

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, May 13, 1965.

The House met at 11 a.m. pursuant to proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor (Sir Edric Bastyan).

The Clerk (Mr. G. D. Combe) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

### OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

At 11.4 a.m., in compliance with summons, the House proceeded to the Legislative Council, where a Commission was read appointing the Hon. Sir John Mellis Napier (Chief Justice) and the Hon. Reginald Roderic St. Clair Chamberlain (a judge of the Supreme Court) to be Commissioners for the opening of Parliament.

### SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The House being again in its own Chamber, at 11.12 a.m. His Honour Mr. Justice Chamberlain attended and produced a Commission from His Excellency the Governor appointing him to be a Commissioner to administer to the House of Assembly the Oath of Allegiance or the Affirmation in lieu thereof required by the Constitution Act. The Commission was read by the Clerk, who then produced writs for the election of 39 members for the House of Assembly.

The Oath of Allegiance required by law was administered to and subscribed by all members except the honourable member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson).

The Commissioner retired.

### ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I remind honourable members that it will be necessary next to appoint a Speaker, and I nominate the member for Stuart (Mr. L. G. Riches) for that position.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I have much pleasure in seconding the nomination. Mr. Riches has been in this House for 32 years; he is extremely capable of undertaking the position; he is a man of integrity and ability; and I assure him that he goes into the Chair with the goodwill of all members on this side of the House.

There being no other nomination, Mr. Riches was elected.

Mr. Riches was escorted to the dais by the mover and seconder of his nomination.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches): It is a tradition that the Speaker, when approaching the Chair, may pause to acknowledge the confidence that has been placed in him and to express his gratitude to members for the honour conferred in the call to this high office. I sincerely thank the mover and seconder for the kindly sentiments expressed, and assure the House that I will do my very best at all times to preserve the dignity and decorum that have characterized the proceedings in this Chamber in past years. I recognize that, for the smooth working of Parliament, impartiality from the Chair is essential, and I assure members that I shall do my best, without fear or favour, to ensure that that impartiality is preserved.

I appeal to members for their assistance in maintaining an atmosphere in which there can be complete freedom of expression, in which we can be assured that decisions are always decided by the majority, but in which, at the same time, the rights and liberty of the minority are adequately and fully preserved. I assure members that with their support I shall endeavour to see that the rights of members, collectively and individually, are maintained. I recognize that this is a responsible position, as indeed is the position of all members. I believe that with the help that has been promised we can so govern our actions and deliberations that, recognizing that authority can be exercised in a democracy only by the consent of the governed, we can rely on a strength over and above our own strength. In that spirit, as we are wont to do each day Parliament meets, we can, with sincerity, ask for Divine blessing on the deliberations of this Chamber, that they may be for the true welfare of our people, and that God may bless and prosper the State.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I sincerely congratulate you on your appointment to the high office of this House and of the State. It is well recognized that you are appointed to this important position on an occasion when a new Government has been sworn in as the result of the election held on March 6. Your long experience of 32 years has already been referred to, and during those years you have taken notice of the actions of your predecessors. No doubt this will assist you greatly. You have had a long experience in local government, which has always been held to be the government nearest the people.

As you have said that minority causes shall be heard, let us remember that it is the people

who elect members to this House, and it is to them we are responsible. In your high office you will always call on the member for the district and, by doing so, recognize the people that member represents. It is a tradition well known to you. On this important occasion it is a grand tribute to you, with your long experience, to be elected to the office of Speaker. It is fitting that, after serving the people of South Australia and the district you represent for so long, you should attain this office. Your election is by unanimous decision, and all members will pay attention to you. We sincerely congratulate you on your appointment and wish you continued success in your high office.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in supporting your nomination a few moments ago, I stated that it would carry with it the goodwill of honourable members of the Opposition. No doubt many problems requiring your interpretation and decision will arise, but we on this side have not the slightest doubt that your decisions will always be impartial and that you will give worthy consideration to such matters. You have been privileged to be in the House for about 32 years, and you are aware of the high tradition that the Speaker has always maintained here, and of the way he has carried out his duties. We are fortunate, indeed, in your selection, and I join with the Premier in congratulating you on your appointment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I, too, add my congratulations, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to the highest Parliamentary office that honourable members can confer on one of their number. It is almost 33 years since you were first elected to this Chamber and, having been elected at the same time, I have watched your progress in the House with much interest. Your public career, which has been well noted in the press, has become a byword throughout this State. Your conduct and decorum here have always been commended, and I am certain that honourable members will witness with much pleasure the impartiality, dignity and decorum with which you will maintain your high office of Speaker. From your long experience you have a sound working knowledge of Standing Orders, and you are well aware of the difficulties that Speakers sometimes encounter in interpreting and establishing precedents. That experience will stand you in good stead, and I wish you well in your new office. I know you will uphold the dignity and decorum of this

House, which are so well known not only throughout this country but also throughout other countries with which we have associations through the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I offer you every congratulation, Sir.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches): I thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the honourable member for Ridley for the sentiments they have expressed. I shall constantly endeavour to see that they do not regret the confidence they have expressed in me this day.

[*Sitting suspended from 11.50 a.m. to 12.15 p.m.*]

The SPEAKER: It is now my intention to proceed to Government House to present myself as Speaker to His Excellency the Governor, and I invite members to accompany me.

At 12.16 p.m., attended by a deputation of members, the Speaker proceeded to Government House.

*On the House reassembling at 12.33 p.m.:*

The SPEAKER: Accompanied by a deputation of members, I proceeded to Government House for the purpose of presenting myself to His Excellency the Governor and informed His Excellency that, in pursuance of the powers conferred on the House by section 34 of the Constitution Act, the House of Assembly had this day proceeded to the election of Speaker and had done me the honour of election to that high office. In compliance with the other provisions of the same section, I presented myself to His Excellency as the Speaker and, in the name and on behalf of the House, laid claim to members' undoubted rights and privileges, and prayed that the most favourable construction might be put on all their proceedings; whereupon His Excellency was pleased to reply as follows:

I congratulate the members of the House of Assembly on their choice of a Speaker. I readily assure you, Mr. Speaker, of my confirmation of all the Constitutional rights and privileges of the House of Assembly, the proceedings of which will always receive my most favourable consideration.

