he could not stand the strain of having to make decisions so he thought he would join the Liberal Party. We all know that he has been a consistent supporter of the Liberal Party for more than two years. I said it last year in the House, and the press is waking up to what we said 12 months ago and last week in this place. I said in opening my remarks that the member for Burra was at one time an Independent, and a member of the Labor Party, and that he supported the D.L.P. candidate in the Barker by-election and wrote a letter to the press. I did not say he was a member of the D.L.P.—only supported it. He assisted the Liberty League. I think he addressed a meeting for it at Peterborough during the Frome by-election campaign.

Mr. Jennings: What is the Liberty League?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know. He became an Independent again.

Mr. Jennings: He will be the next Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. LAWN: He is now visiting the Liberal Party. Last night on television he was asked if he had been offered a ministerial position and he said "No".

Mr. Jennings: Not yet!

Mr. LAWN: No, not yet. He is perhaps hopeful.

Mr. Shannon: He is in the right Party to get a portfolio!

Mr. LAWN: Then the possibility was pointed out to him; and I suppose we might all say something like he said if we were told we had a chance to become a Minister and were asked what portfolio we would prefer. The point that struck me was that the honourable member suggested Agriculture, about which he knew something. He did not say anything about the Premiership; he would not want to compete for the leadership. I do not know whether he will be any more loyal to the Liberal Party than he was to the Labor Party but, knowing the honourable member as I do, I do not think he will be—I do not think he could be, either: I think he is only visiting the Liberal Party and that when he disagrees with something he will make the same break

with it as he did with the Labor Party. I do not think he can be a lasting member of that Party.

I thought the gem yesterday was the remark that a statement made by the member for Ridley some months ago was a reflection upon himself. I thought that was a classic! My colleague, the member for Whyalla, quoted a statement yesterday that had been made by the member for Ridley, and the Speaker said, "That is a reflection on the Chair and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it."

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: The same statement was in last night's *News* and this morning's *Advertiser*. That is a classic! A statement was made by the member for Ridley that he now claims is a reflection upon himself and cannot be repeated in the House, yet the *News* and *Advertiser* are publishing it every day of the week! There was another report in the press some months ago about a 20-minute conversation between the member for Ridley and the Premier in the Premier's office—only 20 minutes; you would not discuss much in 20 minutes, of course! It was one Tom to another Tom, you see. When they met, one Tom said, "Hallo, Tom", and the other Tom said, "Hallo, Tom"; "Come in, Tom"; "Yes, Tom"; "Take a chair, Tom"; "Yes, Tom"; and then they went on from there. The outcome of that 20-minute conversation was that it is rumoured—I do not know if it is true because I was not present; I do not know whether there was any secretary there, so only the Premier and the member for Ridley know whether it is true—in a story going around the town that for his support on vital issues the member for Ridley wanted to be the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: And the Premier laughed at that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot proceed in that tone; he knows that. Keep within the Standing Orders.

Mr. Jenkins: If that is an example of the Government we would get from that side—

Mr. LAWN: I am only giving the story going around the town. The member for Ridley wanted to be Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: When that was knocked back he wanted to be the Minister of Agriculture. Then the story concludes with his asking for the Speakership and a knighthood. Whether that is true or not, I do not know. The only people who can enlighten us are the Premier and the member for Ridley.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide! I draw attention to Standing Orders, which provide that honourable members, when making statements in this Chamber, are responsible for their veracity. I ask the honourable member to keep to that.

Mr. LAWN: I am responsible for the last statement I made. I take full responsibility for that. I said that the rumours or stories going around the town—I have heard this many times, and I heard it—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot continue in this way.

Mr. LAWN: At the time there was a 20-minute interview. People in the street say, "Have you heard the story?"

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SHANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker! You drew the honourable member's attention to the fact that he should not make statements that he could not verify. He is making many rash statements at the moment about you, Sir, which some of us know to be false. This is the sort of thing that appeals to certain people as being clever. I should like you, Mr. Speaker, to call the honourable member to order.

The SPEAKER: I did. I have drawn the honourable member's attention to the fact that when a member makes a speech he must be responsible for its veracity. Rumours and that sort of thing are not allowed under Standing Orders. The statements are untrue, and I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he must continue within Standing Orders or he will be out of order.

Mr. LAWN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder why you do not take the same action when untrue statements are made from the other side of the House.

Mr. Shannon: Your ruling is being questioned, Mr. Speaker. I think this should be dealt with.

