

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, July 25, 1962.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****HIGH TENSION POLES.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.  
Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My question concerns a danger on Rakes Road and Hampstead Road. I notice that the roads have been considerably widened, but unfortunately a number of electric light poles (I believe they are called high tension poles) are 4ft. 6in. or more out of alignment with the kerbing. Can the Minister of Roads give the reason for leaving these poles in the position in which they are, whether any particular department is responsible for it, and does the Commissioner of Highways intend to allow the poles to be there for ever?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I am under the impression that the road work, which is usually the more difficult to get done, was ahead of the service facilities in this case. It will cost about £300 each to move the poles, but I believe they will be removed in due course. I will let the honourable member have a detailed report.

**POWDERED BUTTER.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: It was recently announced that a powdered butter had been developed by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. Is the Minister, representing the Minister of Agriculture, in a position to say how this development is likely to affect the butter industry in this State, and has any arrangement been made by the department seeking further information from the Commonwealth about the commercial possibilities of securing overseas markets for same?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I will put the question to the Minister of Agriculture and when I get the information I shall make it available to the honourable member.

**ARTIFICIAL BREEDING CENTRE.**

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture supply at a later date information regarding the progress being made at, and the possible time of the full functioning of, the artificial breeding centre at Northfield?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: As this question affects the Minister of Agriculture I shall get the information and make it available to the honourable member.

**IRON ORE DEPOSITS.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Can the Minister of Mines say whether the Government has received any applications to exploit the iron ore deposits in South Australia, and, if so, have any contracts been entered into with overseas interests to export iron ore from this State?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: South Australia possesses several deposits of various dimensions and I have been approached by different people on this subject. The main problem associated with the export of the ore is to obtain an economic price. In some cases the deposits comprise low-grade ore and it would be necessary to up-grade the ore, otherwise the freight charge to the port would more than eat up any profit margin obtainable. South Australia possesses immense deposits and we are particularly anxious to use any opportunities presented to us because, as honourable members know, other States also possess large deposits. If we could interest people to exploit the deposits here it would be advantageous to the State.

**MOUNT COMPASS TO NANGKITA ROAD.**

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Can the Minister of Roads inform me whether a traffic count has been taken recently on the Mount Compass to Nangkita Road, and has the Minister any idea of what the traffic count, if any, revealed?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I do not think a recent count has been taken on this road, but I will obtain information for the honourable member.

**STOCK CROSSINGS.**

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.  
Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members are aware that the Highways Department is constructing new bridges on main highways in various parts of the State. Some of the bridges necessarily have long approaches built on either side and when it is necessary to drive stock over this type of bridge much time is taken and traffic bottlenecks are caused. One of the best known examples is

the bridge at Dry Creek and it would be difficult to do anything in that case. However, in some cases where bridges are now being built alternative provisions can be made for stock crossings. In some cases the old bridges are used for stock and in other cases alternative methods may be found. Will the Minister of Roads consider the provision of alternative stock crossings where it is possible to do something to obviate traffic bottlenecks?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: This problem poses several difficulties. Firstly, if old bridges are left across creek beds and rivers and allowed to remain in a bad state of repair they could become a danger, particularly to children who may play on them. They may, however, be useful for stock crossings, in which case, if they are in a reasonable condition, I shall be pleased to see whether they can be retained. Secondly, we have railway level crossings, but are now building over-passes where possible. The Railways Commissioner will resist any suggestion that level crossings be left for the purpose of providing stock crossings where they may create grave risks to fast passenger or freight trains. I assure the honourable member that any individual case submitted by him will be examined.

#### BASIC WAGE.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: No provision exists under the Industrial Code under which to enforce the payment of the basic wage to male and female workers over the age of 21 years, unless such workers are covered by an award. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry take up with the Government the question of ensuring that the male and female basic wage is paid to these workers?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am prepared to do as the honourable member requests.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 24. Page 210.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, but before mentioning some of the things referred to in His Excellency's Speech, I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to congratulate you on your elevation to your high office. I am of opinion that it is well merited in view of the long service you have given to the State in this Chamber. I also congratulate the mover of

the motion, the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, and the seconder, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, on their excellent maiden speeches. The ordeal of my own maiden speech in this Chamber being still fresh in my memory, I can understand how the honourable members felt. I consider that the excellence of their speeches and the knowledge they displayed of South Australia's affairs indicated that they will add materially to the debates in this Chamber.