[*Sitting suspended from 12.35 to 2.15 p.m.*]

#### SUMMONS TO COUNCIL CHAMBER.

A summons was received from His Excellency the Governor desiring the attendance of the House in the Legislative Council Chamber, whither the Speaker and honourable members proceeded.

The House having returned to its own Chamber, the Speaker resumed the Chair at 2.56 p.m. and read prayers.

## OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

The Hon. Glen Gardner Pearson, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his seat in the House as member for the district of Flinders.

## DEATH OF FORMER MEMBERS.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the deaths of the Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph, former member for Central No. 1 District in the Legislative Council, and Mr. James Corcoran, former member for Millicent in the House of Assembly, and place on record its appreciation of their public services; and that, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased gentlemen, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The Hon. Mr. Bardolph, who was a somewhat colourful personality, had a long association with the Party I have the privilege to lead today. He played a prominent part in the industrial affairs of this State for many years, and undoubtedly his efforts on behalf of this State are worthy of commendation.

This Parliament was represented at the funeral of the late Mr. James Corcoran last Monday. A large assembly paid respects to his memory, and the funeral cortege extended for a considerable distance. Mr. Corcoran had an outstanding record from the time he was first elected to this House in 1945. Even his whispering was heard throughout this building, and when it was necessary for him to speak in halls during election campaigns people on the other side of the street had no difficulty in hearing him. Mr. Corcoran was a prominent ex-serviceman. His record in public life deserves the commendation of this House.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I should like, with my Party, to be associated with the remarks of the Premier. Most members on this side of the House were privileged to serve in Parliament with the late Mr. James Corcoran. He had our deepest respect and we had much affection for him. With his great human qualities he was popular and respected. Everyone listened to his views, which were always expressed with moderation and respect. Apart from his political service, he had a distinguished war record.

The late Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph was a member of another place, but he played such a conspicuous part in the political affairs of this country that every honourable member knew him and came into close contact with him. He won the respect of all members.

Although we did not experience his debating qualities in this Chamber, we often heard him speak at conferences. An able advocate of his political opinions, he was respected by everyone. I associate my Party with the remarks of the Premier in expressing regret at the passing of these honourable members, and express sympathy to their relatives.

The SPEAKER: I add a personal tribute to the memory of those whom we are honouring this afternoon. It was my privilege to serve with the late Mr. Bardolph as a member of the Industries Development Committee and of the special committee of inquiry set up by this Parliament, and there I learned to appreciate his many qualities. I always regarded the late Mr. Corcoran as a close personal friend. He was big in stature and in character, and had no peer in sincerity of purpose.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*[Sitting suspended from 3.10 to 3.24 p.m.]*

## NEXT DAY OF SITTING.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, May 18, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

## CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That Mr. S. J. Lawn be Chairman of Committees of the whole House during the present Parliament.

Motion carried.

## GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in compliance with the summons from His Excellency the Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which I obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

- Parkside Mental Hospital Kitchen,
- South Road and Millicent South Primary Schools (Final),
- Carlton (Port Augusta), Draper, Hope Valley, Kidman Park and Whyalla Far West Primary Schools (Final),

Para Hills Primary School,  
Duplication of the Morgan to Whyalla Pipe-  
line (Final),

Bedford Park Teachers College,  
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science  
New Wing,

Installation of Additional Electric Cranes  
at Nos. 13 and 14 Berths, Port Adelaide,  
Thebarton Boys Technical High School  
Additions,

Kensington Girls Technical High School,  
Kimba Water Supply (Final),  
Giles Point Bulk Loading Facilities,  
Whyalla (Bradford Street) Primary School,  
Elizabeth Downs South Primary School,  
Glenelg Primary School,  
Mannum Area School,  
Yeelanna-Mount Hope Railway Line,  
Clare High School,  
Upper Port Reach Development Scheme.

Ordered that reports be printed.

#### COURT OF DISPUTED RETURNS.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and  
Treasurer) moved:

That the House proceed to elect by ballot  
four persons to be members of the Court of  
Disputed Returns pursuant to sections 168 and  
169 of the Electoral Act, 1929-1959.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, the Hon. D. N.  
Brookman and Messrs. Burdon, Hurst and  
Millhouse were declared elected.

#### ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and  
Treasurer) moved:

That three members of the House be  
appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the  
University of Adelaide as provided by the  
University of Adelaide Act, 1935-1964.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, Messrs. Broom-  
hill, Heaslip and Hudson were declared  
elected.

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

Sessional Committees were appointed as fol-  
lows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, the Hon.  
B. H. Tusner, and Messrs. Corcoran and  
Lawn.

Library: The Speaker, Mrs. Byrne, and  
Messrs. Clark and McAnaney.

Printing: Messrs. Corcoran, Ferguson,  
Langley, McKee and Rodda.

#### JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and  
Treasurer) moved:

That it be an order of this House that, in  
view of the creation of the Joint House Com-  
mittee under the Joint House Committee Act,  
1941, a Sessional House Committee be not  
appointed under Standing Order No. 404.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I should  
like clarification on this point. Standing Orders  
have been suspended to enable this motion to  
be moved and, so far, all that the Premier has  
moved is that Standing Order No. 404, which  
is for the appointment of a Sessional House  
Committee, be not proceeded with. It is not  
sufficient to say that Standing Order No. 404  
should be dispensed with for, when we have  
suspended Standing Orders, we must come back  
to Standing Order No. 404. I submit that more  
reasons should be given by the Premier before  
we proceed with the motion.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: If the member  
for Ridley had had a little more patience I  
should not have needed to give an explanation.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It is not a question  
of patience.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The next order  
on the Notice Paper is that the House shall  
proceed to elect a Joint House Committee. If  
this does not meet with the honourable mem-  
ber's approval I cannot add anything except  
that I have not noticed the honourable mem-  
ber's name referred to in any motion to be  
moved.