Mr. LAWN: I am not questioning the ruling at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw and not to continue in that fashion. I ask the honourable member to take—

Mr. LAWN: Did you say "withdraw", Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. LAWN: You have asked me to stop. This is the first time I have been asked to withdraw. I am sorry; I cannot withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I have asked the honourable member to withdraw the remarks. They

are completely untrue. If he fails to withdraw them, I must take steps under the Standing Orders. I again draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the Standing Orders were not made by me; I have to carry them out, as the honourable member knows. The honourable member is in order in making a statement on why he refuses to withdraw.

Mr. LAWN: I do not know whether the conclusion of the statement I wanted to make was heard and reported or whether it was obliterated by the member for Onkaparinga. I said—I do not want to go over it again—that the rumour was that during the 20-minute conversation the member for Ridley asked for the Premiership and was refused; he asked to be Minister of Agriculture and was refused; and then he asked for the Speakership and a knighthood. I said that the only people who could deny that story were yourself and the Premier. I do not know whether you denied it or whether the member for Onkaparinga did. You said just now that I must be responsible for the veracity of the statements and be responsible. I said, "I do not know what went on. I am responsible for saying that a number of people said that to me."

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know if the honourable member misunderstands the position or whether he is trying to do so. I am asking him to withdraw the statement he is repeating, which is untrue. I ask him to withdraw the statement. He has the right under Standing Orders to make a statement before I take any further action. In order to keep the thing going in a peaceful atmosphere, I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. LAWN: I thought it was the member for Onkaparinga who said it was untrue. You are saying it is untrue. In view of that, and in due deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw. I also said the only people who would know the truth were you and the Premier and, as you say it is untrue and ask me to withdraw, I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. LAWN: In conclusion, I just want to offer a little advice or information to you, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if you know this, but I understand that the Liberal and Country League is endorsing against you as a candidate in the next election, which I understand will be in 12 months, the son of the member for Burra. I support the amendment.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply as amended by the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. At the outset, I associate myself with the members who have offered congratulations to persons who have achieved positions and condolences to the families of those who have passed on. I also wish to deal with a topic about which the member for Adelaide has had something to say this afternoon. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) saw fit to make an accusation against me in this House during his speech in this debate, but his charge was completely unfounded and untrue. I drew the honourable member's attention to that fact, but he has not yet corrected the position.

Mr. Millhouse: If you had been in the House and drawn my attention to the fact at the time I would have.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I specifically got up and went across the Chamber, handed you a note, pointed out what was in it, but you chose not to read the note at the time. Subsequently you said that if I got up and made a personal explanation you would withdraw, but that is not the way members behave in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNSTAN: It was completely untrue, unjustified, and with no basis.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a pure mistake on my part.

Mr. DUNSTAN: If it was a mistake, the honourable member should have been a little more careful before he slung accusations around.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you resent it so much if members of your Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has made his speech.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I resent it because that particular style of demonstration is not my own. I did not disagree with those honourable members on this side who took the opportunity to make that demonstration. I chose not to make it myself, because it is not my style of demonstration. Nevertheless, I do not blame one member of the Australian Labor Party or one member of the public who takes any opportunity to show up the disgusting attitude which in this State allows members to come in here and pretend that they believe in the dignity of this Chamber. Some members say that they believe in Parliamentary institutions. They come in here, vaunt themselves, prance around the place, and preen themselves

as if they were loyal to the institutions of British democracy, when they are not, and they accuse members on this side of demeaning these institutions.

Mr. Shannon: Well done! Better than you, Sam!

Mr. DUNSTAN: I wish I had been able, when I was Secretary of the Announcers and Actors Equity in South Australia, to engage the honourable member for Onkaparinga, because he would have gone well as a principal in the Oberammergau passion play. Let me now turn to some of the remarks passed in this Chamber a little earlier in the week by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) from this side of the House before his trans-mogrification into a member on the other side. He made one of the most pathetic speeches heard in this Chamber for some time, and I am sure that he found considerable difficulty in making it. It is sad to hear the kind of pitiful rationalization with which he made his apologies to the people of this State and to his own electorate for the attitude he took and for the action which evidently he had already proposed to take at that time.

Let me deal first with his remarks on the subject of the election. He set out to say that in fact it was not the case that the Labor Party in South Australia had the support of most people, and therefore he did not propose to support that Party's contentions in that regard. In fact he could not admit that this was the case. He produced a variation on the kind of thing that occasionally falls from the lips or the pen of the member for Mitcham, who in a recent article referred to by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) pointed out that you could not ascertain who got a majority of votes because there were nine uncontested seats. That was slightly incorrect, but he also said that there were six Liberal uncontested seats and two Labor. Mr. Millhouse omitted to refer to the fact in the article that two Labor uncontested seats contained many more electors than the six Liberal uncontested seats put together.

