

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 6, 1964.

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

QUESTION TIME.

The SPEAKER: I desire to make a statement to the House concerning question time. During my term as Speaker I have tried to show a good deal of leniency to members in respect to question time, mainly because under the Standing Orders of this House the procedure is slightly different from that in the Commonwealth Parliament where, on the motion for the adjournment of the House, members have the opportunity to air grievances or problems pertaining to their districts. The closest equivalent to that under our Standing Orders is at question time. For that reason I like to give honourable members a fair latitude when they are explaining questions so that they may explain the necessary details to the Minister. However, I think that some of the questions lately have contained explanations that have gone beyond what is provided for in Standing Orders. I ask for honourable members' co-operation; I shall be as lenient as I can but I ask members to avoid long explanations of questions, in order to expedite the business of the House.

Another reason for my request is that question time is limited and every member is entitled to ask his question during that time. Therefore, long explanations and long answers to questions may stop a member from asking an important question about his district. To the Ministers, I have said previously that I do not want to curb their replies. Frequently a question is asked that is of the utmost importance to the House and only the Minister can supply the vital information which may take up some time. I do not wish to curb Ministers but I ask for their co-operation in this matter also.

QUESTIONS.**PLUMBERS.**

Mr. HUTCHENS: Recently, articles have appeared in the press expressing alarm at the shortage of plumbers in South Australia. Associated with those articles is an allegation that the reason for the shortage (to which reason, incidentally, I am not subscribing) is the low price that plumbers are obliged to charge in accordance with the Prices Commissioner's rulings. Has the Government's attention been drawn to this statement, and

can the Premier say whether it is correct or give any reason for the shortage of plumbers in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not believe the position regarding the plumbers is any more acute than the position in a number of other industries. In fact, as honourable members know, there is today a general shortage of labour. The reason that has been given for the shortage, namely, the prices fixed by the Prices Commissioner for plumbing services, would not, in my opinion, be valid. The Commissioner has never hesitated to immediately make adjustments that appear to him to be necessary following any alteration in awards. Quite recently there have been a number of increases in the prices of various commodities, and frequently they have occurred because of an increase in the award, and costs to the industry have risen in consequence. I will get a report from Mr. Murphy setting out the rates, and will also ask him to set out the basis upon which the rates are adjusted and give figures to show what adjustments have been made over a period of, say, two or three years. However, I have made a check on the position with regard to plumbing rates, and find that the retail increase of 1s. 3d. an hour was made on July 2 in connection with the plumbers' increased basic wage and the marginal wage increase of 10s.

BLACKWOOD SCHOOLS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the last few months I have had much correspondence and discussion with the Minister of Education and his officers, and have also introduced two deputations to him, concerning access from the south to the new Blackwood high and primary schools, something which is urgently desired by parents of children at those schools and others in the area, including myself. On July 7, I was informed by Mr. Dodd of the Education Department that he had seen Mr. A. K. Ashby, who had offered to give sufficient land for the access route, and that the matter was with the Public Buildings Department for an estimate to be made of the cost of fencing and other necessary work. Has the Minister received that estimate and, if so, is he in a position to decide whether to accept Mr. Ashby's offer of the gift of land with a view to the provision of access to the schools from the south?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, I have not yet received the estimate. As the honourable member stated, recently an offer was made to the Education Department by

the owner of land adjoining the new primary school of a strip of land to connect the western end of Fern Road with the south-eastern corner of the primary school. The department asked the Public Buildings Department for an early report on the practicability of providing the right of way, also for an estimate of cost for the fencing, sealing and drainage, but the information sought has not yet been received. I will take up the matter again, through the Deputy Director of Education, with the Deputy Director of the Public Buildings Department (the Director at present is away), and I will get a report as soon as possible.

DECENTRALIZATION.

Mr. HUGHES: The final report of the Industries Development Committee, sitting as a special committee to inquire into decentralization of industry, recommended that serious consideration should be given to greater decentralization of State Government departments. As Kadina was suggested as one of the three country districts where it was thought the Agriculture Department might be located with very little inconvenience to the general public, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government has examined this question and whether it intends to adopt the recommendation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Generally, the Agriculture Department is fairly well decentralized at present. A system of offices and branches operates throughout the State, and in those branches there are groups of officers dealing with difficult technical subjects. The tendency has been and will be to send more and more of our technical officers to country branches rather than build up a central organization, but the specific question whether an office should be established to build up the department in Kadina is one upon which I cannot comment at the moment, other than to say that I will examine it closely and be prepared to make a considered comment on it at an early date.

NARACOORTE EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. HARDING: In connection with the recently established adult education centre at Naracoorte, can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to have a residence built for the use of the principal who, at present, is forced to live at Mount Gambier because no suitable house is available at Naracoorte?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Housing Trust has indicated that it proposes to call for tenders for the erection of this house within the next three weeks.

MILLICENT TANKS.

Mr. CORCORAN: So far as I am aware, work on the overhead tank and the storage tank in connection with the Millicent water supply has been completed. However, the grounds surrounding these installations are uneven and bare, mainly because of the excavations, etc., that have taken place. I have noticed that in similar installations controlled by the Engineering and Water Supply Department the grounds have been prepared, levelled and sown down, and are, in fact, well cared for. I hope that this will happen in the case of Millicent, particularly because the installation is situated in a prominent part of the town, being adjacent to the new Millicent and District Hospital. Can the Minister of Works say whether this will, in fact, happen and, if so, when it is likely to occur?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member has implied in his question, it is the policy of the department to tidy up and make as attractive as possible all the sites for its works and fixtures, particularly where they are in towns or townships throughout the State. I have no doubt that, as soon as the ground has solidified and compacted following the building operations, the Engineer-in-Chief intends to follow a similar policy at Millicent. However, to make sure that that is done, I shall direct the honourable member's question to him for his attention.

GOMERSAL WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Is the Minister of Works now able to give the information I requested on Tuesday about a reticulated water supply for the Gomersal area in my district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Further to the answer I gave the honourable member, I can now confirm that the agreements with the applicants for water have been received, checked and found to be in order. I have given approval for the work to proceed as soon as possible.

DOG REGISTRATION.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 28, regarding dog registration?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Local Government has informed me that tenders for the supply of dog discs for distribution to all councils are called each year by the Highways and Local Government Department. The specification provides that the leather loop shall be of sufficient length to take a lin. collar. This has applied for many years, and the

department has not received any complaints that the loop is not large enough. However, if, as is stated in the question, persons are finding the loop too small, arrangements will be made to alter the specification to provide for a larger loop. In his question, the honourable member also referred to fees, and the correct fees are: male dog, 10s. a year; bitch, 15s. a year; and Alsatian of either sex, £2 a year.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS FEES.

Mrs. STEELE: When I was in Western Australia recently I read with interest a news item to the effect that university fees there would rise by 15 per cent. Incidentally, that will be their third rise in three years and will bring their fees to within 86 per cent of the standard Australian level calculated on the average of the Sydney and Melbourne university fees. I could not find out whether this rise referred also to the fees charged to students entering for the Junior and Leaving, as public examinations are termed in Western Australia. Can the Minister of Education say whether any increases are contemplated here and, if they are, whether they will apply to fees charged at the university and to public examination entrants' fees?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Western Australian report referred to fees paid by university students. In South Australia, these fees were last increased in 1962 by about 20 per cent and there are no plans to raise them again; nor will the Public Examinations Board fees be increased this year. Last year the university increased the fees for the Public Examinations Board's Intermediate, Leaving and Leaving Honours examinations. Subsequently it agreed to a request by the Government to withhold these increases pending an examination this year of the effect of the new arrangements for holding examinations in schools rather than at a central location. Recently the Vice-Chancellor renewed the request for an increase in these examination fees, and I referred the matter to the Premier, who submitted it to Cabinet together with a report from the Under Treasurer.

It is well known that in each of the last few years the Government has made increasingly generous grants to the University of Adelaide which the Vice-Chancellor has always graciously acknowledged. The Government takes the view, therefore, that some of the board's additional expenses should be borne by the university out of its general grant. However, after due consideration the Government decided that, as

it did interfere last year with the university's financial arrangements, first, by calling for the holding of public examinations in schools, thus involving increased expense and, secondly, by requiring the university to abandon the 1963 increase in fees, it would make a major contribution to the extent of about £25,000 to the funds of the Public Examinations Board by making an additional grant of £19,000 and also by contributing another £6,000 estimated to be the equivalent of fees forgone by the board on account of examinations granted to teaching scholars nominated by the Education Department.

OLARY ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: My question concerns the advisability of establishing a 240-volt power service at Olary in the North-East of the State. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, inquire whether the railway homes at Olary, which have no power at all, can be connected either from the Highways and Local Government Department camp which has recently been installed with a 240-volt power supply or from a surplus unit of the Department of Agriculture that will be at Cockburn in the near future when the power-line comes from Broken Hill?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will refer the question to the Minister of Railways and let the honourable member have a reply.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE LIGHTING.