Reference was made in His Excellency's Speech to the death of four former members of Parliament—the Hon. F. J. Condon, the Hon. E. H. Edmonds, the Hon. E. Anthony, and Senator Rex Pearson. The first two members were well known to me, particularly the Hon. Mr. Condon, whom I knew very well for many years. I learned to appreciate his great work. Mr. Edmonds was not known to me for very long, but in the short time I was associated with him I came to appreciate his great sincerity and the many years of sterling service he had given to the State in this Chamber. Since the opening of Parliament, Mr. J. E. Stephens, who represented the Port Adelaide District for many years in the House of Assembly, has died. I also knew him very well. He was a great worker for the whole State, and particularly for Port Adelaide, which he represented so well. I extend to the relatives of those gentlemen my very sincere sympathy in their great loss.

Although I have risen to support the motion I want it to be understood that I do not necessarily support all the contents of the Governor's Speech. My interpretation of the motion is to thank the Governor for his opening of Parliament. It also gives an undertaking by this Chamber that due consideration will be given to all those matters referred to in the Speech. I also know that such consideration will be given to all matters that may be brought forward by the Party to which I am pleased to belong, or to anything brought forward by any individual member. I say that because I consider that some of the proposals mentioned in the Speech do not go far enough and also because some matters which I think would be for the benefit of the State have not been mentioned at all.

It was stated in paragraph 7 of the Speech that it was the Government's policy to develop an expanding, strong and varied economy to assure full employment, to establish a higher standard of living, and to improve education and hospital services.

I fear that I have little faith in the Government's ability to carry out its proposed policy

in relation to employment. As to full employment, no-one could convince me that we shall achieve this in the foreseeable future, unless there is a change of Government, both in the State and the Federal spheres. I say that advisedly because in the first place it has been proved by the actions of the Commonwealth Government that it does not believe in full employment. As we all know, the South Australian Government can go only so far in removing this blot as the Commonwealth Government will allow it to go. Without full employment how can we achieve the higher standard of living mentioned in the Governor's Speech? The wholesale unemployment that still exists is the result of the Commonwealth Government's policy, and despite the disapproval shown so strongly last December, very little has been done to improve the situation. Figures have been issued that show that we have with us much unemployment, a situation which should not exist.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The figures show that we are pretty good, don't they?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will show the honourable member that the figures for South Australia, although they have improved, have not improved as much as they should have.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Unemployment is Commonwealth wide.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will have something to say about that later. If honourable members will be patient they will hear the answer to such questions. It is evident that the Commonwealth Government does not believe in a policy of full employment.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What do you call full employment?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I can anticipate what the honourable member is going to say, because this is what appeared in a local newspaper under the heading "Full Employment Warning":

National leaders in the metal industries today questioned the wisdom of a policy of full employment and strongly criticized wage fixing by the Arbitration Commission.

That is apparent from the actions of the Commonwealth Government in relation to unemployment, and that may be why so little has been done by that Government to bring about full employment, such as we had at one time. We have people who talk about what we call full employment and also the situation of what they call over employment.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What do you call full employment—for every single person?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Everyone who desires to work should have the opportunity to get employment. Even on the latest figures, there are still approximately 93,000 people unemployed. The situation that existed at the height of the economic recession was the result of the Commonwealth Government's action. There were 112,000 people out of work at that time—that is all the Commonwealth Government will admit. Today we find that there are still 93,000 people unemployed.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Would they be skilled or unskilled?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: They are of all types. At the height of the recession there were 112,000 unemployed while today there are 93,000, which means that only 15 per cent of the 112,000 have found work. There are 85 people out of work today for every 100 people out of work at the height of the recession. These figures show that there has been only some small improvement.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: On some occasions there are no applications in answer to an advertisement offering employment.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: At Port Stanvac recently there were 1,000 applicants for just a few jobs.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: There are thousands who will not work, too.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It was mentioned that the rate of pay for these jobs averaged £27 a week, but it was a three-shift job. Honourable members are trying to imply that it is a weekly wage of £27, but this is not so, because it is an average after working three shifts and overtime, and that is not such a good wage. I have worked three shifts and know what it entails.