Motion carried.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH moved:

That, pursuant to section 4 of the Joint  
House Committee Act, 1941, Messrs. Freebairn,  
Hughes and Ryan be elected members of the  
Joint House Committee.

Motion carried.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and  
Treasurer) moved:

That the House request the concurrence of  
the Legislative Council in the appointment for  
the present Parliament of the Joint Committee  
on Subordinate Legislation in accordance with  
Joint Standing Orders Nos. 19 to 31, and that  
the representatives of the House on the said  
committee be Messrs. Burdon, Langley and  
McKee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD  
(Leader of the Opposition): I should like  
the Government to consider this matter fur-  
ther. It has always been the practice for  
both sides of this House to be represented  
on the committee.

Mr. Lawn: In both Houses, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This committee has always been a non-Party one, with both sides of the House represented on it. It is an advantage not only to the Parliament but to the Government itself for the committee to include a member from this side of the House, for that member is then conversant with the reasons for the introduction of regulations. After all, the regulations we will be considering are those promulgated by Executive Council, and undoubtedly it will save the time of the House and facilitate business if a member of my Party is able to sit in and take part in the discussions regarding those regulations. I believe that the custom we have had for many years of having representation from both sides of this House should not be lightly disregarded. As my Party considered, as a matter of course, that it would be invited to nominate one person for this committee, it selected the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) for the appointment. If this committee were a one-party committee it would not enjoy the respect of this side of the House, and I make it clear that we would not be in any way committed to the committee's decisions. I ask that this matter be held over while the Premier considers the remarks I have made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the view put by the Leader of the Opposition. It was with some surprise and, indeed, resentment that I learned that the Government intended to nominate three of its own members for this committee. Earlier today, Mr. Speaker, you spoke about protecting the rights of minorities, and I respectfully agreed with every word you said. I noticed that the Premier, when congratulating you on your election, echoed the sentiments you had expressed, but straightway those sentiments are being honoured more in the breach than in the observance, and the Government's action is not suited to the words uttered. The Opposition in this House is to be denied a place on the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I admit that there is no provision in Standing Orders for representation of both sides of the House, but it has been the invariable custom that there be two members of the Government Party and one member of the Opposition Party on the committee.

Mr. Lawn: From both Houses of Parliament!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I point out to the member for Adelaide, for his particular benefit, that that custom was always honoured

by this Party when it was in office. As the Leader of the Opposition said, this is one of the most important committees because it does work for the whole House and for all members, which work, because of its bulk, is not convenient for members to do themselves. It watches to ensure that the Executive (the Government or Government departments), by regulation, or local government authorities, by by-law, do not overstep the mark, and it safeguards the liberty of the subject in this State. So far as I know (and I was on the committee for nine years), Party politics never entered into either the discussions or the votes in the committee itself, nor into debates in this House on motions for disallowance. Most honourable members will remember that usually, on motions for disallowance, the Government has been on one side and members of the committee, from whichever Party they might be drawn, have been on the other side. I have vivid recollections of that myself, and that underlines the fact that this committee acts as a guardian of the rights of all members, irrespective of their Party.

I also point out that it is the House that counts and not necessarily the Upper House or Parliament as a whole, because, under our Standing Orders, a motion for disallowance is moved in either House, and if agreed to in either House, then the by-law or regulation is disallowed. I regret that the Government apparently intends, because of what it thinks might happen in another place (of which I have no knowledge at all, and which I believe is irrelevant in this place), to inject Party politics into this matter. It will be a bad omen for the future if this is not reconsidered by the Government, for we shall then be deprived of representation on what should be an all-Party committee.

Mr. Clark: It is a joint committee from both Houses.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Quite so. That is entirely irrelevant, as far as we are concerned, and the honourable member knows it is. It is what happens in this House that counts. If a motion is moved here by a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, members on this side of the House will not know anything about it.

Mr. Jennings: They have access to the information, anyway.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Enfield knows how this committee works; he has been on it himself, and he knows as well as I that members on both sides always work together on this committee. He will be the first to

admit, when he looks at this matter dispassionately, that both sides of the House should be represented on the committee. As the Leader has said, this Party intends to nominate the member for Burnside as its representative. I am sure that she would be an excellent representative on this committee and that she would serve—

Mr. Jennings: Are you canvassing?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suppose I am, and I am not ashamed of it. I hope that the member for Burnside will, in fact, eventually be appointed to the committee.

Mr. Jennings: I am sure she won't.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I am surprised at the motion moved by the Premier in regard to an important committee such as this, so that three Government members in this House will be appointed to it, but so that the Opposition will not be represented at all. It has been the procedure of this Parliament, ever since I have been a member, that this House is in charge of its own business. We cannot anticipate what the other Chamber will do. I think the correct procedure to adopt is to postpone a decision on this motion until we know the decision of the other House. True, under Joint Standing Orders there must be an equal number of members from both Houses on the committee.

Mr. Jennings: We shall postpone this until they make up their minds, and they will postpone it until we make up ours, and so it will go on for ever.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: We cannot accept this motion until we know the decision of the other House. Possibly, the Opposition there will think differently. This committee is one on which honourable members place much importance. On many occasions when local government by-laws affecting my own district have been concerned I have left the matter entirely to the committee and have been completely satisfied with its report. I have done this knowing that it was an impartial committee and that at all times, in this House at least, it had representatives from both sides. Both sides should be represented on this important committee. Its appointment should be delayed until we know the position in another place.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I do not support a delay because I believe that we can be almost certain of what will happen in another place. However, I wish to refer to the importance of this committee. On this, I disagree with the statement by the member for

Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) that other committees, such as the Public Works Standing Committee and other committees appointed to safeguard State expenditure, are more important. I believe that this is the most important Parliamentary committee because it deals with regulations that have the full force of law if approved. With you, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Ridley, I was a member of this House when the committee was first established. It was prompted by the late Hon. R. J. Rudall and he put forward this proposal because of the disabilities that could be suffered as a result of these regulations. If any member doubts the possible disabilities that could occur, I invite him to scan through the papers presented today and I should be surprised if he could understand them fully within a month. If there is no disallowance each one of those papers becomes a law of the land.