Mr. COUMBE: I address this question to you, Sir, in your capacity as Speaker and as Chairman of the Joint House Committee. Since the resumption of night sittings members have complained about the lighting in the dining room.

Mr. Lawn: I made a complaint in the House last year.

Mr. COUMBE: Will you, Sir, investigate the possibilities for improving the type of fittings or of increasing the intensity of the lighting?

The SPEAKER: Some consideration has been given to the lighting in the dining room and also in the library, which is controlled by the Library Committee, but I will have further investigations made.

PORT PIRIE SCHOOLS.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the inadequate toilet and shelter facilities at the Risdon Park school? Also, has he details about the proposed new Airdale school?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Present indications are that the new school planned for Airdale will be ready for occupation early in 1966, and a recent survey has revealed that some 250 to 300 children who are now attending the Port Pirie Primary School are likely to enrol at Airdale. The reduction in numbers at Port Pirie would enable the situation there to be improved considerably in many ways, including renovations and desirable alterations to the old stone building. The position, therefore, is that improvements on a considerable scale are planned for the Port Pirie school and the firm intention of the department is to have this work done after the Airdale school is occupied. I do not know whether it will be possible in the meantime—I hope it will be possible—for minor improvements to be made, but it would be uneconomical to embark upon major improvements when a new school is built in the comparatively near future.

HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Can the Premier say whether Executive Council has agreed to increase hospital charges from about £24 10s. to £36 15s. a week in public hospitals? If it has, why has this been necessary and what will be the position of pensioners who are not insured to cover this extra charge?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The new nurses' award and other awards have affected hospital charges. I am not sure whether Executive Council has actually approved of any alteration, but the matter has been considered. At present a fair percentage of people going into Government hospitals are being charged less than the insurance money they are receiving. Because of those circumstances the matter has been broadly discussed, and Cabinet is in the process of publishing increased charges. The figures have not yet been gazetted, but I understand that the increased charge for a private room is 15s. a day; for an intermediate ward 10s.; and for a public ward 5s. That does not make any difference to pensioners receiving medical benefits under the Commonwealth medical scheme because hospital treatment is free to them and the increased charges will not affect them. Also, we have a very liberal way of granting a rebate. The rebate is not being altered, so that where a person is of limited means the increased charges will not apply. For our private rooms, which provide accommodation as good as that provided by any hospital in the State, in some instances we were getting only 20 per cent of what was being

charged by private hospitals. The second matter, which has been raised by several members, is that it is anomalous that while a subsidized hospital is charging, say, £5 a day for a ward the Government hospital just across the way is charging only £3 15s. a day for ward accommodation. It is true that some minor changes in hospital charges are proposed, but they are only minor because of the effect of the rebates I have mentioned. They will apply mainly to private rooms in our public hospitals and they will certainly not have any effect on pensioners receiving Commonwealth medical benefits.

GIDGEALPA GAS.

Mr. CUMBE: As the Premier returned only a few hours ago from visiting Gidgealpa and as the development of this field is of great interest to this House, will he report now on the latest developments and drilling at the field?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe the information I can give the House will probably be published from time to time in reports by the company. However, I have just come from the field and the company's reports may be a day or two behind. The hole that is being drilled now—I think it is No. 5—has not produced a gas deposit, and some water problem has been encountered. This may have been cleared up by the drilling that has been taking place within the last few hours, but I am not certain of that. This hole is far from being completed but in my opinion it should not be written off as a hole that will be unproductive. I should like to say to honourable members and to the public generally that I think it is wrong that the price of shares of a particular company should fluctuate from day to day on the success or indifferent success of a particular hole. The most successful fields in America have had dry or unproductive holes, so that the wide fluctuations in the value of shares on the Adelaide Stock Exchange and other exchanges merely because gas has been obtained in one hole and has not been obtained in another appears to me to be entirely wrong and completely outside of any true economic consideration of what the success of the field is likely to be. In my opinion, the field will be a valuable one. In saying that I am not advising people to buy shares or to sell them, but I deprecate the tremendous fluctuation that has taken place in the price of these shares, which arises without there being any significant information to justify it.

DESALINATION.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister of Works say whether any satisfactory tenders have been received for a distillation or desalination plant for use on the Coober Pedy opal fields?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall have to ask the honourable member to give me time to investigate this matter, as I have not seen the docket for several weeks. I know that the reports recently received on the operation of the plant which the Western Australian Government installed at Rottnest Island are much better than the original reports. That plant was similar to the one proposed for Coober Pedy, but in view of the earlier reports of difficulties at Rottnest Island we have been cautious about a similar plant for Coober Pedy. However, I believe results have improved in recent months, and that encourages me to think that the solution at Coober Pedy may be along similar lines. I will take the matter up and inform the honourable member.

TRANSPORT ACT.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Some confusion exists concerning the administration of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, as in some instances permits are still required from the Transport Control Board. Has the Premier any knowledge of a proposed Bill to amend the Road and Railway Transport Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act provides for a ton-mile tax on the roads and is purely and simply a taxing Act. It provides that people using heavy transports on the roads shall contribute to their upkeep. It has no bearing at all on the Act controlling the Transport Control Board. That Act, which operated for a long time, has not been considered by Parliament since the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act was passed. When the tax was introduced, Parliament passed an amendment so that any person paying a road tax would not have to pay the Transport Control Board's percentage tax. The Government has stated its intention to abolish road transport control as such. That has not yet been done, nor can it be done until existing licences held by operators have expired. It is still necessary for a permit to be obtained from the Transport Control Board if a vehicle is to be used for hire over a controlled road. On the other hand, I have checked the position with the Transport Control Board, and permits are at present being issued freely on application.

About 500 such applications have been received of which only 16 were not approved. Legislation will be introduced this session to clarify this matter and to provide that, as soon as the existing licences in respect of controlled routes expire, transport control over that area and over the State will be removed.

KYBYBOLITE SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: My question is directed to the Minister of Works. I understand that today a portable building, 40ft. x 20ft., is being transported to a site at Kybybolite for use as a schoolroom. When the building is being erected there, will the Minister authorize the provision of a folding partition in it so that it might be used either as an assembly room or as classrooms?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Earlier today the honourable member telephoned me about this matter and I have checked up on it. It is correct that the building is being moved today to its new site, and I have instructed that when it is being erected on the new site a folding partition shall be installed in it; and I have given approval for the expenditure involved.

CEREAL PRODUCTION.

Mr. HUGHES: Because of the statement made last night in the debate on the Address in Reply in this House that wheat this year will not be as easy to sell as it has been in the past, will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain the number of bushels of wheat and barley grown and made available for export in the 1963-64 season; the quantity of such wheat and barley that have been exported, and the countries to which they have been exported; and the quantities (if any) yet to be exported? In the event of another good season for 1964-65, what are the prospects of exporting the crop, and can the Minister state to what countries it is expected that these exports will be made?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get the figures for last season as required and a forecast of the future position if possible.

MARRABEL WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister of Works say when the Marrabel water scheme will be commenced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will get a report from the Engineer-in-Chief and inform the honourable member on Tuesday.

LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the interim report by the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement on South-Eastern Drainage and the Development of the Eastern Division, referring specifically to the Control of Floodwaters of Mosquito Creek in the vicinity of Bool Lagoon.

Ordered that report be printed.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

That Mr. Hughes be appointed to be one of the representatives of the Assembly on the Joint House Committee in place of Mr. Bywaters, resigned.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

(For wording of amendment see page 135.)

(Continued from August 5. Page 271.)

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): Prior to the adjournment last night I was quoting from His Excellency the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament, which was supposed to amplify the Government's policy. I think I can truthfully say that it lacked any such policy. More important than the Governor's Speech and speeches by the Premier on behalf of the Government was the speech of the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of the Labor Party which, as we all know, was actually elected as the Government at the last election. One of the main planks of the Opposition's platform was extensively covered last night by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). It was in relation to restrictive trade practices. Realizing the value of this legislation, the Government was prepared, irrespective of the absence of any announcement in the Premier's policy speech concerning this matter, to say that the measure was absolutely necessary for the people of South Australia. But what an abortive piece of legislation it introduced! There is a great saying that if we make things big enough we can drive a horse and cart through them, and the Government's restrictive trade practices legislation could be placed in that category. It is interesting to quote from the editorial of the *Advertiser* on Thursday, February 8, 1962, the day after the Leader of the Opposition had made his policy speech. It quoted the Leader of the Opposition

as having said that the Labor Party would represent all sections of this State. The *Advertiser* leader offered this criticism:

But how can such claims be reconciled with the stress laid on plans to restore quarterly wage adjustments, double long leave benefits, amend the Industrial Code, increase superannuation benefits and liberalize the Workmen's Compensation Act? These moves are typical of Labor's sectional leanings, and must deepen public doubts as to the wisdom of entrusting the Australian Labor Party with the responsibilities of government.