At the end of June this year 6,886 persons were unemployed in this State. In February, 1961, when many people were upset at the situation, and representatives of the trade union movement approached the Premier and told him the situation was bad, the unemployment position was not as bad as it is today. At that time the figure was 6,656, which was lower than at the end of June this year. People believe that a marvellous job has been done in South Australia, but there is that large number of people registered as out of work. What is going to happen in the next few months when 5,000 boys and 4,000 girls leave

school and add to the numbers looking for work at Christmas? Unless something more is done there could be 16,000 unemployed in this State at Christmas. The unemployment figure fell by 48 in June, but that is a small figure and does not make much difference.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do those figures refer to those receiving benefits or to those applying for jobs?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: They are people registered as unemployed.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Are they receiving benefits?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No, they would not be, because there is a means test for benefits and they have to be out of work for a time. Many people become unemployed and try to find another job without registering. Some find work for perhaps two or three days a week, but prefer to look for work themselves instead of registering for work. They are not included in these figures.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Yes they are.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: These figures show the people registered for employment. In my opinion something should have been done earlier for these people.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: In times of full employment, unfortunately there are about 4,000 people in this State who are unable to find a job or to keep one.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I cannot argue on those figures. Representatives of the trade union movement approached the Premier on a number of occasions early last year and pointed out the seriousness of the situation and asked that something be done then. Something has been done, but not as quickly and to the extent that it should have been. At the end of the financial year 1960-61 this State had a substantial surplus after making a grant to the Electricity Trust of a considerable sum, and this position indicates that not enough has been done. If effective action had been taken we would not have the hard core of unemployment that we have today, and which we are finding difficult to eliminate. There is no room for complacency about this matter. Members on this side of the House who have referred to this matter previously both inside and outside this Chamber have been called "calamity howlers" and "dismal Joes", but we are pointing out the seriousness of the situation and the reasons why something should be done. It is a calamity to the man who finds that he cannot meet his financial commitments

because of the lack of permanent work. He finds that many of his possessions are gradually being re-possessed by financial institutions because he cannot pay his bills as a result of being out of work.

What must be the feelings of the people who have been brought here from other countries on the promise of secure and permanent jobs, and then find they have not got that security? It would serve Australia much better if people, instead of soft pedalling, raised their voices in protest against the policy of too little too late. Recently the executive of the Australian Council of Trade Unions met and discussed the seriousness of the unemployment position and a report appeared in the *Advertiser*. I heartily agree with the policy as advanced by the A.C.T.U. If the Commonwealth Government would act upon it something could be done, but I am afraid it will not do that. The report in the *Advertiser*, under the heading "Work Policy Urged", states:

Melbourne, July 3.

The A.C.T.U. interstate executive today called for a Federal Government policy of full employment.

The policy must be one of eliminating the present pool of unemployment and providing future job opportunity for youth, the A.C.T.U. executive declared in submissions sent to the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies).

The submissions call for:

Restoration of selective and quantitative import controls so that employment levels may be raised in those Australian industries that have had to dismiss workers and curtail their production below capacity levels.

Lifting the purchasing power of the Australian people through a higher basic wage, margins and increased annual leaves.

A temporary review of the intake of migrants in the light of the present unemployment situation in Australia.

Reduced taxation on workers and others on low level incomes and reduced sales tax and other forms of indirect taxation on essential commodities as a means of increasing their purchasing power.

A progressive reduction in hours starting with those industries already affected by mechanization or other technological changes.

An increase in social services benefits, including child endowment and pensions and increased finance at minimum rates of interest for housing.

I agree with such a policy, and if it were applied our employment position would be greatly improved. Regarding hospital services, much has been said about the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I was present at the opening of the new East Wing, where there appears to be every modern convenience

for the use of the medical staff and patients. Undoubtedly it is a fine wing, and if it is an indication of what will be accomplished in further rebuilding we shall have nothing to fear when the hospital is compared with other hospitals. The people responsible for its design and construction should be commended.