I remind Government members that on occasions previous Governments were glad to disallow regulations in the light of evidence tendered before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Frequently the House unanimously rejected regulations. Although I am not acquainted with Executive Council procedure, I do not believe that it could give the same minute examination to these papers as is given by the committee. It would be impossible for Executive Council to call evidence from interested parties about the possible effect of a certain by-law or regulation, and this is what the committee was set up to do.

A motion for disallowance may be moved in either House and if either House carries the motion it becomes effective in that House. I suggest that the Government, for its own guidance in the matter, would be wise to have a member of the Opposition in this Chamber on the committee who could inform the Opposition of the evidence tendered and possibly support the Government in getting a regulation passed. On the contrary, it may be that by virtue of certain evidence tendered the Government itself may be a little perturbed about the effect of a regulation. I admit that the Government would have three members able to talk about it, but the committee would speak with greater force if it included an Opposition member.

I have seen this committee operate since its inception. We have always listened to members of the committee; those members have not always been unanimous, and on those occasions the House itself sums up the position on the evidence the members of the committee tender and possibly also on any advice they have

received from people who are affected by the regulations. After all, it is the public that we should consider. A member of the public may come before the committee and say that under a certain regulation he will not be getting a fair deal. That person may be speaking only from his own point of view and his objection may not be valid, but on the other hand his objection may be valid and in those circumstances the matter should be considered fully. Possibly the Government itself will, upon reflection, realize that in the interests of good Government it would be wise for both parties in this Chamber to be represented on the committee. If the Government persists in its present move, it is flying in the face of well established practice. It will be throwing down the gauntlet to the Opposition in this Chamber, and I suggest that that is not generally the manner in which a Government gets its way in government affairs. I think that past experience in this Chamber will afford satisfactory evidence to any member who has been in this Chamber over the last few years that some co-operation between the Government of the day and the Opposition of the day facilitates good government. I think that is a well recognized fact, and I do not think that the Government's present step is an appropriate one to take.

It is unfortunate that the Government is not able to have a voice from the Legislative Council on this committee. However, I do not think it will be of any value to the Government to have all its members on the committee from this Chamber, because they will be outvoted in the other Chamber which will have three members in that Chamber who will be able to move a motion for disallowance. If we have an Opposition member of this Chamber on the committee we may be able to influence a certain Party in another place.

Mr. Lawn: Oh!

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Adelaide is not so simple as he is trying to make out.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Adelaide does not come from the hills.

Mr. SHANNON: I know there have been many occasions when the Leader on our side of the House has influenced members in another place. I think the member for Adelaide will agree that members on his side of the Chamber not only advise members in another place but they meet jointly, a thing we do not do on our side. There is a closer link there for the Government Party, as we do not meet jointly in this House. This is an unwise move by the Government and, on reflection, it will regret this action if it continues with it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Finders): It is regrettable that the Government at this stage should appoint three of its members on this committee to the complete exclusion of any representation from this side of the House. I have listened to discussions in this House over many years, and on several occasions I have heard the Government of the day criticized for allegedly governing by regulation. I agree that it is necessary for any Government to tender regulations for the conduct of State affairs in specific matters. I did not count them, but I presume that at least 30 regulations were laid on the table of the House today.

Mr. Shannon: To which Minister are you referring?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not referring to any particular Minister. I may be underestimating the total by a substantial number, but it is an accumulation of many regulations that have been awaiting tabling. Not every day is like today. Regulations are necessary, and in the past we have had an active committee on these matters concerned with the interests of the public and of the people whom the regulations affect. Having in mind requirements of the departments which frame the regulations for the conduct of their business, the committee has scrutinized the regulations carefully. I know from experience, as other ex-Ministers know, that departments, with the best intentions and the wisest motives, continually submit regulations framed from the point of view of the departments' administration, and framed in a way designed to achieve the purposes in the interests of the departments. They do not necessarily take into account the people whom the regulations affect.

Often I have had to call in the head of a department and tell him that, although the regulation was what was wanted, it affected the liberties of people in a way that had not been realized by the department. The regulation has had to be modified or redrafted so that the objects of the department can be achieved without unduly interfering with the liberties, rights and privileges of State subjects. I am not criticizing the departments in any way. I believe it is the duty of the Minister, of Parliament, and of this House to ensure that regulations do not unduly interfere with the liberties, rights and privileges of the subject. I am sure the Government agrees with me on this matter. It is a question of the point of view. We who represent the people have a responsibility to maintain their liberties. If this committee is not to have

a representative from this side of the House, we shall have to scrutinize every regulation, that is, to do the work of our representative on this committee. Our only means of raising objections to these regulations will be by debating every one of them on the floor of the House. That will be the first filter through which these regulations will pass in this Chamber.

Mr. Shannon: That used to be the procedure.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It may have been, but I can see the wisdom of the late Hon. Mr. Rudall in appointing this committee so that it could have an initial look at regulations, and thereby save much valuable time that would otherwise be lost by having to debate the issues in the House. Much time will be saved by having a better-balanced committee to scrutinize the relevant matters in the first place. Reference has been made to the fact that there is a shortage of Government members in another place to meet the needs of committees. I believe it would not be contrary to Standing Orders to appoint a Minister to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. During all the years that the Liberal and Country League was in Government in this State it did not do this sort of thing to the Opposition. This is not a good start for the Government; it will hardly improve its public image if on its first day in Parliament it uses its majority to prevent the Opposition from having representation on this committee.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the statements made by members on this side of the House, and I express disapproval at what is happening here this afternoon. At the outset I was almost prepared to concede that the Government had misjudged the situation, and that it would reconsider the motion, as it was invited to do by the Leader of the Opposition. However, as the discussion has progressed it has become evident that this is far from the Government's mind. It appears that, whatever else happens, the Government will insist that there is to be no member from this side of the House on the Subordinate Legislation Committee. This committee is of value not only to Parliament but also to the Government itself. I believe it was unique in the Parliaments of the Empire (as it was then called) when it was first established. It has been of wonderful service to Parliament ever since it has been functioning. Honourable members place implicit trust in it, and Party politics has been kept at a minimum. Indeed, I do not believe that Party politics has ever entered into the functioning of this committee.