Irrespective of the effort by the *Advertiser* in its editorial to try to swing public opinion against Labor's position at the time, we now know the disastrous results for the Government. Ultimately we got an equally divided House. I think we can all fairly say that that has not altered the lack of Government policy, but it is interesting to note that a few of the matters about which the *Advertiser* was critical have been adjusted to a slight degree by the Government. It would seem that it is good enough for the Government to introduce and amend such legislation as a result of criticism levelled at the Labor Party.

I do not dwell on the Leader's policy speech because, as the Opposition, we are unable to bring to the House the platform and recommendations we submitted to the people at the last election. Only the Playford regime can implement these things. I heard the members for Torrens and Gouger and other Government members loudly applaud the Government for what it had done. What a great Government it has been for the people of South Australia! What a proud record it has! If records count it will be in minority for many years to come. Let us look at Sir Thomas Playford's policy speech, referred to in the *Advertiser* on February 14, 1962, a week after the Leader of the Opposition had delivered his. It was said that the Government was planning an outlet from the city to the newly developed north-eastern suburbs, which would in part take the form of a freeway adjacent to the River Torrens. That was in 1962. We are now coming to the 1965 elections, yet has this project been carried out? Once again there is inactivity on the part of the Government. Yet Government members get up and laud the Premier for doing such a wonderful job, and they exclaim that because of their record they should be returned to Parliament. If records are to count, let Government members look at what the Government promised to do. I say sincerely that they would be the most dumb politicians any person could ever look at. I mentioned that I did not dwell on the

Leader's policy speech because we should have been the Government, and the Government must admit that. This Government would be the only minority Party in the British Commonwealth able to call itself a Government.

I said before that as an Opposition we cannot implement certain portions of our policy where finance is involved. The Government said that one of the matters it considered essential to introduce related to restrictive trade practices. I imagine this Government would be better known as the "Restrictive Government". Here is another item from the Premier's policy speech:

The Anzac Highway, already loaded with traffic (this was in 1962) already carried an increasing volume of traffic to the South Road. In the circumstances the Government proposed to construct a main road as far as possible on the route of the old Glenelg railway line. This would require the reconstruction of the Hilton Bridge.

That was nearly three years ago, but where is the road down the route of the old railway line to Glenelg? I said last night and I repeat it: it will be included in the next Government policy speech in the hope of resurrecting the seat of Glenelg held by the Minister of Education. Incidentally, I think the Minister is down there canvassing now, because he realizes he is in a hopeless position. The next part of the policy speech I will quote reads like a fairy tale. Incidentally, there was no television fantasy last night, and people really enjoyed their television because they did not have to put up with the Premier.

Mr. Lawn: I thought my family was happy when I got home last night.

Mr. RYAN: They did not have to tolerate the Premier. I could have told the people what he was doing last night. The Premier's policy speech went on to say that the Government recognized the need for extensive alterations to the Keswick Bridge. That was nearly three years ago. I went over the bridge one day last week, and I still cannot see (they must be invisible) these extensive alterations. But these are promises. Over the years I have been in this Parliament, Government members have said, "We do not go to the people on promises: we go on our record." I say that this Government does not have a record. Anyone who has children at school will realize the fallacy of the next statement in the Premier's policy speech relating to school books.

Mr. Lawn: But they are only the three P's: Playford's Policy Promises.

Mr. Ryan: Yes. The Premier hopes that people's memories are not so good that they

will remember the promises made by this inactive Government. He said that allowances for books and stationery in secondary schools had been increased to an amount sufficient to meet the full cost of all those items reasonably required by schoolchildren. Well, any parent who has children attending secondary school today knows the financial burden incurred through the meagre return offered by the Playford Government. As a matter of fact, it does not meet even 50 per cent of the requirements that the Government tried to outline in the 1962 policy speech.

In the Governor's Speech for 1964 (and it has been admitted by Government members themselves that it was brief) there was absolutely nothing of importance, and, if members opposite had to support the Government in what was contained in that Speech, they would have to be silent because there would be nothing on which to comment. As I have already mentioned, one could be led to believe that, as 1964 was the last year in which a Governor's Speech would be delivered on behalf of the present Government, it would contain some outstanding legislation in the hope that the Government would be able to retrieve lost ground before the next Governor's Speech was delivered. I am sorry that the Treasurer (to give him his correct title) is not in the Chamber.

Mr. Millhouse: But he is in the Chamber. Why don't you look?

Mr. RYAN: I see that he is here. Today, I have my first opportunity to retaliate against the ridiculous answer I received from him last week in connection with a complete 24-hour stoppage at Port Adelaide. If I may quote the Governor's Speech again, he said:

As in the previous year less working days were lost on account of industrial disputes in this State than in any other of the mainland Australian States.

Last Thursday a complete stoppage occurred on the Port Adelaide waterfront and I throw the blame for it directly on to the Premier as the creator of the ridiculous stoppage. When I asked him why the Government was not prepared to pay a certain rate for the unloading of a particularly obnoxious cargo by men directly employed by the Government, the Premier said that if the men believed that they had a grievance they had a tribunal covering that industry to which to make their representations.

Mr. Lawn: Did the Premier admit that the Government was employing waterside workers on this job?

Mr. RYAN: The Minister of Marine told me that it was employing these men. When I said that the Government did directly employ them, he said, "If they have a grievance, let them go to the Conciliation Commissioner." There is no Conciliation Commissioner for this industry but he did not know that. The Government employed them and the Conciliation Commissioner was referred to. I do not think the Premier is fully conversant with what is required in this industry because he gave a most ridiculous reply: "Go back to your tribunal!" There isn't one. No award has been broken.

Prior to the South Australian Harbors Board being the successful tenderer for the unloading of phosphate rock at Osborne, there was an agreement between the employers, who were the charterers and owners of the cargo, the British Phosphate Commission, and the Waterside Workers Federation. They always honoured their agreement but when the South Australian Harbors Board took over the unloading of these particular ships and cargoes they refused to accept the agreement in operation at that time. The award then operating provided for boards of reference. The men concerned applied to the board of reference and the rate awarded was far below that given under the previous agreement between the men and the owners of the ship and cargo. The Premier said that he did not know why the men had not gone to the tribunal to establish what they were entitled to. On May 10, 1957, when the first shipment was handled by the Harbors Board, the board of reference was called and was strongly opposed to what the Harbors Board put forward. The rate fixed on that occasion was far less than that fixed in the agreement with the owners of the ship and cargo. On December 20, 1957, another board of reference was called, and this, too, was strongly opposed to the board. An industrial officer of the Public Service Commissioner's Office was present on that occasion and if he was not truly representative of the Government on industrial matters I do not know who would be. On January 7, 1958, another board of reference was called and it, too, fixed a rate far lower than the agreed rate. On February 11, 1958, another board of reference similarly dealt with the matter as did boards of reference on April 29, 1958, and May 28, 1958.

Realizing that it was hopeless to try to achieve an agreement with the Harbors Board as the direct employer, the employees decided that they would try other means to obtain their just entitlement. On December 14, 1962, a

further board of reference was held and once again the results were abortive. Since that time strenuous efforts have been made to reach an agreement between the employers and the employees that would be satisfactory to all concerned. The rate that was going to be suggested was one that would be voluntarily agreed to by the owners of the ship and cargo. The owners were prepared voluntarily to pay the money to the Harbors Board on the condition that it would be passed on to the employees. The Harbors Board flatly refused to accept this proposal and to make the money available. It flatly refused to enter into discussions so that agreement could be reached. Last Tuesday in Sydney Mr. Crocker, the manager of the British Phosphate Commission, informed the Federal office of the Waterside Workers Federation that as a shipment of phosphate was to be discharged at Port Adelaide he thought the federation's office could advise the Adelaide branch that a recent agreement allowed for an extra rate of 1s. 10d. an hour. The owners of the ship and cargo felt that because of the conditions of the shipment they would be prepared to pay 3s. 2d. an hour or an equivalent rate. The union approached the Harbors Board on this matter and the board saw fit to ignore the machinery that had been set up in the majority of capital city ports of the Commonwealth. This machinery had been designed to settle industrial disputes. There was considerable unrest in this industry over many years and one of the fundamental reasons for it was the conditions prevailing under the decisions of the board of reference. Realizing what was involved, the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. McMahon) set up a committee under the directorship of the head of the Department of Labour and National Service to report back to the Government what was believed to be necessary to overcome the unrest that existed in the industry. As a result of that committee's investigation, Mr. McMahon, the A.C.T.U. and members of the federation agreed to the setting up of an industrial relations committee in every Commonwealth port. That committee was to deal with matters causing unrest and stoppages on the waterfront. This machinery was set up at the request of the Commonwealth Minister for Labour, who hoped that every employer would accept it so that the unrest existing on the waterfront would be alleviated. I understand that the South Australian Harbors Board intimated that it did not know that this committee existed, but when told that it did, the board refused to become a part of it. This is

the tribunal set up to which the Premier says employees should apply, but the Harbors Board refused to have anything to do with it. Although the Commonwealth Government was fully conversant with what was necessary in any industry to overcome difficulties and was prepared to offer advice, assistance and guidance, the South Australian Government was not interested in the matter.