I am convinced that something should be done urgently for our mental hospitals. Questions have been asked here and in another place about the Government's intentions, but the Premier said that nothing substantial could be done in the next financial year. The position is grave and action should be taken as soon as possible. It is apparently a live issue because public statements have been made about the hospitals. I visited the Parkside Mental Hospital in the company of several other people and, although some improvements have been attempted in recent years, I felt that the standard was not as high as it could have been, and that much of the accommodation for the patients was of a low standard because of overcrowding. In some wards it was difficult to move between the beds because of lack of space. In other wards patients slept in small cell-like cubicles. I thought the toilet facilities were much below standard in some wards. Some people who have been to the hospital since my visit have the same opinion, and despite what has been said concerning the high standard of mental hospitals in this State I still think that they are below standard. What I saw shocked me. I was surprised at the small number of medical staff in relation to the large number of patients. The general staff and the medical staff are to be commended for their work, and in particular the medical staff has achieved results, despite the overcrowding at the hospital and the low standard of the accommodation.

The present Deputy Medical Superintendent (Dr. Shea) has accepted a position in another State, and although we must congratulate him on being appointed to a higher position than he occupies here, it is unfortunate that a doctor of his ability should be lost to South Australia. Few people are being properly trained to treat people suffering from mental ill-health. Because of the great difficulty there will be in replacing Dr. Shea his departure from this State must be a great loss. Figures quoted regarding Callan Park Mental Hospital, to which Dr. Shea is going, show that 22 doctors attend 1,600 patients. I have been informed that 1,600 patients are at the Parkside Mental Hospital but only eight doctors. In New South Wales two different

universities have chairs of psychiatry. Although it is the policy in South Australia to establish such a chair at our university, one has not yet been established, although some effort has been made in the matter.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: The necessary provision has been built into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I realize that the idea is to go on with the matter, but it is an urgent matter, and until a chair is established and people are trained in the work, we shall be in our present unsatisfactory position. It takes years to train people to become efficient in this work, and the necessary action for that training should be taken soon. This matter of a chair is not new. By chance I came across a cutting from the *News* of June 20, 1960, which contained the following letter to the Editor:

A person who is mentally ill needs sympathetic and expert treatment, just as does a man with a broken arm, and he has often as much chance of being cured. Unfortunately it is true that victims of ill-health are shunned. It is true that many people who complain to their doctors of vague symptoms are given a course of tonic. It is no wonder the average suburban doctor often cannot recognize early symptoms of mental illness—he has had only about 30 hours of psychiatric training years ago. So it is a wonderfully encouraging sign to see the appeal for a Department of Mental Health at the University of Adelaide. This department will train doctors and students and be a source of information to teachers, parents, and ministers. The appeal for funds deserves the support of every thinking person.

The article was signed "Teacher" and appeared two years ago. The cry was for more doctors of this type, but despite the fact that this was the Government's policy we have not yet had it carried out. This is an urgent matter and mental hospital patients should receive the proper care that their illness deserves. They should be given an opportunity to return to a normal life with other people. These things have to be planned, but when the planning stage extends over such a lengthy period something must be done to hurry it up.

I conclude my remarks on this matter by reading from the *News* of July 23, 1962. The leading article is headed "Light in a dark world". It states the position reasonably and suggests that something should be done. It appears that members on this side of the Council often read articles from the *News* although we do not accept the view that the policy of that paper supports the Party I represent. That poses a most unusual situation where we find members of the Labor Party reading letters

from the local press when the leaders of that press, on most occasions, support another Party. The article states:—

New wider horizons in the treatment of mental illness are opening in Australia. An enlightened policy which should have been in force long ago has come into being.

South Australian mental hospitals now discharge 80 per cent of their patients within 12 months of admission—and the bulk of those go out within only three months. New drugs, mainly in the tranquilliser family, have given doctors the means of establishing therapeutic relationships with their patients in a fraction of the time it took formerly.

A more enlightened public attitude enables the mentally sick to be treated in a new context—as curable patients, not as monstrosities. Officialdom, faced with the proof of cures and the insistence of a number of dedicated doctors, has moved a long way towards meeting the challenge of mental sickness.

The appointment of the brilliant young South Australian psychiatrist, Dr. B. J. Shea, to run the Callan Park Mental Hospital is only the latest, the most striking evidence of the new policy in New South Wales.

The old stigma that attached to Callan Park will have been removed, as forgotten as the old surrounding walls. An enlarged and highly qualified psychiatric staff, working in new, attractive, airy wards, will create an utterly new atmosphere. In short, what was a lunatic asylum will become a general hospital for the mentally ill.

