

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, July 30, 1963.

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

QUESTIONS.**TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Can the Minister of Roads inform me whether there is any truth in the rumour I have heard that he as a member for the Southern District intends to introduce a Bill this session for the purpose of setting up a totalizator agency board to conduct an off-course totalizator system throughout South Australia, similar to the one operating in Victoria?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: This is the first time that I have had information of this suggestion.

REID MURRAY COMPANIES.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Attorney-General any information to give to the House and the public regarding the operation of the Reid Murray group of companies in South Australia?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: For some time I have been making detailed inquiries with regard to the operation of the Reid Murray group of companies in South Australia. The Registrar of Companies, Mr. Sowden, has been in touch with Mr. E. H. Niemann of Melbourne, one of the joint liquidators of Reid Murray Holdings Limited, and I have been in touch with Mr. E. A. Gibson of Adelaide, who was appointed by the committee of management to inquire into the financial position of certain South Australian subsidiaries. I have also been in touch with Mr. J. I. N. Winter, who was appointed receiver and manager of certain Reid Murray subsidiaries by an insurance company that had been appointed as trustee for the debenture holders of David Murray Holdings Limited, and who also was appointed by the National Bank of Australia Limited as receiver and manager for certain other companies of the David Murray group of companies. From these facts it will be seen that the affairs of the Reid Murray group in South Australia have been under the supervision of two very competent and experienced public accountants, and I am indebted to them for the up-to-date information on the affairs of the group that they have supplied to me from time to time.

It appears that many of the Reid Murray subsidiaries in this State are operating profitably and are being efficiently and competently managed, and that if an inspector were appointed in these cases it could have a very damaging effect on the economic position of these particular companies, and such an appointment could act unfavourably as far as the interests of creditors and debenture holders are concerned. It is for this reason that I have failed to take action regarding the appointment of an inspector in this State, as has been done in some other States. It appears that if the operations of this group had been conducted as successfully in the other States as was the case in South Australia the position would have been very different from what it is today, and the debenture holders and creditors would have received payment of their money in full, and there could have been a dividend available for the shareholders. It is clear that big losses have occurred in the other States and that the necessity for detailed investigation in those States is very much greater than it is here. However, from recent information that has come to my knowledge, it does appear that, in the case of three or four subsidiary companies, there is ground for giving careful consideration to the appointment of an inspector. I am at present obtaining detailed reports about these companies and, if they reveal that it would be wise to have an inspector appointed in this State, I will not hesitate to make a recommendation to the Government accordingly.

It has been brought to my knowledge that statements have been made about the actual position of the Reid Murray companies in South Australia. It is for that reason that I have made this statement so that the public will know that this matter has had my careful attention. I have taken action that I believe to be in the best interests of the creditors, the debenture holders and the shareholders.

CAR PARKING.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I direct my question to the Chief Secretary. In view of the lack of parking facilities in the city of Adelaide and the possibility of further businesses being forced into the metropolitan area, will the Government consider the erection of a three-tier parking station over the Adelaide Railway Station to accommodate 9,500 cars?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member's question would be directed more appropriately to the Minister of

Railways, because I understand that the Railways Commissioner has expressed certain views. Whether the Minister would like to add to them I do not know, but he has expressed opposition to a proposal for the erection of a parking area over the station.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I direct my question to the Minister of Railways.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The proper thing for me to do would be to obtain the latest information available from the discussions on this matter and advise the honourable member accordingly.

SPEED LIMIT THROUGH ELIZABETH.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: For some time the public and members of this House have been interested in the speed limit through Elizabeth, upon which I have asked several questions. I understand that the Minister of Roads may be in a position today to give some information on the matter.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: It was only a few days ago that I informed the Council what I thought the position was—that we would not establish speed zones through Elizabeth until traffic lights could be installed. However, almost immediately after making that statement, I was informed that quite unexpectedly the implementation of the tenders that had already been let for traffic lights could not be proceeded with for some months as certain switch gear manufactured in the United States of America could not be obtained. In view of the general demand and in the interests of common sense in extending the top speed limit to various areas between Pooraka and Gawler, the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board has advised me that the regulations are now prepared and that they will be gazetted under its powers this week. For the information of honourable members, if they care to peruse later the relevant charts that have been exhibited in this Chamber they will find them interesting. They set out the basis on which this type of speed zoning is done. While these signs will be placed right along the length of the road from Pooraka to Gawler as they are gazetted (which means, in other words, on Thursday or Friday) the give-way signs have already been installed on both sides of the road through Elizabeth, and this is highly desirable. The Commissioner of Police, who is Chairman of the Road Traffic Board, has asked me to

advise honourable members that all these signs will be subject to review again when the lights are installed. We can anticipate that speed zoning will take place towards the end of this week and this will be notified by the appropriate signs throughout. The speeds are as follows:

- (a) Gepps Cross to Pooraka North, 45 m.p.h.
- (b) Pooraka North to John Rice Avenue, Elizabeth, derestricted.
- (c) John Rice Avenue to Hogarth Road, Elizabeth, 50 m.p.h.
- (d) Hogarth Road to Woodforde Road, Elizabeth, 40 m.p.h.
- (e) Woodforde Road to Gardiner Terrace, Smithfield, 45 m.p.h.
- (f) Smithfield North to Gawler By-Pass, derestricted.
- (g) Gawler By-Pass to the racecourse, 45 m.p.h.