If this cargo had been unloaded a few hundred yards further along the Port River the agreed rate would have been paid: it would have been paid in every other port in this State and in every berth in Port Adelaide except the gantry wharf at Osborne. These are the circumstances in which the Premier said that the men had rights and should apply to the tribunal and work in accordance with the award. He must be ignorant or, if he is conversant with the matter, he must be pretending that he is ignorant as a way out of the difficulty. He has stated that this State has fewer hours lost and less unrest than any other State. If the attitude of the Government, as a direct employer, in this matter is adopted in other industries, I am sure that a different comment will be seen in the Governor's Speech next year. Any voluntary offer should be made available to the persons to whom it is made. Apparently my comments are falling on deaf ears because the Premier does not want to hear what I say and the Minister of Marine could not care less. The Minister of Education is missing from the Chamber.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) was very loud in his praises of the terrific financial effort of the Playford Government, which he said in the last 12 months had been able to tell the public that there had been a surplus. He had the audacity to give the credit for this surplus to the Treasurer, and he went on to laud what he considered was financial wizardry in handling the finances of this State. It is easy to create a surplus in Government finance; if a certain sum of money is allocated for certain Government works and some of those works are not proceeded with, there must be a surplus or there is something wrong with the finances of the State, and the only way in which this can be brought to the notice of the public is by setting up a public accounts committee. I have tried to find out the ramifications of Government expenditure over the last 12 months, but that is almost impossible.

Mr. McKee: What is wrong with the Public Works Committee?

Mr. RYAN: Much of that committee's time is wasted.

Mr. Shannon: You would be a very good judge, too! I should like to have you on my committee. I would teach you how to work; I would give you a job to do.

Mr. RYAN: I always thought that if someone wanted someone to do something, he should set an example, and the honourable member would be a good example in showing people how to do anything! Wait till the age limit catches up with the honourable member! My venerable friend—I was going to say something else—was critical of the Australian Labor Party 18 months ago when it was announced that it intended to bring in an age limit for candidates for Parliament.

Mr. Shannon: We have not kicked out our best brains yet. You have, but we have not.

Mr. RYAN: On that occasion the age limit was only sought by the Australian Labor Party; it was something that was to be considered by the Party. In the daily press this week the following report appeared:

A compulsory age limit on Liberal and Country League politicians is to be sought. If approved, it would force the Premier to retire from active politics in 1968. The age limit is proposed by the Burnside Young Liberal Branch.

I do not know if the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) or the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) is sponsoring this. They were critical of the Australian Labor Party when it sought to introduce this type of internal rule, and now it has reacted in their Party. The chairman of "my committee" may be looking for a job elsewhere if his Party follows the lead given by the progressive Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Shannon: Ask Calwell; he is not so sure.

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Calwell is criticized because he is not on the executive of the Australian Labor Party to control the destiny of that Party. Despite this, when Mr. Calwell offers himself for a position on the executive of his Party he is criticized by those who hitherto criticized him for not doing this. It seems that members of the Liberal Party realize that the time has come for them to copy something that has already been adopted by another political Party.

Turning now to the work of the Public Works Committee, numerous projects are submitted to it for urgent consideration and valuable time is spent by the committee investigating and recommending on certain projects; yet I claim that such time is wasted because the recommendation is frequently pigeonholed. I challenge the chairman of that committee to deny that statement.

We have been told much about the financial wizardry of the Treasurer and his wonderful effort in producing a surplus last financial year, but one has only to look at one of the most important phases of Government expenditure (that is, education) to realize how he has been able to produce his surplus. Last year's Loan Estimates, which were approved by this Parliament as the supreme law-making body in this State, provided £140,000 for three schools at Elizabeth, and on those figures one would be entitled to assume that each school was to cost about £47,000. Tenders have been called and will close on August 4, although approval for spending the money was given by Parliament last year. Another sum of £130,000 was also approved last year for a structure at Port Pirie, tenders for which closed on July 21. This expenditure could not have affected the financial position last year because tenders have just closed. The building and furnishing of an electrical trades school in my district at a cost of £20,000 was also approved last year but tenders will not close until August 11. That in effect is a direct saving of the Government's expenditure of last year.

Mr. Jennings: That only goes to show that you can save money if you don't spend it!

Mr. RYAN: That is what I am pointing out. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) was loud in his praise of the wizardry of the Treasurer in producing a surplus. If the Government does not use the money already allocated to it, there is no reason why there should not be a surplus. The erection of an electrical trades school in my district at a cost of £90,000 was also approved last year by Parliament, and tenders will close on September 1. On that series of figures I have given there has been a saving of £287,000 on last year's expenditure.

Is it not time that a public accounts committee was appointed so that these matters could be dealt with by an authoritative body and Parliament enlightened as to what is happening to the finances of the State? If Parliament's authority is to be overridden, why do we have a Parliament at all? We may as well accept the Premier as the absolute dictator and let him decide what is to be done. It is apparent that decisions made by this Parliament are being ignored by the very people who should carry them out. We must realize that this is a dictatorial State. In effect, the Government would have us believe that it has done a job which no other Government could do. Thank goodness that its term

in office is gradually coming to an end. I wish that the Chairman of the Public Works Committee were here to hear my comments, but he is out enjoying his afternoon siesta. Plans for the erection of a new primary school at Pennington were submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee a considerable time ago. It was considered of extreme urgency and it received the expeditious attention of that committee, which submitted its report. The tenders closed and were accepted only 10 days ago for this project. There was another project approved by Parliament last year but not proceeded with during that financial year, yet, in the words of the Minister, it was a project that was extremely urgent and absolutely necessary! For the benefit of Government members who do not know it (and I know that the members of the Public Works Committee are fully conversant with it) a school was promised in that district seven years ago. In some of the present classrooms there is not even light or power because the Government does not think it necessary to spend public money installing such things in a school that will be replaced by a new one. That actually happened and I think the member for Rocky River would be fully aware of the circumstances: There is something wrong with a department when this sort of thing goes on.

Mr. Heaslip: They are very lucky to have a school, aren't they?

Mr. RYAN: The people of Rocky River are very lucky to have the honourable member as their representative! I think this is the second oldest school in the State with the biggest turnover of students of any school in South Australia.

Mr. Shannon: I understand the honourable member has been rude in my absence.

Mr. RYAN: If the honourable member will only stay, I shall give it to him straight away.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. TEUSNER): Order! The honourable member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. Shannon: The wonderful Wizard of Oz.

Mr. RYAN: If there are any wizards in this place I could look at a couple who really nauseate me. Coming back to the member for Rocky River's remarks, he knows as well as I do that this matter was referred to the committee as one of extreme urgency. If he thinks it was not necessary, why did he support it? Is he only a "yes" man who says "yes" because the majority says "yes"?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. RYAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Acting Speaker. I shall continue with my criticism of the Government—not of the Public Works Committee. The committee expeditiously dealt with this matter in accordance with the way that it was referred to it, namely, as a matter of extreme urgency. Tenders closed 10 days ago for a job that was extremely urgent two years ago!

Mr. Lawn: I think the member for Rocky River meant that under the present Government we were lucky to get the school at all.

Mr. RYAN: If that is what he meant I humbly apologize. On May 28, 1964, a new system of education was introduced in South Australia in the form of television lessons, and this was given great prominence by the Minister of Education. I agree with him that it is something new, something not tried before, but is extremely beneficial both to the department and the students concerned. Let me say that it could never have succeeded if the necessary receiving equipment had not been installed in the schools that were to receive the lessons. Under instructions from the department, some schools purchased television receivers so that they could receive the broadcast lessons. The State was involved in considerable expense, because teachers had to be provided to write the script and give the lessons over the television network. As this system was introduced by the department the schools assumed that the sets would be provided by the department. The schools thought that even if they were not reimbursed the full cost they would receive at least a subsidy, and it was not until after they had purchased the sets on that assumption that they received the news through the grapevine that nothing would be paid by the department and that the sets would have to be paid for by the parent bodies or out of school funds. How far are parents expected to carry this financial burden for education? Are they expected to bear the full financial responsibility?

Mr. McKee: There is so much money in school canteen funds now that I doubt if the Government would grant any subsidy.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, but that does not apply to all schools. Some schools are putting the profits from the canteens to very good use, and in so doing they are relieving the department of its financial obligation. The parents were asked to supply equipment, and they did this expecting that they would be reimbursed by the department to some degree, if not fully, and this is something for which the department must accept criticism. Realizing what was

involved, I sought information from the Minister last week. Incidentally, this system has been operating for some months. I asked the Minister whether the Government could pay at least a subsidy on these sets, and I received an answer that even I did not expect, and that is saying something. The answer was that the direct telecasts were being carried on by the department at considerable financial expense, and the department was considering what would happen with this type of education in the future. If it is to be discontinued because of the financial drain on the department, what will happen about the capital cost of the equipment? Presumably, it will be a direct loss to the schools that purchased the equipment.