Under the new order, New South Wales has seen the introduction of psychiatric clinics, treatment for mental illness in general hospitals, and out-patient and day treatment for mental patients. South Australia has most of these things in some measure. But there is still a woeful shortage of trained medical and nursing staff in all our mental hospitals. There are shortages and inadequacies in accommodation.

It is to be hoped that these things will be remedied in the near future. The doctors now have the ability to beat the major threat of mental illness. All they need are better facilities, and full public and official support.

I wish now to refer to paragraph 9 of His Excellency's Speech referring to the Industrial Code. The Code has been in force since 1920, although a number of attempts have been made by the Labor Party to amend this important piece of legislation and bring it up to date. Our most recent attempt was made last year. However, the Code is still much the same as it was in 1920. The measures we attempted to introduce last year had the full support of the South Australian trade union movement. During the debate on the Industrial Code Amendment Bill the Premier was reported to have said that meetings, at which agreement had been reached, had been held between employers and the trade union movement. He also said he proposed to

introduce a Bill this year dealing with matters upon which agreement had been reached. However, I am aware that agreement was reached only on matters of a minor nature that were, in effect, the changing of words, bringing the Code up to date, or dealing with situations that had gone out of existence. No great improvements were to be effected in the Code from the trade union point of view or from the employers' point of view.

The employers were adamant in their objections to the amendments desired by the trade union movement and the trade union movement was equally opposed to accepting in their entirety the suggestions of the employers. However, both sides agree that there is room for improvement, the difficulty arising on the point at which they can get together and agree on some acceptable compromise. No agreement has been reached that is likely to improve the Code to any extent, yet there is much room for improvement.

Some sections of the Code are ineffective in today's experience and they do not carry out the purpose for which they were introduced. Amendments should be made particularly to those sections dealing with the safety of workers and the provision of hygienic conditions in factories. I have been reliably informed by the appropriate trade union that one section of the Code requiring consideration deals with foundries. The union has found that some foundries in South Australia are in a shocking state of disrepair and in some cases the floors are so uneven that the conveyance of molten metal across them creates a serious hazard. I am informed that the Code, or perhaps the Factories Act, do not help the position. I am also told that attempts have been made to get an improvement, but that there is difficulty in providing proper safeguards. New South Wales has a provision relating to factories that is very effective. If the present Code does not control this kind of thing, it should be amended accordingly.

Another situation exists in relation to men working alone on power-driven machinery. I understand that the Code does not cover this position. They may be working at night without being within sight or hearing of other employees to whom they could appeal for assistance if something went wrong. I know one employee who worked on a machine at night when alone, without anyone to whom he could call for help. His hand became entangled in the machine and he was left in agony until the day shift workers came on to relieve him.

Because that kind of thing exists, provision has been made in the Commonwealth legislation forbidding an employee to work on a power-driven machine unless he is within sight or hearing of another employee. It is a wise provision and if something similar had been included in our Industrial Code the accident to which I referred may not have happened. Provision should also be made in the Code covering interpretation of "employee" and "employer". Steps should also be taken relating to subcontracting where a contractor may contract to build a number of houses or undertake some other type of work and sublet it among other contractors. We find that some people contract for materials only and subcontract the labour to another group. I am reliably informed that in some instances a group of people have agreed to do a job at such and such a price for the labour for the erection of a certain number of houses. Although it may be held that this is subcontracting, in my opinion it is piecework. There seems to be room for an interpretation to be included in the Code to get over that problem. Because they may be termed "subcontractors" they work outside the provisions of awards and are not covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act. We find that they work at all hours, such as at weekends, in order to get the equivalent of the wage paid to someone working on a weekly-hire basis. Something should be done to clarify the position and prevent this unfair competition, where we find men working and sweating to get the equivalent of a certain wage, when they should be working on a weekly wage.

Unless the Government is prepared to accept proposals for amendments other than those on which unanimous agreement has been reached between the Trades and Labor Council and employers' organizations the Code will not be improved to any great extent. There should be not only minor amendments, but major amendments which I think are of great importance and they should be included in any Bill brought forward to amend the Code this session.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the motion and in doing so congratulate both the mover and the seconder on their maiden speeches. It must always be something of an ordeal to make a first speech in Parliament. It is not easy at any time to address members of this Chamber because it is unlike any other form of public debate. However much it may be thought to the contrary, this is not a place for the delivery of an intimate speech, or where one may indulge

in flights of oratory. Therefore, our two new colleagues are to be commended for their excellent speeches. Both obviously have enlightened interests in the affairs of their districts and the welfare of the State generally. We look forward to many fine contributions from them.