Mr. Quirke has gone in for a variation of this style of thing. He said, "Well, the only way the Labor Party can claim to have the support of 54 per cent of the voters is to take the votes recorded in the contested seats in the election and then we get 54 per cent of those and that is where we get the 54 per cent of the people of the State, regardless of the fact that in certain seats there were no candidates of the two major political Parties." That, however, is not what

the Labor Party said and what the supporters of that Party said. What the Labor Party has said has been clearly set forth in arithmetical calculations and set forth in this House, and this has never been answered. Not one single opportunity has been taken by Mr. Quirke, or anyone else, to try to show that these calculations are wrong. They did not like to talk about them. They put up straw men of their own and then proceeded to knock them over. Mr. Quirke proceeded to take the seats not contested by both the major Parties, do some arithmetic about them, and say, "That is how we arrive at the ordinary basis of support."

That, however, does not give the picture that the L.C.L. has great support in South Australia. Let us get at the reasonable basis of finding out what is the support for the Parties in South Australia. There were no contests involving both A.L.P. and L.C.L. candidates in 19 of the 39 electorates, but we can take the Commonwealth House of Representatives figures in those electorates and add them to the State vote in the 20 seats contested by both Parties.

Mr. Clark: There were only a few weeks between the two elections.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It was not long. Some honourable members opposite may say (although it would not be very advisable to do so), "That is not fair. You cannot judge the State votes by the Commonwealth votes." I notice that Mr. Coumbe is not interjecting at this stage, because there was the occasion in this House when he said that the way to arrive at the position was to take the Commonwealth voting. In fact, the only unfairness in that is to the A.L.P., not to the L.C.L. In the 20 seats contested by both the major Parties at the State election the Labor Party got a 2 per cent better vote in the State election than in the Commonwealth election. There were very few exceptions to that. This method is even more unfair to the Labor Party when one takes into account the uncontested seats in the State election, for the most part held by the Liberal Party. In the country at the State election we did far better than 2 per cent more than the Commonwealth figures.

Consider the figures in the districts of Murray, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Frome, Wallaroo and Chaffey. Therefore, it is in no way unfair to the Liberal Party to take the House of Representatives figures; it is being very kind to it. If we take the House of

Representatives figures for the 19 seats not contested by both the major Parties at the State election and add them to the 20 seats contested by both, in fact we get a Labor support of 54 per cent, the L.C.L. 40 per cent, the Democratic Labor Party 4.5 per cent and others 1.7 per cent. That is being extremely fair to the Liberal Party. If we correct those Commonwealth figures by the 2 per cent swing to Labor and take the corrected figures then—even that is being more than kind to the Liberal Party, because it does not consider that we obtained a bigger swing in the country areas than in the city—the South Australian figure would show a 56 per cent support for the Australian Labor Party. How can it possibly be contended by the member for Burra or anybody else, in the face of those figures, that the A.L.P. has not an overwhelming majority of support in this State. His next excuse was revealing. He made it perfectly clear that he was not really relying on the contention I have just dealt with. His real excuse was a novel variant of something produced by the Premier before. He said:

Last year the total export production of this country exceeded £1,000,000,000. About 70 per cent of it represented primary production, and it was produced by 5 per cent of the people of Australia. In the last 10 years they increased their production by about 40 per cent, but in the same period income fell by 40 per cent. At one time Opposition members supported the one vote one value system and I used to think it was fair until I obtained figures showing who produced the wealth of Australia, and how they were safeguarded. A system of one vote one value would rob that 5 per cent of representation. It would be completely dominated by the mass of city seats, as was the case in the last election. In the metropolitan area the Labor Party received a heavy proportion of the 54 per cent of votes. A system of one vote one value would take away any semblance of standing for the 5 per cent who produce 70 per cent of our exports. It must be remembered that they also feed the people of Australia. The 70 per cent represents only the export quantity.

That is it. Apparently the basis of the honourable member's view on representation in this House is that people should be represented according to function, according to the kind of production in which they are involved and how much they produce. Only one kind of government has ever produced that sort of proposal and that was Mussolini's Government. He believed in a form of syndicalism and that government representation should be according to function. That was almost as representative as the kind of government we

have in South Australia. We cannot, under any circumstances, have government based upon representation according to production. If we were to do that and grant the honourable member's premises, his conclusion would be wrong, but let me first deal with the premises. How are we going to give representation according to function? Who is engaged in primary production in South Australia? Where do we stop at primary production?

Mr. Jennings: Where do you start?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly! The quarry owners, those engaged in mining, people employed in the forestry industry and manufacturing are all engaged in primary production: Is only the producer of the end product for export engaged in primary production? What about the factory worker producing farm machinery? Has he nothing to do with primary production? What about workers in fertilizer factories, those producing roofing iron and building materials, and those engaged on electricity supplies? What about those producing food? If the honourable member is suggesting for one moment that the farm population feeds itself off the land, that would apply only to some pre-war period.