The department should come out in the open and declare itself on the question of subsidies. I checked on a number of schools to find out whether the parent bodies or the schools knew what items of equipment could be subsidized. I was amazed to find no list was published and that most of the bodies that apply for a subsidy (whether they be school committees, school councils, or the schools themselves) do so only because they have been told they can get it, or believe they can get it.

Mr. McKee: It should be publicized and sent to all appropriate schools.

Mr. RYAN: Correct. I hope that the Minister will at least see the wisdom of what I am now suggesting. I was at a school council meeting not long ago, where it was stated that the department might not want to publish such a list because, if some school committees thought they could get something in this way, they would make a claim for it, which, if successful, would mean a direct saving for the school. What a system to operate! I discovered last year that a number of articles and commodities bought by school committees were subsidized, whereas this year similar articles, for no reason at all, have not been subsidized, and the school committees have been given no reason. Where does it start or stop? At least there should be some official list because the money involved is part of the State's finances. It is also money with which the parents of the students, the students themselves and the school staffs are vitally concerned.

I have investigated some of these matters and have ascertained that on consumable goods used for nature study, which is a part of the primary school curriculum, a subsidy is payable, but on consumable goods used in art

classes, art, too, being a part of the primary school curriculum, no subsidy is payable. Last year some schools received a subsidy but this year they are told that such an article is a consumable article and that no subsidy will be paid on it. There should at least be some policy in this matter. As State money is concerned, it is a matter that should not be left to the discretion of some officer in the Education Department. Surely he himself would not wish to be placed in a position where he would be required to say "yes" or "no" without any reference to the policy being pursued by the department in this case. It is too important to be left in that way. I am sorry that the Minister of Education himself is not here this afternoon so that my criticisms and comments on this all-important matter could be heard by him.

I now come to a matter about which the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) may say I have no direct knowledge, as it does not pertain to my district; but it does. He referred to it last night—the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act. The honourable member may consider that I know little about it and he may ask why I am offering criticism now when I did not do so when the Bill was introduced. If that is his attitude, I intend getting in first and telling him why, because, before this legislation was introduced, I had many conferences with Government officials, with the Treasurer and on one occasion we were even taken into conference with the Parliamentary Draftsman. When they knew what I had in mind, I was asked not to proceed with moving an amendment to that Bill because any amendment at that stage might interfere with the validity of the legislation and result in a challenge to the Act. Vehicles that operate on the waterfront have no speedometer.

Mr. McKee: And you cannot fit one, either.

Mr. RYAN: No. The vehicles go equally as far back as they go forward.

Mr. Heaslip: Which way are you going?

Mr. RYAN: I made a statement that the vehicles go backwards and forwards.

Mr. Heaslip: Then I asked which way you were going.

Mr. RYAN: I am going forward, sometimes slowly and sometimes quickly, depending on who is chasing me. If the member for Rocky River is in front of me I will not go backwards; I will still go forward and he may have to look out or I shall run over him. I think these vehicles travel as many miles in

reverse as they do forward. Apparently the member for Rocky River has never seen one. These vehicles are also used in operations on Government property. I have had numerous conferences with the Premier and with officials that he told me to see. The Parliamentary Draftsman advised that this should not be proceeded with because the validity of the Act was important at that stage. I did not proceed with it because I was informed that there could be other ways and means.

Mr. Heaslip: You were not suggesting a reduction?

Mr. RYAN: General McArthur said, "I shall return", but the member for Rocky River won't return. The matter referred to by the member for Rocky River last night also affects my district.

Mr. Heaslip: What, primary producers!

Mr. RYAN: Yes, to a certain degree. I think I have handled just as many primary products as the member for Rocky River has, and I have done it the hard way, but not by sitting on a fancy chair and watching them go by. The *Troubridge* greatly concerns primary producers and one end of its operations takes place in my district.

Mr. Heaslip: In the middle, not the end. It goes right across the gulf.

Mr. RYAN: I am concerned with the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act so far as it affects this end. I am not concerned with what happens in the middle or the other end because they are not in my district. I have had numerous discussions about this and the cost will be passed on to primary producers because of legislation introduced by this Government.

Mr. Heaslip: Are you basing that on the figures of the member for Frome.

Mr. RYAN: Twelve shillings a ton. The Adelaide Steamship Company will not carry it. The consumer will pay the lot; it is a direct charge.

Mr. Heaslip: Have you had any complaints from primary producers?

Mr. RYAN: We have had many complaints. I remind the honourable member about the 300 irate farmers that attended the meeting at Port Lincoln a fortnight ago. Were they protesting against the legislation? Didn't they put the Minister of Works in the hot seat? Have you received any protests!

Mr. Heaslip: None from carriers.

Mr. RYAN: Of course we have received complaints from carriers. Some carriers are not content with the existing legislation because they want to pass on the increase but the

Prices Commissioner has ruled that it is not to be passed on until he has made a complete investigation. Members of the Liberal and Country League say that his office should not exist and that it is a drain on public moneys. Why not set up the committee as suggested in the Opposition's amendment and then that office would be improved and probably recommendations would be made that more controls, as suggested by the political roundsman of the L.C.L. glad rag, would be implemented for the benefit of the people of this State. The fundamental principle involved in this legislation was for interstate hauliers to pay registration fees similar to those operating within the State. If this is so I wonder how the Minister of Agriculture will face his electors on Kangaroo Island. They have no railways and, therefore, how can they compete with interstate hauliers? The revenue received from the operation of this Act is a direct imposition on people who have not the necessary facilities to move their produce.

The member for Rocky River should have done some homework on this matter. I know that the member for Frome is able and probably willing, when the time comes, to defend himself. The member for Rocky River quoted parts of what was said by certain members and, of course, a different construction could be placed on what was said when only parts were quoted.

Mr. Heaslip: Are you also in favour of a 4-ton limit instead of an 8-ton limit? What is your policy?

Mr. RYAN: What is my Party's policy? It was enunciated last night. My Party has no direct policy on this particular legislation.

Mr. Shannon: Or on anything else!

Mr. RYAN: Is there a penalty for assassinating people? Wouldn't I be doing a good turn for the community? I would probably be decorated. The honourable member is supposed to represent the primary producer! I would say he is a liability to primary producers, not an asset.

Mr. Heaslip: They don't think so.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member is a director! Is he an asset?

Mr. Heaslip: What is your policy?

Mr. RYAN: I repeat what has been said. We have a policy on the amendment now before the House. Has the honourable member one? Of course, the answer is "no". Government members have not supported or effectively opposed the amendment. Some Government members oppose price control and would do away with it tomorrow, and yet

the honourable member for Rocky River talks about policy! Members on the other side of the House have no confidence in the personnel of the committee suggested by the Opposition, and do not think they are capable of doing the job. Members have said that the committee would be incapable of bringing in a recommendation. I have given the Liberal Party's policy. It intends to widen the Eyre Highway and take another road into the district represented by the Minister of Education, but he hasn't a hope. He is finished now, and he knows he will not be here next year.

Mr. Heaslip: Hasn't the Labor Party a policy?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and we are proud of it.

Mr. Heaslip: Let us know what it is.

Mr. RYAN: Doesn't the honourable member think it would be a waste of my valuable time trying to convey information to a dumb member like he is!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. TEUSNER): Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair. I have said that to him before. When he has been here for a few years he will know that the proper thing to do is address the Chair, not members opposite.

Mr. Jennings: I think the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) should be reminded of that on occasions, as he has been here much longer.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SHANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker. Your ruling has been challenged by the member for Enfield. I suggest that you are the one to decide who is in order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I called the honourable member to order when he interjected. I ask the honourable member for Port Adelaide to continue his remarks.

Mr. RYAN: I shall quote something that was conveniently not mentioned by the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) last night. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey), when referring to primary producers, said:

He has to market his goods and the most effective way he can do so is by using the roads. He can be protected by our inserting a special provision in the Bill.

He went on to say:

A clause should be inserted in the Bill to exclude primary producers.

Mr. Heaslip: Did he move it? Did he ask for it to be inserted?

Mr. RYAN: The man from Snowy River! It is a pity the river didn't catch up with him.

Mr. Casey: He missed that point very conveniently last night.

Mr. RYAN: I will address my remarks to you, Mr. Acting Speaker, not to the member for Rocky River, who would not understand. He is absolutely hopeless. The member for Frome said during the debate on the Bill that he considered it was necessary that a clause be inserted to exclude primary producers. We have been accused of not having a policy and not being supporters of primary producers. If primary producers have had any support, they have had it in the main from the Australian Labor Party. The member for Rocky River knows as well as I do that he and others have reached the position they are in today through the stability of legislation introduced by Labor Governments. If it has been of no use, why has it not been revoked by the Liberal Government? Members opposite realize they would be committing political suicide if they attempted to revoke legislation introduced in the past by Labor Governments. They talk about all the assistance they give to primary producers, and say that the Labor Party is a sectional Party out to assist only certain people.