I also join with the mover and seconder in paying my tribute to the work and personalities of former members who have died in recent months. I shall not mention them by name, but shall add a little to what has already been said by other speakers respecting the Hon. Sir Walter Duncan. Successive Parliaments become linked with the names of outstanding personalities, and Sir Walter was and is one such personality. We who came here in the last Parliament as new members will, I am sure, later in our lives say to others who are junior to us in service, with a certain amount of pride and nostalgia, "Of course, we were here in Sir Walter's time". We are all very pleased to have his friendly figure still in the background of the work being done in this Chamber and in the political life of the State. I also take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. President, upon your appointment to your high office. You are highly respected by all honourable members and we express the hope that your term will be long and happy.

I, with other honourable members, welcome the news of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh to this State next year. We all remember the happy and successful tour that Her Majesty made in 1954, and we are eager to greet her once more. All honourable members will join with me in expressing keen interest in the forthcoming visit of the King and Queen of Thailand. They come to us from a country which is old in tradition and which is an honourable ally of Australia as a member of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization. I am sure they will be given a royal welcome by the people of South Australia.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying how disappointed I was at certain parts of the speech of the Leader of the Labor Party in this Chamber, the Hon. Mr. Shard. He began well, and made a good point when he referred to the need to build a festival hall, and on this matter he would have the support of all honourable members.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Do you include Ministers in that?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I hope they are interested in it, and I am sure the Government must be giving serious consideration to it. The regular holding of the festival will emphasize the need for a suitable hall, and I hope that an amount for this purpose will be included soon in the Estimates.

When the Leader of the Opposition came to the burning issues of the election results and the events which followed those results, I thought he was going to seize on this subject like a tiger, but alas, he turned out to be a newspaper tiger. The honourable member read a long series of extracts from a variety of interstate and local newspapers, and he produced the extracts with the extraordinarily naive suggestion that they were the spontaneous reflection of public opinion.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Weren't they?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: This was absurd enough, but more so from the Leader of a Party which always seems to be thumping the table—and there was a light thump from the Hon. Mr. Kneebone this afternoon—when it says that newspapers are always against the Party, are always trying to influence the public against its policies, or always supporting the policies of the Liberal Party. Having read the extracts, he then referred to the gerrymander.

We hear much about this gerrymander and today the word is so bandied about that I thought it may be worth some time on research. Although honourable members have probably heard the explanation before, it may well bear repeating, because the word has a very colourful origin. In the year 1812 a certain statesman, Elbridge Gerry, was Governor of Massachusetts in the United States of America, and the Democrats in that year, in order to secure an increased representation in the State legislature, dissected the State in such a way that the shapes of the towns in the County of Essex formed a certain outline. One day a well-known painter when visiting a newspaper editor noticed on the walls of the editor's room a map showing the electoral districts. The map took his fancy and with a pencil he added a few strokes to put a head, wings and claws on the outline of one particular district, and said to the editor, "That will do for a salamander". The editor, being quick-witted, said "No, a gerrymander". That is how the word came to be a proverb. Incidentally, a salamander is a lizard-like animal supposed to live in and be able to endure fire. The dictionary definition

of "gerrymander" is "a method of arranging and drawing electoral districts so that the political party making the arrangement will be enabled to elect a greater number of representatives than they could on some fair system".

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Then it cannot be applied to a unanimous decision of Parliament.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: That is what I am coming to. The Leader of the Opposition well knows that this type of juggling with electoral boundaries and drawing salamander-like shapes on the electoral map have not been done in this State. In 1955 a system of electoral districts and boundaries was proposed by an independent commission appointed by this Government, in fact, by this Parliament, and the Labor Party in that year voted unanimously for those boundaries. The Hon. Mr. Shard pretended to be ignorant of this matter but the record in *Hansard* is quite plain and reads, "There being no dissenting voice the Bill was read a second time", and the same entry appears for the third reading. When the honourable member was shaken on this point he shifted to another topic, and accused the Government of conspiring to defeat the ends of political justice, whatever that may mean, by nominating an Independent member as Speaker in another place. This is an outrageous statement to make, and I suggest that his mention of a prize and his pointed reference to monetary allowances may have landed him in real trouble if he had said what he did outside the confines of this Chamber. When he was challenged on this point he deflated his case again and said, with a certain agility of mind, that he had said nothing uncomplimentary.