How can we possibly give representation upon the basis of function? Of course we cannot do it. But if we were, for one moment, to take his premises and grant them saying, "We will give to the people who produce most in South Australia the greatest say in the future of this State", let us see what the result would be.

Mr. Clark: What about those who produce things that cannot be valued in terms of cash?

Mr. DUNSTAN: The honourable member completely omits them. The honourable member for Gawler would not have any say either because, apparently, we should have to produce some kind of tangible service to, the people to be counted at all. It is only those people producing tangibles that the honourable member considers. Even auctioneers would be omitted.

Mr. Clark: And rightly so, in my opinion.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Let me turn to the estimated net value of production for 1960-61 in South Australia quoted in the *Quarterly Summary of Australian Statistics* for March, 1962. That shows that the South Australian rural production was £104,000,000, the total non-rural primary production was £16,000,000, and the total non-primary production in factories

was £170,000,000. Therefore, the primary producers were not producing the major portion of the wealth in this State according to the honourable member's premises; in fact, factory production far outweighed the value of primary production (including all the quarries, etc., and mining production in primary industries). According to the honourable member's contentions factory workers should have an overwhelming say in this Parliament. However, if we asked him to act according to his premises he would not. It is only the veriest rationalization to allow him to escape from the principles he espoused for well over a decade in this House and upon which he was elected, the principle of representation that is gaining support everywhere in countries claiming any sort of democracy. On this score let me turn to a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. There we have a particular section of the Federal Constitution of the United States of America that provides:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

As a result of that last phrase, many factors have flowed from recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court. One was the decision that schools must be integrated and that States could not deny to negro citizens equal rights under the law to schooling, nor could they deny to negroes equal rights to enrol and to vote. The most recent decision has made it perfectly clear that the States cannot deny to citizens an equal right in voting power within the State constitutions. Tennessee, of course, is the home of the gerrymander, and it had done some of the things that the Premier had done here, but it never had such temerity as our Premier to go to quite the lengths that he has gone here. I have a full schedule of the proportions of the population to representation in some of the States. None are as bad as South Australia. It was a fact that various States had decided to give a preponderant voice to rural population in order to keep the Conservatives in power. The Mayor of Nashville complained that the pigs and cows in Moore County had better representation in the Tennessee Legislature than the citizens of Nashville and Davidson County. A few pigs and cows in

South Australia have better representation than many people who live in the city area.

Mr. Jennings: And more appropriate representation, too.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The decision of the Supreme Court was that the failure of the Tennessee Legislature to reapportion its districts since 1901 was unconstitutional, and therefore the citizens could force the legislators to reapportion the districts to give equal voting rights to the people in the counties in their State. I have a schedule of rural population as a proportion of the population in the various States and the proportion of the State Houses that that rural population elects. Some fairly startling discrepancies are apparent. In Colorado, for instance, 36.3 per cent of the population elects 53.8 per cent of the members. That is not quite as bad as in South Australia. In Delaware 31.1 per cent elects 57.1 per cent. Florida is the worst, and closely approaches our own position—27.4 per cent elects 72.6 per cent of the representation. For the most part, even in the original home of the gerrymander, no State has gone to the extraordinary lengths that the Premier has gone in South Australia. I leave out his supporters because, of course, the Premier decides what shall be done and they do it regardless of their own personal views and regardless of the fact that some of them, before they were elected, said that they could not see how any sane or sentient being could possibly support a division of voting so disgraceful.

It is obvious that in any part of the world where there is a claim by the citizenry to democracy, it is becoming more and more established that democracy must mean, and cannot mean anything other than, an equal voting power for the citizenry in the election of its representatives. It certainly does not mean election according to function, because that would not be democracy at all. That would not be people's rule, but industrial rule, function rule, illusory idea rule, and not rule by the people. The only way that we can have rule by the people is to have one vote one value, and that is what we intend to have, and what South Australia will have in the foreseeable future. We are aware, of course, that the Premier has suggested a proposal to try to save himself from the consequences of a spreading population wrecking the gerrymander system. He knows that the spread of population into areas bordering on the metropolitan area, as he has now defined it, is going to mean that this House will have a sudden decrease in the standard of its politeness after 1965.