Mr. Heaslip: You still advocate a reduction from eight tons to four tons, do you?

Mr. Casey: That is not the point.

Mr. Riches: For the satisfaction of the honourable member, let me say that I do.

Mr. RYAN: If the Acting Speaker (Hon. B. H. Teusner) had a spike in his boot now he would use it. If there were a real Government here, at least it would attempt to defend its policy. In 1962 it promised, among other things, to construct a road on the route of the old railway to Glenelg. Every Wednesday night we hear the Premier making promises over television; and they are only promises.

Mr. Lawn: Didn't the Government promise a stable economy?

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The Labor Party has a policy and its programme is in printed form and available to anyone who wants to read it, but the same does not apply to the Liberal and Country League. Ever since I have been a member of this House, meetings of that Party have been held at North Terrace to prepare a policy. For instance, for years the Party's annual conference has advocated the abolition of price control, but what does a member like Mr. Heaslip do when legislation for its continuance is submitted? He opposes it, knowing full well that it will be carried because it has the support of Labor members. If

ever I have seen a Government without a policy, it is the present L.C.L. Government.

On previous occasions I have mentioned the question of the appointment of justices of the peace and I intend to continue bringing the matter forward until such time as amendments to the Act that my Party believes to be necessary are introduced by the Government. If such legislation is not introduced this session, at least I will, as a member of the Government Party in 1965, have the opportunity to introduce it then. If one realizes what is involved, one is then aware of the urgent need for an amendment of the Act. Any application for the appointment of a person as a justice of the peace must be forwarded through the member of the electoral district in which the applicant resides. I made representations to the Attorney-General for a list of justices in my district and he asked me to supply him with a list of suburbs within the district. I wrote and told him that it was hardly possible to do that because the names of various suburbs had since been changed. I was forwarded a long list of names of people holding that high office who were presumed to live in my district, but when I checked I found that included amongst them were people in the Hindmarsh, Enfield and Semaphore districts. So it is apparent that the office of the Attorney-General's Department has no clue as to the electoral district of a particular member. Often an appointment is not proceeded with because other people hold the appointment in that district. If the records do not disclose where districts and people are, how can the department know? That is one reason given why a recommendation is not made in the case of a particular individual. I have discovered that on the records given to me at least half of the people shown as being within the boundaries of my district are no longer in the place of residence disclosed by the records of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Jennings: I bet a few of them were dead.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, but the records still showed them as justices. One of the most glaring cases was that in which a suburban police station asked me to forward a submission for an appointment because there were no justices near the police station. I forwarded that submission, but the department did not proceed with it. On inquiry, I was told that two or three justices resided near the police station concerned. The records showed that there was a justice next door to the police

station but, when I checked, I discovered that the address had been a parking lot for a super market for about six years—this despite the fact that the department had refused to proceed with the recommendation because an appointee resided next door to the police station referred to.

If people want to act in this capacity (and let me say they do a good job and are necessary in view of the requirements connected with the signing of certain documents), the department's records should be up-to-date. There should be an obligation on an individual appointed for life to this high office that if there is any change of circumstances, whether professional or residential, he shall notify the department concerned so that the records may be altered. In some older districts (and I stress that this pertains not only to my district but to all districts) some appointees shown as residing in the district of a certain member have long left it, and no further appointments have been made because the official records show that they still reside there. It is time that the Government woke up to the fact that times have changed, and that it is necessary to alter legislation to bring it into line with modern requirements. As the Attorney-General is not a member of this Chamber, I hope that my remarks, which are meant as constructive criticism, will at least be considered by the department concerned. If we continue in future along the present lines, many people will be disappointed. It was due not to their own circumstances but to a breakdown in the administration of the Attorney-General's Department. In conclusion, I say that the Opposition has submitted something that is constructive and that the amendment to the motion is important. It contains much merit and would prove beneficial to practically everybody in this State if carried. If the people are to be represented as they should be represented, they should at least be protected where protection is necessary. The amendment, as submitted by the Leader, should be carried.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): As you know, Mr. Speaker, I usually oppose the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, but believe me it is one of the happiest events in my life to be able to support the amendment to the motion that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I shall address myself at considerable length to the amendment later on, but I intend now to deal with several other matters.

First, I wish to refer to a question I asked the Premier last Tuesday. I asked whether it was a fact that the Government was considering the introduction of a State lottery. I asked the question deliberately, because I believed that the Government had not been giving this matter consideration. The Premier simply got up, said "No" and sat down. I might be wrong, because I have known the Premier to get up and tell us a lie if he wants to, without batting an eyelid.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. LAWN: I do not say the Premier lied. I said I believed him on this occasion. I say that I deliberately set out to ask the question, believing that he would say "No".

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, I think I heard the honourable member say that it would not be the first time the Premier has lied in this Chamber. Is that correct? If so, I object to that remark. I am not sure that the honourable member actually used those words, but unless I misheard him they were the words he used. I am subject to correction.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable Minister phrase the words which he thought were objectionable?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thought the honourable member said it would not be the first time that the Premier had got up and told a lie. That was the impression I got and if that is so I take exception.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister has taken exception and I ask the honourable member for Adelaide to withdraw his remark.

Mr. LAWN: I withdraw it. I believe that the Premier meant what he said on this occasion, although he said only one word. I also believe that he spoke the truth when he said "No". The reason I asked the question was that it had previously been reported that Cabinet was considering the introduction of a State lottery. According to the Premier's reply there was not an atom of truth in the press statement that Cabinet was considering the introduction of a State lottery. My mind went back to last year. Members will recall the unfortunate passing of a member of this House, the late Mr. W. W. Jenkins, who was the member for Stirling. A statement published in the press then was completely untrue. We know that some reporters are concerned not so much with reporting a fact but with getting something printed that they think has some news value. If members will recall, last year I was told here on the Thursday afternoon prior to the death of Mr. Jenkins to

cancel a meeting of the Parliamentary Labor Party executive as a meeting of the Australian Labor Party executive was scheduled for 11 a.m. the following Monday morning. Some time on the Friday afternoon Bill Jenkins passed away, and when the reporter was at the Trades Hall on the Monday morning and knew that the A.L.P. executive was meeting he deliberately wrote a story that the executive was meeting to take some advantage of the death of Mr. Jenkins. He was not concerned about whether or not the story was true.

I consider that the same thing happened here: someone wanted to write up a bit of a story last week with the object of creating some news value, without any concern as to whether or not the story was accurate. The reporter could have gone to the Premier or any other Cabinet Minister and ascertained the position. I do not believe that Cabinet discussed the setting up of a State lottery. I have a pretty fair idea of the Premier's attitude towards a lottery; I have questioned him over the years that I have been here on this matter, and I am confident that so long as the present Premier remains as such the Government he leads will not introduce a lottery. I asked my question on Tuesday last because I did not believe there was an atom of truth in the press statement. I merely point out that some people are not concerned about the truth so long as they can gain an item of news value (as they call it) at the expense of the Government or at the expense of the Opposition. I maintain that the standard of press reporting in South Australia has slipped considerably in the last two or three years.

Some little time ago I applied to the Premier for assistance for an organization which carries out valuable work in my district. I refer to the Daughters of Charity, of 258 Hutt Street, Adelaide, on whose behalf I wrote to the Premier on June 22 last. I visited this organization and found that there were only three sisters in charge of the organization. Each day they visit the poor and the sick in the southern half of the city bounded by Grote and Wakefield Streets and South, East and West Terraces, and on occasions they also go into the northern half of the city and down to Thebarton. That is a terrific job for three Sisters to do. In addition, at about the time I visited this organization 16 people were being given breakfast every morning, and 64 were being given lunch every day except Sundays. Naturally, the three Sisters cannot do this work themselves, and 24 voluntary helpers come in and

help to prepare and serve the food and clean up afterwards. The Sisters have no regular income to provide this food for the needy people who call for a meal. In addition, the Sisters give away left-off clothing to people who need it. What has happened over the years is that, until his death, the late Mr. A. A. Edwards, a former member of this House, used to go to butcher shops and around the markets and collect meat, bread, greens, fruit and all types of food, and donate it to the Sisters at the place I mentioned. Since his unfortunate death, another person has endeavoured to carry on the work that Mr. Edwards did, but he found from the start that he never received the assistance that Mr. Edwards did, and, bit by bit, they are telling him, "There will be no more for you in the future."

Mr. Jennings: Have they applied for Government assistance?