He then stated that what was really asked for was electoral reform with justice for everyone, and something that was reasonably fair. One would think from what we read in the newspapers that this Government is not approaching the question of electoral reform with any sense of responsibility. One has only to take up the papers and see cartoons and read statements of opinions of journalists to get the impression that the Government of this State is completely irresponsible. The Speech which His Excellency delivered in this Chamber to open Parliament is a testimony to the way in which the Government has carried out its obligations to the people of this State. I am convinced



that if something responsible and reasonably fair is not worked out by the Government and accepted by Parliament it will be because of the attitude adopted by individual members of the Labor Party. If it were not for the attitude adopted by some of these members a different result might have occurred on the recent propositions. I am convinced that the Government will adopt a responsible attitude in this matter, and what is eventually brought down will be consistent with the rights of all sections of the community.

I now turn to a matter that should be actively concerning all citizens. I refer to the ever-mounting toll of deaths on our roads, particularly in the metropolitan area. Day after day we read in the press that people of all ages and from all walks of life are killed in road accidents. The figures are alarming. In Australia for the year ended June 30, 1961, as many as 2,542 people were killed on the roads and 60,749 injured. This road toll is a greater cause of deaths than cancer, but it is interesting to note the different philosophical attitude adopted by people concerning these matters. In the age group from 15 to 44, in 1961 deaths from cancer in Australia totalled 1,087, but in the same age group 1,261 were killed in road accidents. However, the main result of such accidents is not killing but maiming. For example, in South Australia more than 35 people were injured for every one killed on the roads. Cancer exists in all countries, but there has been no suggestion that nothing can or should be done about it. We are constantly being asked in a public campaign to "fight cancer with a cheque and a check-up". The present cancer appeal in South Australia has raised £72,500 from the general public.

Why do people accept as inevitable that more people must die on the roads? With cancer there is always present the fear that "It could happen to me", but with road accidents people say "The chances are that I will not have one". They say, "I have some control over the matter of road accidents", but the figures do not support that argument. South Australia, with one-eleventh of the Australian population, had one-eighth of the total number of road accidents in which people were injured last year. On our roads last year 203 people were killed, 90 in the metropolitan area and 113 in the country. The number injured was 7,665, more than 20 a day. The number of accidents reported was 19,779, and accidents are reported only if there is damage of £50 or more or a person is injured. Of these accidents 13,586

were in the metropolitan area and 6,193 in the country. The people who think their chances of having an accident are no greater than previously should compare present-day figures with figures of five years ago. I have already given the figures for the year ended June 30, 1961. Now I give figures for the year ended June 30, 1956. In that year 3,709 people were injured, and, therefore, in five years the figure has more than doubled. The population of the State has not doubled in that time, and the number of motor vehicles and driving licences has not increased by 50 per cent in the period.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: I think the honourable member is wrong. The number has trebled in 15 years.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I have given the figures that I obtained and there has not been anything like the increase in the number of motor vehicles and driving licences as in the number of road accidents. What is causing these shocking statistics, and what can be done about the matter? The first question is not difficult to answer, but it is difficult to find an answer to the second question. According to the report by the Commissioner of Police for the year ended June 30, 1961, the number of accidents caused by drivers failing to give right-of-way was 4,232. The Australian figures show that this failure to give way at intersections causes more accidents than any other single cause. The next highest category for cause of accident is not so specific, but it is labelled in the statistics as "inattentive driving", and it is in the 4,000 or more class in South Australia. Besides these statistics the 194 drunken drivers pale into insignificance. Although 4,232 accidents were caused by drivers failing to give way only 2,839 were prosecuted for the offence. If the aim of the Road Traffic Act is to prevent accidents logically there should be more prosecutions than accidents. In most instances where one driver fails to give way the driver of the other vehicle manages to avoid a collision with the offender. Many drivers are quite unaware of the rule that they must give way to the vehicle on the right at a junction. Many believe that at "stop" signs the rule does not apply and, in my experience strangely enough, many believe that the main roads rule applies here as in some other States.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: They would be few in number?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The number of people who still believe that they do not have