Mr. Jennings: You are being too subtle. Do you mean that the member for Barossa will be out?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, that is what I mean. A few other members, of whom we have spoken, will be rejected by the electors as a result of this population spread. The Premier decided that he was going to propound a system that would have the appearance of improvement, but which, in fact, was rather worse than the present system. He said, "We are going to have a metropolitan area with 20 members instead of 13." A great improvement! It was great generosity to the metropolitan area. However, he said that the metropolitan area would be defined to take in everything from Gawler in the north, out to Tea Tree Gully, through part of the Mount Barker subdivision, and down to Port Noarlunga.

Mr. Clark: Why would Tea Tree Gully be brought into it?

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is the area that is giving the member for Barossa some worry at present, because Labor voters are going there at such a rate.

Mr. Laucke: My only worries are the requirements of my district.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The honourable member needs to examine some figures, because if he is not worried he will soon be. The thing about this proposal, of course, was that if the Premier had been intending to redistribute on the 1955 basis that area would not have been entitled to 13 seats but to the equivalent of about 18 seats according to population. So, under his plan, we were to get two more seats than this new metropolitan area was entitled to under the 1955 basis of redistribution. Then the Premier was going to put in an extra member to bring the House up to 40. The rest of the State would have had 20 members.

Mr. Clark: What happened to the two for one principle?

Mr. DUNSTAN: That was the only specific statement in the Liberal Party's platform from which the member for Adelaide did not quote. The remainder of the platform was a vague series of principles—nice things like "Home and Empire", and nasty things that were fairly vague. It was surprising that one did not find "Home Sweet Home" and "Dog is Man's Best Friend" featuring in it. The only specific thing in its platform was the maintenance of the present basis for the ratio of country and city representation. The idea that the present country area had to be served by as many members as it now has in

order to give service to the electors was to go, too, because, of course, the Premier wanted the opportunity to gerrymander the country area. What he proposed to do was to reduce country membership and increase the quota of voters in certain areas of the country, so that no longer was the country to have a preponderance of representation but only certain areas of the country which would suit the Government.

Mr. Bywaters: That would take some explaining.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. In fact, the proposal was carefully designed to demolish the present Labor Party representation of the country areas of this State. The extraordinary thing is that while honourable members opposite get up and say that they represent the country interests, according to Labor Party proposals country representation was to be maintained and they protest because there would be so many members, in contrast with the country areas, within 10 miles of the G.P.O., in fact the Labor Party represents not only the majority of the people in this State but the overwhelming majority of its area. The sparsely settled areas of this State are overwhelmingly represented by Labor members. But that was to be demolished. The Premier was interested not in area but in seeing that those who live in certain areas which normally voted Liberal would have a preponderance of representatives. If under that proposal the same sort of vote had been cast as was cast at the last election, showing clearly a 56 per cent support as a minimum for the Labor Party in electoral support throughout the State, we could not have got a Constitutional majority: it would have been impossible. If we had got even 58 per cent we would not have got a Constitutional majority under that proposal. It was clearly designed to prevent the people of this State electing a Government they want and rejecting a Government they do not want, and at the same time to give them the impression that this was reform. It was simply gerrymandering a gerrymander.

The member for Burra went on to say, "Well, my feeling is that in all the years I have been here I do not think anybody could have done better with the money that was available than the present Government, so I am not going to turn it out of office." I should like to say a few words on that topic, too. What is done by this Government for the large number of people in this community

who need the care and assistance of Government agencies? I am referring to the Commonwealth Grants Commission's report for last year. Some improvement is shown for the last year: we have come up from being the bottom State in social services expenditure to being the next to bottom State, the bottom one being that haven of Liberalism which is showing such support for the Liberal Party at the moment—the State of Queensland. That State, which previously had a high rate of social services expenditure, is now bottom, under a Liberal administration, and we are next to bottom.

Mr. Bywaters: The Premier went up there to show them how.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, and as a result the Labor Party is doing as well as it is in that State, and now has a majority of representatives in the House of Representatives. Let us look at some of the items of expenditure. The average expenditure on social services, including education, health, hospitals and charities, law, order, and public safety in the States was 475s. 7d. per capita; South Australia's figure was 459s. 1d. Let us have a look at a few of the particular items. We have heard a great deal recently about mental hospitals, following protests about the present position of mental hospitals in this State, protests that were very well grounded indeed. We heard some protests in reply from the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele), in whose district one of these hospitals exists, and some even louder protests from the Chief Secretary, who seems to wake up about his department only when somebody says something critical about it, whereupon he produces a whole series of great proposals, like lowering the wall around Parkside, as a major improvement in the situation, and then they seem to die. If we go through the record of the proposals about the Magill Reformatory in the last few years and precisely what the Minister has had to say about that, we find an example of the sort of thing that can occur.