Mr. LAWN: They have not, but I have on their behalf. I hope that the Government will favourably consider the application I made on their behalf. I do not want to compare this with other organizations. I trust that the Government will favourably consider the letter I sent to the Premier on June 22, and send someone down. I am prepared to go with anyone to visit this place and show him the work being done. I have been there and seen the dinner at 12.30 p.m. I have seen the second group of people coming in and having food there. I have seen people as I have left the Daughters of Charity and gone out to my car. I have seen married couples with a child in their arms knock on the door when they have called for food or clothing. In addition, on Tuesday or Wednesday of every week the Daughters of Charity occupy a hall near St. Patrick's Church. It is a well-known fact that they are there on Tuesday or Wednesday every week, and the poor people of Adelaide, not only of the city proper but of the whole metropolitan area, call for left-off clothing and things like that.

Mr. Bywaters: And that is happening in an affluent society.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, unfortunately it is, and it has been going on for years and years. I do not know how far back. On behalf of these people I appeal to the Government. There are two Cabinet Ministers now present and I hope that my appeal does not fall on deaf ears. I will leave it there in the hope that, when the Budget comes before us in a few weeks' time, we shall find a line on it to provide some assistance in the same way as the Government

assists the organization at Whitmore Square, where there is a shelter for homeless men. The Government has over the last couple of years, since that home was set up, subsidized it every year to the extent of £1,000. I am not suggesting that the amount here should be £1,000 but, if the Government investigates this matter, the amount may be more because these Daughters of Charity are providing not only beds but also food and clothing for a large number of people. I will leave it at that. The next matter I refer to arises out of a question I asked the Speaker on June 11 about the lifts in Parliament House.

Mr. Jennings: I will bring the honourable member up to date: they are still not working.

Mr. LAWN: I said a couple of hours ago that the lift would be out of order. It was out of order on Tuesday night and Wednesday morning of this week, but I will come to that. The Speaker was good enough to take up this matter on behalf of the members and staff of Parliament House and was kind enough to forward me a letter. It was addressed to the Minister of Works and he passed it on to the Speaker. It came from Mr. Slade, the Director of the Public Buildings Department, and read:

Prior to the Chief Mechanical and Electrical Engineer submitting his report of September 9, 1963, herein, I understand he discussed with you as an alternative to the provision of self-closing car doors for the lifts the installation of power-operated doors to automatically close both the car doors and the outside doors at an estimated cost of £2,200. Mr. Doig then saw me and I submitted my recommendation of September 16, 1963, herein, for the provision of self-closing doors at an estimated cost of £300. The actual cost of these doors was, in fact, only £135 16s. 6d.

The enclosed report of the Electrical Engineer of June 19, 1964, shows that no requests have been made for attention to the back lift since June 28, 1963, and that for the period November 10, 1962, to March 19, 1964, only five requests were made for attention to the front lift. Since the installation of the self-closing doors in March last no requests for attention have been made for either lift.

The Electrical Engineer points out that it is still necessary, when entering or leaving the lift, to see that the outside door is closed and he states that he has ascertained beyond any doubt that people have been seen to walk out of the lift without closing the outside door. If the outside door is not closed the lift cannot be controlled from any other floor.

Normal routine maintenance is carried out on the lifts every Monday morning commencing at 8 a.m. and it takes approximately two hours for each lift. This is normal practice and is unavoidable.

It would seem that the cause of any inconvenience, apart from normal weekly maintenance, is the leaving of the outside doors unclosed. This could only be overcome by greater care being taken or an expenditure of £2,200 for self-closing doors.

It is beyond me why the Public Buildings Department expects complaints to be made from here to Victoria Square every time a lift door is left open.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Well, why don't you shut them?

Mr. LAWN: I am not the one who is leaving the doors open. On the opening day of Parliament many visitors used the lifts and they expected the doors to operate in the same way as the doors of lifts in other buildings. Consequently, quite often the doors were left open on that day.

Mr. Ryan: The Minister does not expect members to go from the basement to the top floor to shut the door every time it is left open, does he?

Mr. LAWN: The other day I went to the basement to visit the Leader of the Opposition and was accompanied by a member of the Legislative Council and a lady friend of hers. We had to walk down the stairs. I went to the Leader's room and on returning to the lift I found that the door was closed. I then walked to the top floor and closed the door. I know that some people are leaving the doors open. Does the department expect members to ring Victoria Square and have officers of the department come down here and close the doors? The letter I have quoted refers to a complaint about that. However, honourable members have not complained on each occasion that someone has not closed the doors. Since receiving the letter, I have sent two letters to the Speaker about the lifts and now that another lift has broken down today, I shall be sending him another letter.

Mr. Ryan: I notified the Clerk the other day that a lift was out of order.

Mr. LAWN: I think it is ridiculous that every time a door is left open and a lift does not work that someone should have to come down and close it. That is carrying it too far. Another point is that someone gave the Minister of Works an estimate that it would cost £2,200 to fix the lifts properly and £300 to partly do the job. The latter work was done and the actual cost was £135 16s. 6d. Therefore, if this person's estimate of the complete job is as far out as his estimate of the partial work, the full cost could well be about £1,000.

Mr. Ryan: And that is too much, according to the Government.

Mr. LAWN: The Minister of Works accepted the figure of £2,200 as correct for a self-closing door, but I draw his attention to the fact that the estimate of £300 for an inside door was far from accurate.

Mr. Ryan: The actual cost was less than 50 per cent of the estimate.

Mr. LAWN: The Minister insists that the other amount is correct.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I did not comment on the other estimate.

Mr. LAWN: The Minister was informed that it would cost £300 to do the job properly.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I would not assume that because we made a saving on that job we could do it every time.

Mr. LAWN: Why not? Apparently the Minister assumed that the same man could not make the same mistake twice.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think that I have had more experience of estimating and of actual costs than the honourable member has.

Mr. LAWN: Then why should the Minister ask someone else to give an estimate if the Minister knows more about it?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Don't be silly. I do not do the estimating myself.

Mr. LAWN: Someone estimated that it would cost £300 to install the inner doors but the job was completed for £135 16s. 6d. The same person said it would cost £2,200 to do the complete job properly. The £300 estimate proved to be more than 100 per cent incorrect, and it is fair to assume that the estimate for the completed job would also be incorrect and that it would cost about £1,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No it is not.

Mr. LAWN: I think it is. On Tuesday this week the lift was out of order; again on Wednesday; and we have been informed that it is out of order now. The inner door was jamming this morning and I realized that it would only be a matter of time before it would not work. Surely the Government can have something better in this House. Supposing a division occurred and the members for Torrens and Angas were dictating letters and could not return to the chamber. What would happen?

Mr. Shannon: They would slide down the stairs like everyone else does.

Mr. LAWN: Would the Government ask for the division to be called off?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Even the best lifts are not always reliable. The lifts in the building in which I work were out of order only this morning.

Mr. Ryan: But not always, like ours!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. CUMBE): Order! The honourable member for Adelaide.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They have been there a short time and this is the first time they have been out of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Order! The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. LAWN: Mr. Acting Speaker, I accept the Minister's statement that any lift is likely to break down. I know that when new self-closing doors are installed one can expect bother from time to time. I use many lifts with self-closing doors on North Terrace because I have to visit doctors. I visit the Liberal Club Building to see a dentist, and Verco Building to see a doctor, and in every instance the self-closing doors are always working.

Mr. Jennings: Did you notice any red plush carpets in the Liberal Club Building?

Mr. LAWN: They can be seen as one walks in from the front door.

Mr. Ryan: Did you get a rule book?

Mr. LAWN: It is possible to get a book of rules, but if one asks for a policy they haven't got one. Many years ago, when Premier of this State, the grandfather of our present Premier received a deputation that asked him to introduce industrial legislation in South Australia containing provisions concerning the hours a man should work, a minimum basic wage, and factory safety measures. The deputation was told that if it wanted that type of legislation it would have to have its own members in Parliament because the Government would not introduce it. That incident brought about the birth of the Labor Party in this State. Recently the trade union movement has been consulting with employers in an effort to increase safety measures in factories. Latterly, the Government has often participated in these conferences to impress employers and workers in industry that they should do everything possible to prevent accidents, and I commend that practice. However, back in March of this year I found that men were hanging outside the windows of this building to clean them. As members know, the concrete ledges under the windows are sloped downward, and the cleaners stand on them and hang on to the window with one hand while cleaning it with the other. That is the cleaning practice followed in Parliament House by men employed by a Government participating in Safety Week and sponsoring safety in industry.

Only last week a statement by the Attorney-General on safety in industry was published in the daily press. Despite this, men must stand on ledges outside this building to clean the windows. In most city buildings there are fittings inside, and even these are out of date. In buildings constructed a few years ago and in others that have been altered, a couple of

hooks are affixed to each window so that the worker can attach a belt to them, and sit on the window ledge with his feet inside and clean the window. Windows in later buildings are reversible so that the workman stands inside, cleans one side, reverses the window, and then cleans the other side. I am disappointed to find that cleaners employed at Parliament House have to stand outside the windows and hang on with one hand while they are cleaning the windows.