Mr. Clark: Could you imagine an Opposition member being Chairman of the committee?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have never even thought about who would be Chairman. I do not remember any dissension about the election of any member or about the appointment of the Chairman before this debate. In my experience in this Parliament this is unique. The Government is preventing representation from one side of the House on the committee.

Mr. Clark: You do not see the point.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member can explain fully what he means when he speaks. However, I wish he would explain his point then rather than by interjection now. I believe that he will receive a better hearing from Opposition members than I am receiving. This committee has a history of co-operation which, I am afraid, will be sadly lacking in future. Recently the Premier announced that this session would be longer than usual and I believe that one reason for this will be that Opposition members will have to do more work on subordinate legislation as they will have no member on the committee from whom to receive advice. It is important to have some assistance in this respect. The only purpose of this committee is to assist members in their deliberations on subordinate legislation. Membership on the committee should not be looked at merely as a job; it is a committee that should assist all members, but I am afraid that it will not assist the Opposition in the way it should.

From time to time all Opposition members have expressed their confidence in, and supported the principle of, local government, but this procedure cannot be expected to meet with the approval of local government. I believe that we owe it to local government to see that both sides of the House are represented on the committee. The Government should support the Leader's moderate suggestion and endeavour to include an Opposition member on the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I have not referred to the candidature of any person in particular, although I should entirely support the nomination of the member for Burnside. However, I am not speaking of personalities: I am merely trying to point out to the Government that on the first day of the session it is making a mistake in not providing for an Opposition member to be appointed to this important committee.



Mr. HALL (Gouger): I agree with the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) that this committee would be the most important one a member has to deal with in the representation of his district. We need only look at those matters in which we have all been involved. The committee deals with matters affecting people from all walks of life. The decisions of the committee affect not only people in industry and those administering Government departments but also the ordinary citizens. We know of the diverse matters that the committee deals with, ranging from the prevention of fires to such questions as preservatives in sausage meat. It deals with matters associated with traffic. As the honourable member who has just resumed his seat has said, local government figures very largely in matters brought before this committee.

Here we are to have the Opposition in this House denied a proper window into the Subordinate Legislation Committee. As the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has said, we have heard much about the rights of minorities, yet under the present proposal we have the immediate removal of this right of a voice for the Opposition. I say it is always too early to grow sloppy in the proper administration of Parliamentary affairs, and the first sitting day of this Parliament is certainly too early an occasion to get careless and sloppy about this matter. If these nominations are approved and we have three members from the Government benches and none from the Opposition, it is conceivable that a remedy will be found for the present situation which apparently prevents a Government member in another place from taking a place on this committee. Who knows what the future legislation in this House will be? If we appoint three Government members from this House and legislation is introduced to alter the Statute to enable a Government member in the Legislative Council to sit upon the committee, where will we be here? We will have lost our representation, even though the reasons advanced now by the Government have disappeared.

I repeat that we on this side of the House want a better deal on the first day of sitting from a Party which campaigned strongly during the elections with a slogan of fair play. One of the things it neglected to tell the people was that it would come to this House and deprive the Opposition of its rightful place on this committee. I seek a ballot on the question so that the matter may be tested properly and we may express our opinions on it.

The SPEAKER: A ballot having been demanded, it must be held. In those circumstances, at this stage I intend to put to the House the first part of the question: "That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present Parliament of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in accordance with Joint Standing Orders Nos. 19 to 31." The debate can proceed on that basis only, the demand for a ballot having been made. I call on the honourable member for Burra.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): That rather steals my thunder, Sir, but I am in complete accord. In my 24 years in this House this question has never had to be decided by a ballot, and never has the Opposition been denied its rights as a minority on committees such as this.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It was not an analogous situation, of course!

Mr. QUIRKE: Of course it was not, but that does not make any difference to the ideas underlying it. It seems that this Government, starting out at the beginning of its political life as a Government, is going to use the hammer. That is what is being used today.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not pursue that argument at this stage. The question of the appointment of the personnel of the committee is not before the House at this juncture. A ballot has been demanded.

Mr. QUIRKE: I will not discuss the ballot beyond saying that this is a good way to resolve the difficulty as it will allow an expression of opinion by members on this side. It will not make any difference because no-one on the other side of the House will dare to vote against it.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): This is an occasion on which free speech is being denied the Leader of the Government by the call for a ballot, as I now have no chance to explain this matter. I hasten to assure the Opposition that further matters have to be considered before six o'clock, but members opposite have usurped much of the time this afternoon to discuss this matter. Perhaps the Opposition will accuse me of not giving sufficient time for questions. If it wants it that way it can have it. I say now that, in the interests of the people responsible for conducting business in this place, the House will adjourn before six o'clock this evening.

I believe that any Government is entitled to have a majority representation on a committee. We know that, because of the constitution of

the Public Works Committee, and because of the set-up in the past, the four Labor members in the Legislative Council, representing the Government in that place, cannot take a seat on the Subordinate Legislation Committee. To the suggestion that a Minister be appointed to the committee, which has been advanced here today, I can only say that that would be most impracticable, because of the volume of work confronting Ministers at present. It would not be fair to ask a Minister of the Crown to be a member of this committee. I am willing to introduce legislation on this matter at the appropriate time and as early as possible, but if representation is to be in the nature of one to one from another place, it will be three to two from this place. I do not intend to speak further on the composition of this committee.