Let us have a look at what in fact this Government's policy has been in relation to mental hospitals. According to the Grants Commission's report, expenditure on mental hospitals in the last year of review was 24s. 6d. per capita in South Australia, compared with an all-States average of 32s. 5d. We spent less per capita on mental hospitals than any other State. No wonder those hospitals are in the position about which people have so effectively protested, and it is not really terribly much use either the

member for Burnside or the Chief Secretary coming forward now and saying, "We have great plans." They have had plenty of time for plans, and plenty of time for doing things; this Government has been in office since 1933.

Mr. Ryan: The present Chief Secretary has been in office for 24 years.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. In 24 years, surely he would have been able to work out a few necessary plans to save the sort of thing that is evident at Parkside, Enfield and Northfield now. Surely he would have had time to plan for the obtaining of the necessary people to staff the hospitals; he could have done it by spending a bit more money.

Mr. Ryan: Didn't he make a statement that they spent more than any other State?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not know, but if he did it was completely untrue. In fact, ever since the war this State has under-spent every other State in the Commonwealth on health and hospitals. No other State has had so low an expenditure as ourselves; no other State has such bad hospital provisions overall; no other State has so bad a ratio of hospital beds to population; no other State has so bad a ratio of trained medical staff to population; and no other State has so bad a ratio of trained nursing staff to population as this State has. Let me turn to a little matter of relief of the aged and institutions, for which the average in Australia is 10s. 9d. Whereas Tasmania spent 24s. 4d. per capita, we spent 7s. 9d. per capita, by far the lowest figure of any State in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Have we the highest death rate or the lowest?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not know, but that has got nothing to do with what we are actually spending on the care of the aged.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You were talking about hospitalization; it cannot be too bad if people don't die.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will deal with that interjection, other than to say that the degree of intelligence displayed is sufficient comment! These are just two minor examples of the attitude of this Government towards the poorer people in the community. The member for Burra has said, "Well, the Government has done its best with the money available." He overlooks, of course, that very large sum of money which over the years when we were under the Grants Commission we could have had and did not get from the Commonwealth through this Government's sheer outright neglect of

social services. Let us just turn and have a look at the money that is available. What do we receive in revenue, and what do we use from revenue in South Australia? For non-income tax revenue paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and used by the States, the average of the States was £12 9s. 3d. Ours was £8 17s. which was, in fact, the lowest in the Commonwealth. Tasmania had a slightly higher amount, and all the others were much higher. So we raise in State non-income taxation revenue less than any State. In other words, we are saying to the people of this State, "Look, under this Government, you don't need to do the things that are morally held to be due to the populace in every other State of the Commonwealth."

It does not matter that the poorer people in this community are hard hit; it does not matter that this Government chooses to adopt an attitude to public relief that is a crying disgrace where the poorer people of this community are faced with the fact that the relief money is a repayable loan and the Government will force it out of them even though they are not in a position to repay. For instance, a poor woman may be forced, unfortunately, to go on to public relief before she gets a maintenance order through and, no sooner does she get it through (after a long period of waiting because there are not sufficient officers available to deal with these things, in consequence of which the Government has not enough prosecuting officers and other officers to give assistance to such women) than she has to repay the relief money. If a woman goes for assistance while waiting for a maintenance order to go through, she has a long wait to get an appointment with the prosecuting officer; a summons is issued and anything up to three months can elapse from the time the complaint is issued before she gets her order; because, if the order is contested, it will not be heard in much less than three months because we have not enough officers or magistrates to deal with them.

In the meantime she has had to apply for public relief, and anybody trying to live on public relief knows it will not go far. So she gets in debt and, when her maintenance order comes through, the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department takes some of it to pay back the public relief she has had. There is case after case of that sort of thing. If, for instance, an unfortunate widow is getting public relief assistance in this State for the children that she has to look after, a friend of the family may come along and

say, "Look here, your children are worrying you. We shall have to get the children something to interest them. I will rent a television set and have it put in your house so that, at any rate, the children will be out of your hair when you are getting tea at night." No sooner does the television set, which she does not own and in which she has no property, appear in the house than the public relief is cut off.

We could elaborate case after case of this sort of thing, yet this Government insists on getting this relief money out of the poorer people of this State and refusing them the social assistance they need. We are under-spending every other State, yet the member for Burra says, "Well, with the money available, that is the best the Government could do." The money available was the money that every politician in this State should tell the people of this State it was the moral obligation of this Government to pay. We have no right to be raising less money in revenue when we are supposed to be, according to the Premier, a prosperous State and are supposed to have a high rate of Savings Bank balances. (It is a bit of a laugh but he, nevertheless, says these things.) Yet members opposite refuse to say to the people of this State, "You must put into the public sector the things that are morally necessary to go to the people of this State, the kind of services they deserve."