Mr. Jennings: What about the shutters?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member for Mitcham reminds me—

Mr. Jennings: What! I will sue you for defamation of character.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member would be justified. I offer my apologies to the member for Enfield, and I hope they will be accepted. I shall certainly not refer to the member for Mitcham as the member for Enfield. At the windows of Parliament House are wooden slats that are supposed to be sunshades, and I ask members to look at the way they are attached to the buildings, which is by means of a little chain that slides in and out. The chains are rusty, and not long ago one of these shades on the western side of the building fell from the top floor and smashed into 2,500,000 pieces, I believe—the pieces were counted. This shade was smashed to smithereens. I mention this because members opposite may ask why a cleaner standing outside the window does not rest against the shutters instead of hanging on to the window with his hands. The cleaners know what will happen if they do; they will go down with the shutters. One wooden shutter has gone, and the shutter outside my office has a rusty chain and is likely to fall at any time. These shutters are not wanted; if shutters have to be there, why not have aluminium slides that can be pulled down?

Mr. Shannon: What about having them in the house being constructed at the zoo?

Mr. LAWN: When you get your zoo you can do what you like; you are part of one now. When I have had complaints, I have availed myself of the opportunity of taking them to the correct authority, and I thank the Premier for the assistance he has given me. Some complaints I have sent on to him have been investigated by police officers, and it has often been a complete waste of time, as some of the stories given to me by some of my constituents were obviously fictitious. He had them all investigated however. He sent my letter on this matter to the Minister of Works and on June 4 I received a letter stating:

The matter has been examined and discussed with the contractor who has the contract for cleaning the windows. Arrangements are now being made for an examination to be made of the feasibility of fitting safety rings to the outside of windows.

Shortly after that, this is what happened: men went down to the basement of this building and started fitting safety rings in the basement instead of starting on the windows upstairs. They may have started on the room of the Minister of Education.

Mr. Jennings: They thought they might fall upwards.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I am informed that there have been no further installations. Does anyone wonder why we talk about the circus government we have in South Australia? If it were not for the electoral set-up the Government would have been out of office years ago. I wish to refer to another matter that indicates the lack of interest of the Government in the welfare of some of our people. I have heard it said by members opposite when it suits them: "We represent all sections of the community." The matter to which I shall refer is serious, although it may be so to only a few hundred people, but I claim to represent all sections of the community except those who live by R.I.P. That has a different meaning on the other side of the House from the meaning given it by the members on this side. We think of it as "rest in peace", whereas on the other side members think of it as "rent, interest, and profit".

When referring to the sick and needy, I have already referred to an organization in my district carrying out fine charitable work with regard to feeding and clothing those in need. I now refer to a section of the community that has a sickness called arteriosclerosis, and the members of the Australian Medical Association in South Australia do not know how to deal with it. Last year I noticed in the press a statement that this disease or sickness was curable in Kassel in West Germany. A Dr. Muller in that city had been using a machine there for some years and injecting oxygen into the arteries (this was called oxygen therapy). He was curing thousands of patients who, in Australia, would have had nothing to look forward to. The top man in South Australia has told me that only two out of five operations in such cases are successful, and the only treatment of which we know in South Australia is by operation. I cannot speak for the other States, but doctors here operate, and 40 per cent of those operations are successful, but the other 60 per cent of cases are doomed.

There was more than one reference last year in the press about this treatment in Germany. A lady from Semaphore was going over there to be treated. Reference to this matter was made again in January last. I had hoped that during the last three months of last year I would have read in the press that the Government intended sending some of its doctors to Germany to investigate the matter, and authorizing the importation of a couple of these machines. However, I did not hear anything further. On Wednesday nights we hear statements by the Premier over television regarding matters which are supposed to be for the benefit of the public, but they are only fictitious.

Mr. Jennings: Playford promises!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Mr. Speaker, in view of the time I will leave this matter until later and refer briefly to some remarks of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) at page 85 of *Hansard*:

The Government can be proud of its achievement in the supply of electricity and water. It was stated in 1963 that the Electricity Trust had had a successful year. This year a record is claimed—and with some justification. Areas, such as the Stirling Electoral District, are almost completely serviced and it is gratifying to know that areas on the West Coast and Kangaroo Island will be connected soon. Not only have there been no increases in the cost of electricity since 1954: there have been several small decreases. No other State has been able to achieve this, and the Electricity Trust is to be commended for achieving this feat in a period of rising costs. Water is also supplied at costs which bear comparison with those in other mainland States.

I would have thought that the honourable member had been reading some of my previous speeches that I had made either on the Loan Estimates or the Budget. This is not private enterprise that he was speaking about. I issue a challenge to any honourable member opposite to name one private enterprise that has reduced its charges since 1954. As has been pointed out before, substantial increases in its annual surplus have been recorded by the Electricity Trust. It has been able to absorb the cost of three weeks' annual leave, long service leave, basic wage and marginal increases since 1953 without advancing its charges. Mr. McAnaney said that the trust had reduced its charges to consumers.

Mr. Bywaters: The honourable member is an individualistic Socialist.

Mr. LAWN: He said in his maiden speech that he was invincibly himself. I still have not worked that one out. He told the House that one of the greatest benefits for industry in this State was the service provided by the Electricity Trust.

Mr. McAnaney: That shows how fair I am.

Mr. LAWN: I am not going to answer whether the honourable member is fair or not. He refers to the achievement of the Electricity Trust which, of course, is a State undertaking. I suggest he ask the Premier what difficulties he encountered when he tried to take that concern over in about 1947. The member for Stirling went on to mention his district and referred also to the West Coast and Kangaroo Island. As I have said before, the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, as it then was, would not have gone outside the metropolitan area because, being a private enterprise, it was concerned only with making a profit. It would not have worried about sending power out to the honourable member's district if it could not have made a huge profit out of it. The then Leader of the Opposition gave evidence before the commission that was set up by the Government. There was strong opposition to the Government's plan from the other side, both here and in the Upper House. I must say that the best undertakings in this State are those that are run by the Government. Take water supplies and electricity supplies, for instance.

Mr. Jennings: The member for Stirling is a bit of a left-winger, I think.

Mr. McAnaney: How many other Government undertakings make a profit?

Mr. LAWN: I was going to mention that. If the honourable member looks at the Auditor-General's report and then goes back a few years he will find the answer. What does the Woods and Forests Department contribute to State revenue every year, irrespective of the hundreds of thousands of pounds it ploughs back into its own industry?

Mr. Jennings: The honourable member could name the two State banks for a start.

Mr. LAWN: Yes.

Mr. Jennings: Does the member for Stirling regard a profit as only a monetary one? What about the service given?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, of course there is a service given—and what about the Art Gallery and those other places along North Terrace, the Museum and the Public Library? What private enterprise would run those places without imposing a charge upon the public? Would private enterprise run the railways unless it could make a handsome profit? Would the primary producers have a railway today if private enterprise were running things?

Mr. Loveday: Would they give the primary producers special concessions?

Mr. LAWN: No. Then the honourable member refers to the millions of pounds spent—and I think I can refer to both the State and Commonwealth Governments—on research and increased primary production through the C.S.I.R.O. and such organizations. I agree that the Government spends millions of pounds on research to assist people to grow more wheat on the same acreage, as well as to increase production in other lines. The member for Stirling made a couple of worthwhile statements. It is all right for us to spend huge sums on research on behalf of primary industry, but when we come to controlling the industry, it is a hands-off policy. We must forget the millions of pounds and give concessions, but as soon as we want a planned economy—

Mr. McAnaney: Who pays for those things?

Mr. LAWN: I think I had better read the relevant paragraph, because the honourable member referred to the economy, something in which we on this side believe, and which we have advocated for a long time. People on the other side say that it is impossible and not worthwhile. The paragraph states:

As mentioned earlier, we spend millions of pounds on research to increase primary production. We have been successful in that respect, but we should spend more time and money to find out how a permanent balanced economy can be achieved.

Mr. Loveday: That's a good point.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and it is something that we have been advocating for years. This next statement is amazing, coming from the other side of the House:

After all, democracy—government by the people for the people—

The honourable member made a slight mistake there—

can best be achieved by leaving as many decisions as possible in the hands of the people themselves.

Mr. Ryan: They get it in this State!

Mr. LAWN: I suppose that is where he gets back to private enterprise—"Don't take away from us our freedom to do as we like and to treat our employees as we like, and don't take away from us the right to charge whatever we like." The honourable member talks about democracy! He is sitting with a Party that killed democracy in this State in 1936. The people did not elect this Government. On every occasion since 1936, with only one exception, the people have voted overwhelmingly for the Australian Labor Party to form a Government. Even the honourable member knows what happened here in 1962. When Labor came back with a majority the Government put one Independent in the Chair and took the other into its ranks and made him Minister of Lands so that it could still carry on the Government, taking from the people the right they should have in a democracy to elect a Government of their own choice. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 11, at 2 p.m.