I am most surprised that there is no co-ordination between the two Chambers regarding this matter. Why should there be so much divergence of opinion that members opposite and their colleagues in another place are unable to meet as a Party? There will be a Party system of government—make no mistake about that! We believe we are entitled to have at least equal representation on this committee, and the only way this can be done is in the way I have indicated. I am not reflecting on the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele), but the Government is endeavouring to resolve a problem. Representation on other committees will have to be considered, and the Government will have to attempt to alter the position. A ballot has been called for, and I am not prepared to withdraw my nominations.

*While the ballot was being taken:*

The SPEAKER: Honourable members will strike out the names of the three members for whom they wish to vote. I call on the Premier, as the mover of the motion, to act as scrutineer.

*The ballot having been taken:*

The SPEAKER: As a result of the ballot, Messrs. Burdon, Langley and McKee will be the representatives of this House on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council in accordance with the report already received.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): May we know the terms of the message, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Jennings: The same as they have always been.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You wouldn't know!

Mr. Jennings: I do know. I have heard them for 12 years and they are the same as they have always been.

The SPEAKER: The message states:

Mr. President, the House of Assembly requests the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present Parliament of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in accordance with Joint Standing Orders Nos. 19-31. The members to represent the Assembly on the committee will be Messrs. Burdon, Langley and McKee.

Motion carried.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That a committee consisting of Mr. Broomhill, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Hudson and Lawn, and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report on Tuesday, May 18.

Motion carried.

#### QUESTIONS

##### ADMINISTRATION OF ACTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Governor's Speech referred to Ministers' responsibilities. As a number of matters covered by Acts of Parliament, such as the Prices Act, do not come within the scope of any of the regular Ministries, will the Premier have a paper prepared setting out the Ministries and the Acts that will be under the control of the respective Ministers?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I shall be pleased to do that.

##### EGG MARKETING.

Mr. BURDON: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of a statement which appeared in yesterday's country edition of the *Advertiser* giving details of a meeting held at Murray Bridge on Monday evening, May 10, relating to the proposed Commonwealth egg marketing plan? The press report of that meeting quoted one of my constituents as saying that South Australian poultry farmers were largely dependent on the Victorian market, and that the introduction of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities' plan would mean the collapse of this market. The meeting apparently decided to canvass a petition asking for a referendum of South Australian poultry keepers on the adoption of the C.E.M.A. plan. As legislation was passed last session

to permit the holding of a poll if the Government considered this necessary, will the Minister say why he did not arrange for a poll?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am aware that such a meeting was held at Murray Bridge on Monday evening, and I have a report of that meeting before me. The honourable member said that a constituent of his, a Mr. Yoannides, had raised certain aspects relating to the C.E.M.A. plan. I have also noticed that Mr. Yoannides, in letters in the *Border Watch*, has referred to the C.E.M.A. plan, and I believe that quite a few of the statements he has made are not correct. For instance, he said that poultry farmers were not aware of, and had not been acquainted with, the purposes of the C.E.M.A. plan. However, I recall that meetings were held at Nuriootpa, Adelaide and Murray Bridge, when the C.E.M.A. plan was adopted by poultry farmers. At the Nuriootpa and Adelaide meetings the plan was adopted unanimously and, at the Murray Bridge meeting, with the exception of six at a meeting of more than 200, all present voted in favour of the scheme. The scheme was explained fully to the poultry farmers. It was well reported in the newspaper at that time, and subsequently many reports have been issued through the press as to the effects of the C.E.M.A. plan. Therefore, Mr. Yoannides is not correct when he says that poultry farmers are not aware of the scheme. I did notice, too, that a committee was appointed to canvass for signatures to petitions, and the members of this committee, according to reports I have had from Murray Bridge, are a lady and her son (who are now the receiving depot for eggs for another State), a wheat and woolgrower, an employee of the P.M.G.'s Department, and a poultry farmer. I shall watch with interest the petition, if it comes in, to see what signatures it contains.

The honourable member asked why I did not call for a poll. I point out that this was not obligatory. The Act passed and assented to last year stipulated that the Minister may call for a poll of poultry farmers on this issue. Within a day of my being appointed Minister I had a telephone call from Colonel McArthur (Chairman of the C.E.M.A. plan) asking me whether I would receive him to discuss this matter with him. I agreed that I would do so at the earliest opportunity. I asked Mr. Anderson (Chairman of the Egg Board) to attend the meeting, and Colonel McArthur told me of the urgency for the

implementation of this plan because of the chaotic condition of the industry. He told me further that he had sent a telegram to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Adermann) incorporating a resolution carried at a meeting of the Australian Egg Board, which stated:

That the Minister for Primary Industry be informed that the financial situation of the State Egg Boards is rapidly deteriorating to such an extent that it is impossible for them to carry on without the immediate introduction of the C.E.M.A. legislation. It would be unfortunate if the system of orderly marketing should collapse within a few months of the introduction of the C.E.M.A. legislation. As it is estimated that a drastic reduction of egg prices (in some States up to 2s. per dozen) is imminent under the present conditions, we request that the Federal Government give urgent consideration to accepting the responsibility for the immediate implementation of the C.E.M.A. legislation.

The Chairman of the Egg Board informed me that there were 4,200,000 dozen eggs in shell, and 9,000 tons of egg pulp in surplus this year. I was urged to agree with the other States of the Commonwealth, because they had agreed previously that this legislation should be introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament. Both Colonel McArthur and Mr. Anderson told me that unless the legislation was introduced quickly the coming spring season would be chaotic in the industry. I received an urgent telegram from Mr. Adermann asking me to accept the proposal. Cabinet agreed that this was an urgent matter and, as I agreed in principle, legislation was introduced quickly by the Commonwealth Parliament. In his second reading explanation, the Minister for Primary Industry stated in the House of Representatives:

The end result of this type of situation will be chaos in the egg marketing system and the State Egg Boards themselves will be forced to trade interstate in competition with their own producers if they are to survive. No board or individual will be prepared to sell on the export market, and cut-throat competition on the Australian market will force prices down until eventually they are at approximately the same level as the export prices.