During the whole of the 1950's the Government grossly under-spent on education, and the children of this State are reaping the returns from that. As the Minister of Education knows, grossly over-crowded classes still exist in public examination forms having temporary teachers. That is the sort of thing that the member for Burra says is entirely justified and he can go on supporting. That is the sort of thing that causes the majority of the people of this State to say, "This is a wretched Government—get out!" We want a Government that will give us the sort of services and the kind of understanding from public bodies to which the people are entitled; but the member for Burra says, "No; as far as I am concerned, with the money available"—and normally, at other times, he is always talking about how much money, under his policies, would be available—"this Government has done everything it could possibly do."

Mr. Frank Walsh: It is theory.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I shall be interested to hear how much theory he can get into the Government. Other people have come into the Government and tackled the Premier previously. We all know how the Premier acts

on these things. I have yet to see him intimidated for long. I can remember an incident when the Premier pulled a "fasty" in this House one night. He was faced with something of a rebellion on his back benches about the Town Planning Bill, so one night, when few members were in the House and all the rebels were somewhere upstairs, he switched that item to the top of the Notice Paper and rushed it through the House without an amendment being moved. Then the rebellion occurred. The next Bill that day was a Bill for the continuation of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act. In those days the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) had some individual views, which have since disappeared in this House. He started to move all sorts of amendments which would have completely wrecked that Act—to the delight of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), had it occurred. However, the Premier was faced with so much rebellion that he did not even call for divisions on the amendments of the member for Alexandra. I had to call for divisions to save the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act. I recall the amendments to the Town Planning Act. The Premier came back, capitulated, recommitted the Bill, and took all the teeth out of it. But the member for Torrens (Mr. Travers, as he then was), who was the chief rebel on that occasion, did not last in the House after the next election. The present member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) was the person to benefit from the actions of Macruthless Playford on that occasion. I cannot think that the member for Burra will achieve very much in trying to alter the outlook of the Premier, who is likely to go on until that time (which will be not later than 1965) when he will be sitting on the Treasury benches no longer. I look forward to the day when, after 1965, he will be occupying the seat now occupied by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Jennings: He wouldn't take that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: We shall see. There are two further matters to which I want to refer this afternoon on the subject of the Chief Secretary's Department. The first of these is the activities of the advisory committee under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act. I believe a committee of this kind is vital. It is important to see that the charities in South Australia that are given licences to collect moneys publicly should be proper and *bona fide* bodies set up to carry out the charities that they proclaim. That should be the end of

the functions of the committee—to inquire into whether the organization is a *bona fide* charitable organization set up for the purposes it proclaims. If it is, there is no reason to refuse to any such organization the right to a licence to collect for charitable purposes. It is no part of the functions of the committee to discriminate between charities and say, “We have a limited amount of money to be used in the charitable pool. We think that one kind of home for children should have most of the market in this regard, and we cannot have competition from another home.” It so happens that the former superintendent of the Protestant Children’s Home decided that he wanted a new children’s home at Victor Harbour. He purchased a place with the idea of an organization taking it over and setting it up as a proper children’s home in that area. I cannot conceive anything more desirable.

Mr. Bywaters: He put a lot of his money in.

Mr. DUNSTAN: A charitable body to take it over and run it under proper surveillance was properly set up by a reputable firm of solicitors. It was incorporated with objects and rules. The home was to have started after an initial appeal had been made by the gentleman concerned. He is an estimable gentleman and a former member of this Legislature, being a member of the Government Party. He arranged for an appeal to be undertaken and for the home to be set up. He has been deliberately prevented from getting the home under way because of the activities of the department. I say that after a careful perusal of all the correspondence. His organization has been refused a licence under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act. At first it was refused without any reason being given. The only reason that could filter through was that it was felt that the larger children’s home with which he had been associated might not get as much money in the future, as he would be in the same field seeking money for the home he wanted to set up at Victor Harbour. That was the only reason. After much worry and many approaches (and courteous approaches they were) to the Premier and the Chief Secretary he at last got an interview with the committee that had held up an interview for some time because some of its members were overseas and could not be contacted. In the meantime he had put his own money into the home. They finally saw him and at the interview said that they might grant a licence if he could comply with conditions laid down by the Children’s Welfare and Public Relief Board. The board said it thought

there should be alterations in the supervision of the home. They may have been proper suggestions. Under the Maintenance Act the board would have had power to take action if the suggestions had not been carried out, but what reason could there be for holding up a licence and stopping him from conducting a charitable appeal?