to give way on a main road is amazing. However, they still believe that a driver has to give way to all traffic at a "stop" sign.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Do you think they would represent one per cent of drivers?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am not able to say what the percentage is, but I constantly come across people in the course of my work who tell me this, and I find it surprising. Undoubtedly this is the chief cause of accidents.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: The honourable member's remarks about the failure to prosecute depend on whether a collision occurs. The Act provides that if the vehicles continue and a collision is likely to occur, a driver should give way to the man on the right. Unless an accident occurs no case exists for a prosecution.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I know that, but nothing should prevent a prosecution if an offence is detected. An accident need not necessarily occur before an offence is committed. That is my point. True, it is only after an accident, in 99 cases out of 100, that an offence is detected and that is the whole burden of my remarks. Logically, and if this Act is working as a preventive Act, more prosecutions should be launched than the number of accidents that occur.

Surely the remedy lies in a more diligent enforcement of the Road Traffic Act and particularly of the regulations dealing with the rule of giving way to the vehicle on the right. I am sure every honourable member will agree that this offence is committed many times each day by many people. Our police force does a fine job and I am not, in any way, criticizing the officers. Although they do a fine job it can only be consistent with their numbers and their other duties. At most times the public is prepared to take risks because, usually, they see no policeman around or, possibly, they think there is no chance of a policeman suddenly appearing. Anybody who drives regularly on the roads must be impressed, and sometimes amused, by the orderly and sober way drivers behave in traffic when a police officer suddenly rides by.

I am not a traffic engineer or an expert on traffic matters, but a layman who has one small suggestion to make on ways of preventing this rising road toll. I suggest the establishment of a special volunteer Police Force of constables which would constitute some sort of invisible force wherever they were on the roads. Under section 30 of the Police Regulation Act power exists for the appointment by

the Commissioner of Police or by a magistrate of special constables. If we had a body of men who would first of all be prepared, as a public service only, to volunteer for the job and to undergo a special course of training and instruction in the provisions of the Road Traffic Act, and then consider themselves at all times on duty to detect breaches of that Act only, I believe we might make some progress towards reducing those figures.

Essentially of course, such special constables would need to undergo a rigorous selection procedure or, alternatively, be of such status in the community as to be patently trustworthy and objective in outlook. I have never suggested this to anyone, much less to their association, but it does occur to me that many of our Justices of the Peace, who although they hold that commission never sit in our Law Courts, would be willing to volunteer for this additional public service. I suggest that, after thorough training, they would be prepared to keep a watchful eye on our traffic. The effect on the driving public, I am sure, would be salutary. I wish to make it quite clear that I am not advocating any system of on-the-spot fines or anything of that nature. That is an entirely different matter. No need should arise to change any method of prosecution of offenders. It is purely a matter of detection of such offences that is important.

Obviously, in practically all cases, these offences are detected only after an accident occurs, but it should be our constant duty to try to detect breaches before accidents occur. This is only a suggestion and many wiser heads than mine have been applied to this problem of trying to reduce the road toll. I have not heard of a similar suggestion before and I put it forward hoping that it might arouse some public interest. We have tried having policemen in plain clothes, and I believe that these trials have been quite successful in the detection of offences, but I understand and appreciate that the Police Force is not keen on that system and, indeed, the problem still comes back to the fact that with the tremendous increase of traffic on our roads we cannot expect to have a Police Force of such a size that it would be constantly on the spot and have officers in all places at all times. That would be expecting too much of any Government.

Therefore, I make my suggestion for a force of volunteers selected on the lines I have advocated. I have great pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address in

Reply and trust that what I have said, particularly in relation to the rising road toll, will be given earnest consideration.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Honourable members are acquainted with the position that until the Appropriation Bill is dealt with it is necessary by means of Supply to carry on the Government's financial responsibilities and meet any increases in salaries that may have been recommended by

wage fixing tribunals. I say this to indicate to our new members the difference between a Supply and an Appropriation Bill. This measure provides for a further sum of £6,000,000 to enable the Government to carry on through August and into September; and should an Appropriation Bill not have been before the Chamber by that time, it may be necessary to introduce a further Supply Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, as is our usual practice, to enable the Government to carry on for the time being.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 31, at 2.15 p.m.