The export price is a little over 1s. a dozen at present. The matter was urgent and I, with other Cabinet members, agreed to the implementation of this legislation which, I have been told today, has passed all stages in the House of Representatives. With the exception of two members, one on each side of the House, all other members supported the Bill, and this illustrates the importance of the matter to the Commonwealth Government. One Liberal member (Mr. Jeff Bate) said, in

effect, that he thought there should be a poll, and he moved that way, but the motion lapsed for want of a seconder. This proved to me that other States of the Commonwealth favoured the scheme and, as it was urgent that this legislation should be introduced this session, there was no time for a poll. The former Government had the opportunity after passing the legislation last year to conduct a poll, had it wished to do so. A poll was not refused, but one was not conducted. That is the reason for the urgency now. Had the legislation been accepted when first proposed in 1961 the levy would have been 3s. 7d. Because of the surplus, the legislation provides that the levy shall not exceed 7s. this year. Of course, it will vary from time to time, according to the surplus for export; the smaller the surplus the smaller the levy.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Could the levy go beyond 7s. next year?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I believe an amendment was carried to the effect that it could not go beyond 10s. It will not be in excess of 7s. this year, but I am not prepared to say what might happen next year.

#### ATHELSTONE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Education tell me when the new Athelstone Primary School is expected to be ready for occupation, and what the Government intends to do with the old primary school on Gorge Road when it is vacated?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member early next week.

#### PORT PIRIE HARBOUR.

Mr. McKEE: The Minister of Marine indicated some time ago that he would visit Port Pirie to inspect the launching of small trailer boats and the facilities for mooring small craft there. Can he say when he will make that visit?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I propose to travel to Port Pirie on June 6 and spend all day Monday (June 7) and part of the Tuesday in the honourable member's and the Speaker's districts.

#### WINE GRAPE PRICES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Early in March, before the present Government took office, I approached the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) and referred to him the plight of some grapegrowers in my district who were unable to dispose of their grapes at the prices fixed by the Prices Commissioner.

I was informed that he had convened a meeting of some of the winemakers' representatives for March 8, when the matter would be dealt with in an attempt to solve the problem. After the present Government came into office I mentioned the matter to the Premier, who said he would meet representatives of winemakers. I understand that he has had several conferences with them. On April 13 the *Advertiser* reported that the President of the Wine Grape Growers' Council had said that the Premier had promised to instigate an investigation to improve the position of growers. The press also stated on the same page that the Premier had said he considered an investigation into the winemaking industry by a Royal Commission was essential. Will such an investigation be made? If so, when will it be made and will it be by a Royal Commission?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The honourable member's questions touch on policy and some time has elapsed since he approached me. Not having been sufficiently informed about what the winemakers are prepared to pay or of the exact tonnage likely to be surplus, I have not been able to get the desired information from the appropriate authority. As soon as the Government has made up its mind on what form the inquiry should take, I will answer the honourable member's other questions. Many matters are involved, including discontent among the grapegrowers and winemakers, as well as a proposal to process the wine. Instead of exporting it, it is proposed to convert it into brandy to save space. That is as far as I am prepared to go at the moment.

#### ELIZABETH OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. CLARK: For some time, as the Minister of Education probably knows, I have been interested in the establishment of an occupation centre for retarded children at Elizabeth. I understand that this is now to come to pass and that the Minister has details of it. Am I correct in assuming that the centre will serve also the surrounding districts of Salisbury and Gawler?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: An occupation centre has been approved for the Elizabeth area. It will be established in a double unit Housing Trust house at 93-95 Sampson Road, a short distance from the Elizabeth Grove shopping centre, pending the erection of a departmental centre on a site held at Elizabeth. This occupation centre will serve about 20 children in the Elizabeth, Salisbury and nearby districts.

## STANDING ORDERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Premier will remember that he was a member of the Standing Orders Committee that made a report to this House during the last Parliament. I hope he realizes that it contains some important suggestions about the streamlining of Standing Orders. Can he say whether the new Cabinet has considered Standing Orders and whether the Government intends to bring down a Bill to amend them in accordance with that report?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I believe the Cabinet intends to do so.

## TEROWIE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: During the last Parliament I directed many questions to the Government about an adequate water supply for Terowie. I also suggested several schemes, any one of which would give that town an adequate and permanent water supply. Can the Minister of Works say whether his department has looked into this matter and, if it has, what is the present position?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: From investigations made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, it is evident that a water supply to Terowie from any source would be a very costly proposition and one which the Engineer-in-Chief could not recommend at the present time. If in the future a working arrangement could be made with the Railways Commissioner for the supply of water from the Yongala reservoir and wells this source of supply would undoubtedly provide the cheapest method of supplying Terowie. As the matter stands at present, a supply from this source is not practicable but the position will be reviewed after rail standardization is completed.

## STUDENT TEACHERS.

Mr. McANANEY: As student teachers have been led to believe that their allowances will be increased, can the Minister of Education say when a decision will be made on that matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Increases for student teachers have already been considered, and a statement will soon be made on what is being recommended.

## MILLICENT SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Minister of Education say when tenders are likely to be called for the erection of the Millicent South Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member early next week.

## CADELL IRRIGATION.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On September 24 last year, the then Minister of Irrigation, in reply to a question, said that he had allocated £21,250 from Loan funds for the completion, before June 30, 1965, of the first stage of a £36,750 programme for the rehabilitation of the Cadell drainage system. When will that work commence?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member was good enough to inform my office that he intended to ask this question and I have the following report for him:

The reconditioning of sections of the Cadell main drain system and installation of a new caisson and pumping unit at an estimated cost of £37,000 were approved in 1964. It was anticipated that the first stage of the work would be completed during 1964-65. However, the urgent need for improved irrigation facilities in another area prevented a start being made at Cadell. Arrangements are now in hand for the full programme to be undertaken during 1965-66 and provision has been made accordingly for the Loan funds involved. Tenders for replacing sections of the main drain will be called very shortly.

## ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM.

Mr. JENNINGS: During the recent election campaign, the then Premier said at a meeting at Prospect (which, I think, was attended by about 25 people) that he was able to decide what would be done with the Islington sewage farm. I had been probing into this matter for a long time with the then Minister and had not received a satisfactory answer. Can the Minister of Works say why the then Premier had such prescience?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not know what was said by the then Premier. However, the previous Government appointed a committee composed of the Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Jackman), the Railways Commissioner (Mr. Fargher) and the Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan) that is now considering the sewage farm referred to by the honourable member. I expect a report soon and when it is at hand I shall inform the honourable member accordingly.

## RAILWAY FINANCES.

Mr. HEASLIP: In the *Advertiser* of March 24 appeared an article under the heading, "Rail Future 'Is Bright'", which stated:

The Premier (Mr. Walsh) yesterday forecast a bright future for the railways in South Australia. . . . The Premier was opening the biennial conference of the South Australian Division of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemmen at the Trades Hall.

. . . The Government intended that the railways should earn at least another £1,000,000 a year. State Cabinet had turned down a proposal for a silo at Appila because it was nowhere near a railways system.

Can the Premier say whether he was correctly reported and, if he was, will he enlarge on the reason given for the refusal of the proposal for a wheat silo at Appila and say what relation that refusal has to the increased railway earnings?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The answer to the first part of the honourable member's question is "Yes"; I consider that I was reported reasonably correctly. The answer to the second part of the question is "No".

#### PORTFOLIOS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The two portfolios most closely affecting primary production in the State are those of Agriculture and Lands, which are to be administered by one Minister. Can the Premier say whether this is intended to be a permanent arrangement or whether any re-arrangement is likely later?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: This position will certainly not be permanent. Certain amendments will have to be made to the Constitution Act and if they are favourably considered by Parliament (as I hope they will be) it can be taken for granted that this temporary arrangement will not be carried on for any longer than is necessary. The Minister has told me that he is really wrapped up in the two departments at present. The Government will review the matter as soon as possible.

#### CADETSHIPS.

Mr. HUDSON: Public Service cadetships are advertised as being tenable for a certain number of years, usually three years. However, the successful applicant discovers that the rate of remuneration under the cadetship begins on the day the cadet commences his or her course of study. As a result, the cadet gets paid for only 2 years 10½ months or less, instead of the full three years as advertised. Students who receive teachers college scholarships are paid from January 1, even though their courses of study do not begin until early in February. Furthermore, any cadet taking a cadetship invariably incurs some expense, often considerable, prior to the commencement of his course of study. In view of these facts, will the Premier take up the matter with his colleague, the Chief Secretary, to see whether all Public Service cadetships can

commence from January 1, thereby giving each cadet an effective term of three years and not a lesser term as at present?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I will ask the Chief Secretary to supply a report, and as soon as it is available I will make its contents known to the House.

#### SERVICE PAY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The subject of service pay was referred to in His Excellency's Speech. I have received correspondence to the effect that the Government has made a decision that service pay will be made available only to members of unions, and that a circular has been issued to that effect. Can the Premier say whether it is a Government decision that service pay will be paid only to unionists, and whether the Government has approved of the circular issued to that effect?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have not seen any circular such as that. To the best of my knowledge it is not Government policy to do what has been suggested, and the Government has not issued such a circular.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ARTERIO-SCLEROSIS.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.  
Leave granted.

Mr. LAWN: During the recess the previous Speaker had a circular delivered to members containing a replica of a letter received by him from the Australian Journalists Association, together with his reply. The association's letter complained about the objections made by members in this House to newspaper reporting of their speeches last session. In fact, the reporting is just as bad today. Portion of the association's letter stated:

The next day, Mr. Lawn told a reporter in the corridor outside the *Advertiser* room at Parliament House that if he had realized his errors, he would not have "raised the matter at all" on September 1. He admitted that he did not see in the *Advertiser* of August 28 the report of his personal statement made in the House the previous day.

Frequently last year, by correspondence to the then Premier, by questions in the House and by certain remarks, I endeavoured to obtain from the Government a decision to permit the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals to provide for the citizens of South Australia the method of treatment of arteriosclerosis being used in West Germany. I emphasize "method of treatment". Following my remarks in this House, the *Advertiser* on the front

page, well displayed and in large letters, claimed that I had urged the registration of alien doctors. On the same afternoon the *News* printed a statement by Sir Philip Messent, on behalf of the Australian Medical Association, criticizing my alleged remarks.

I obtained leave to make a personal explanation and explained that I was seeking a form of treatment adopted in another country and not the registration of foreign doctors. Later, in the corridor of the House the reporter concerned asked what I had said on the previous day. I told him, and he asked, "What does the *Advertiser* say this morning?" I told him, and he then said there was no difference. I reiterated that I had said I wanted a form of treatment given in West Germany to be adopted here. I also said, "Your paper said that I wanted the registration of alien doctors." He said, "What is the difference?" For about 10 minutes I tried to explain, and I was about to give up in despair when he reluctantly agreed to make the correction I had urged by publishing the words I had used in the House. Members will recall that I asked that the correction be displayed as conspicuously as was the inaccurate report, which appeared on the front page.

After waiting for two or three days and not noticing the correction, I raised the matter again in the House, and only one member

out of 39 told me that he had seen the correction. I said, "I did not see it; I am sorry now that I raised the matter." Later, when I had occasion to go to the floor above to dictate letters, I met two *Advertiser* reporters and was about to apologize to them. In fact, I got as far as saying that I was sorry, when the reporter concerned apologized to me. He said, "I am sorry the correction was not made. I sent in the correction. If they do not print it, I am not to blame." I then explained to him that I had been informed by a member in the House that the correction had been printed. He said, "It has been?" I said, "Yes." He said, "I did not see it." I said, "Neither did I. Had I seen it I would not have raised the matter. I am sorry I raised it." I never use the word "error", as the reporter would have realized if he had known me better; if I am referring to a mistake I use the word "mistake". No mistake was made on my part. If a mistake was made, it was made by the reporter in saying that I was seeking the registration of alien doctors, whereas I wanted adopted a form of treatment that had been adopted in West Germany.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 18, at 2 p.m.