It was clear that the appeal would be for a *bona fide* charitable purpose—to provide a home that is vitally necessary for the young people in the State. No-one could doubt his ability to run such an institution. The amount of money he raised when superintendent of the home I mentioned was considerable indeed, and he was a satisfactory superintendent. As is evidenced by references not only from the home itself, but from the Government, he is in that position, and I think it is wrong. I do not think the advisory committee is carrying out its functions properly and I hope that speedy action will be taken in the interests of Bethlehem Home Incorporated so that it will be licensed and that he will be able to proceed with the appeal. The mortgagees of the property have been concerned to see that the home gets going, and they have been forbearing about the financial position in which Mr. Halleday has been placed as the result of delays on the part of the Government.

Mr. Bywaters: It must be discouraging to a man trying to do a public service.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It cannot be anything else. It is a reflection on administration that it should have occurred. I knew about this business a considerable time ago because in desperation Mr. Halleday approached me. I advised him to continue to approach the Government courteously to see if it could not be got around. In no circumstances did I think it was advisable for him or the institution to air the matter publicly until the last moment when it seemed that it was vitally necessary.

Mr. Jennings: You think it is coming?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. The delay in this matter is unconscionable, and I hope the Chief Secretary will take action as rapidly as he can. Another matter vital to the department concerns the activities of Archway Port at Port Adelaide, which is our only institution, apart from the one at Northfield, doing residential work at present for alcoholics. It is doing work of an extremely valuable nature. Anybody who has seen the institution grow from a small beginning, as I have, must marvel at the devoted work of the people running it. I saw it in its early stages and have followed its progress

since. The institution is doing very effective work in the field of voluntary service to alcoholics, but it needs more money for the development of its properties. I know that there is a reasonable Government grant to it already, but it needs to be enlarged.

What is the situation with regard to alcoholics? We passed an Act last year to deal with future alcoholics. I know that plans are before the Public Works Committee for the development of the institution at Northfield, but at the present rate of progress it will be years before we get the institution. We must have the investigation by the Public Works Committee, but however rapid it may be it is certain that the investigation will take some time. Then a contract for the work has to be let, and the buildings have to be constructed. Even if the Government puts a line on the Estimates this year for the work, and it is getting close to the time for that to happen, it will be some time before the institution is completed. In the meantime, we see a sorry procession in the police courts of South Australia when men come up day after day. On Mondays there are 40 or 50. Men appear in the police courts with 50, 60 and up to 300 convictions for drunkenness. All that can be done for them under present circumstances is to give them 14 days' gaol in order to dry out, and then the day after release they are back in court. We have to do something for them as rapidly as we can, but I realize it will take some time to get a State institution under way. For those who are redeemable, and because they want to reform themselves, Archway Port has done an enormous amount. Every time it reforms a man there is a saving to the State in sheer hard cash, and in addition there is a saving of a human soul. I hope the Chief Secretary will see that Archway Port gets the small amount of extra money it is seeking. It is not to be a large grant. Members have complained about this business ever since I have been in the House, and I am becoming a veteran and falling rapidly into the sere and yellow leaf stage.

Mr. JENNINGS: Not yet!

Mr. DUNSTAN: I may not look old, but I feel it sometimes. In the 10 years I have been here I can hardly remember a session without the matter being raised. We used to ask for an institution to be declared under the Inebriates Act, but nothing happened. Year

in and year out I have raised the matter of alcoholics and the difficulty of dealing with them. We at least did something in the way of legislation last year, but the problem is still here and it is urgent. People in my district who have members of their families subject to this disease often ring me. There are several young men in the district who are alcoholics, and they go to gaol, come out, go back home, break the home up, bash the old people about, and I try to quieten them and get something done. It is a disheartening thing and the old people get desperate, because, although they love their boys, what can they do? They do not know what to do or where to turn in the circumstances. A small sum of money for a worthy institution like this can save untold suffering, and I hope the Chief Secretary will make an extra provision in the Estimates for Archway Port.

The last thing about which I wish to speak is the question raised by members of this House about the cost of immunization services. I do not believe that it is the duty and responsibility of local government organizations to carry out general immunization services. They are neither equipped for it nor do they have the money for it. Local government organizations in nearly every district in the State are protesting at being expected in the future to cope with poliomyelitis vaccine injections. How are they going to be equipped to do this? How are they going to manage? It seems to me that the overall cost of immunization services should be borne by the Health Department and that the campaign should be run as an overall campaign. The Health Department has shown itself capable of running such campaigns before; and transferring the cost to ratepayers, with the consequent disorganization and burden on local government, which is already vastly overburdened with expenditure, seems to me to be quite unreasonable. I hope that the department will reverse its policy on this matter. Every local government organization in my area has asked me to protest at the suggestion that they should have to bear this cost in future. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply as amended.

Mr. RICHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 14, at 2 p.m.