HACKHAM CROSSING.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I realize that it must be at least two years since I asked a question relating to the Hackham railway crossing. On the the last occasion that I asked this question my importunity was somewhat relieved by the Minister of Railways telling me that a new by-pass road was being made so that this crossing need not be altered. Although a fine new by-pass road is being constructed, at the present rate of progress it seems to me that it will be a number of years before it reaches the Hackham crossing. In the meantime, because there are two goods trains a week going over that crossing and a rail car testing about once every three months, the whole of the traffic is being diverted by a difficult roundabout and in a most inconvenient way involving hundreds of cars every day. Having again the temerity to suggest that the trains (because there are so few of them) might stop for road traffic, I ask the Minister of Railways whether he will further consider this question with a view to relieving the situation at the crossing?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I find myself almost completely in sympathy with the honourable member's outlook on this matter; in fact to such an extent that, as the developments are being planned south of Morphett Vale and Noarlunga, I have already given instructions for a report to be presented, which

I can take to the Government, on the advisability or otherwise of dealing with the railway line from near Reynella to Willunga. The cost of over-passes over that distance of some 14 miles will probably involve the Government to the extent of £200,000 or £300,000. It is obvious that the whole position must be carefully investigated before a final decision is made, but I assure the honourable member that investigations have been commenced.

TEACHERS COLLEGE FIRE.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: On June 13 I directed a question to the Minister of Labour and Industry in connection with a fire at the Teachers College new building. He advised me that he would call for a report and make it known to us when it was available. Has an investigation been made and has the Minister anything to report?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am able to report that the Minister of Works has made a careful inquiry into the cause of that fire and has taken the appropriate steps to ensure that there will not be a repetition of it. I have not the exact details of the report with me, but I shall get them and make them available to the honourable member. I assure him that my colleague, the Minister of Works, has made certain that there will be no possibility in this building, or in any other building in which the Government is concerned, of a fire arising from similar causes.

PRICE CONTROL.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Since price control has been lifted on certain goods and services, exorbitant prices are being charged for certain repairs, particularly to electrical equipment. I understand there is one firm in Adelaide—no matter how small the household equipment may be—which charges a service fee of £1 or £1 10s. before doing any work and then charges for equipment and labour costs attached thereto. In view of that I ask the Chief Secretary whether the Government will consider re-introduction of price control on repairs to household electrical equipment?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I think it preferable if the honourable member would give me the particulars regarding the firm concerned and I shall refer the matter to the Prices Commissioner for investigation.

“SAFETY SALLY” SIGNS.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: My question is in relation to “Safety Sally” signs outside schools, which I think we all agree are very good. Until recently they had a 15 m.p.h. speed limit sign on them. However, those signs have been removed. If it has been for the purpose of bringing about uniformity in signs I would ask the Minister of Roads if he would reconsider the whole question of the 15 m.p.h. signs on these “Safety Sallies”, because it is an effective means of attracting motorists’ attention to the speed required, and it is one which is hard to replace by any other means.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I shall have pleasure in obtaining a report for the honourable member at the earliest possibility.

YORKE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The report of the Public Works Standing Committee on the Yorke Peninsula water supply has recently been tabled in Parliament. Is it the intention of the Government to provide funds in the Loan Estimates this financial year to enable the committee’s recommendation to be carried out, and if so will an early commencement be made on the project?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I shall refer the matter to my colleague in another place and obtain a report.

GAWLER COURTHOUSE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Although the Gawler courthouse building is sound, it is very old; the acoustics are bad, and the adjoining rooms and facilities are in need of attention. Will the Attorney-General ascertain when it will be possible to bring the building up to present-day requirements?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The honourable member asked me a question along the same lines a short time ago. I then referred the matter to the Minister of Works, who had investigations made. I have not had the result of those investigations, but I shall follow the matter up and get a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

FISHERIES ACT.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of July 23 regarding the comments of Mr. J. J. Redman, S.M., in connection with the weight and size of fish?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I referred the honourable member's question to the Minister of Agriculture and he is seeking a report of the magistrate's actual remarks, and when he has them I shall be able to give an answer.

NATIONAL POISONS ADVISORY PANEL.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Last session we passed legislation amending the Dangerous Drugs Act that provided that all new antibiotics and drugs had to be analysed by the Health Department. Can the Minister of Health say how many analyses were made and how many new drugs have been placed on the market?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: All States have agreed to produce uniform legislation on poisons. I do not think South Australia has made any actual physical examination of the various poisons because we have a representative on the National Poisons Advisory Panel. This panel assesses the value of new drugs coming on to the market and takes evidence regarding them; and it is on the panel's reports that we decide whether or not to accept the drugs. I do not know whether the panel requires an actual analysis. I believe that the panel would be prepared to accept, without physical examination, a definition of the contents of drugs given by reputable pharmaceutical firms. As far as we are concerned, our position is through representation on the National Poisons Advisory Panel.

BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (on notice): Does the Minister of Roads have any further information as to when (a) the Blanchetown bridge will be completed; (b) work will proceed on the construction of the necessary approaches for the additional ferries at Berri and Kingston; (c) these ferries are likely to be in operation after the completion of the bridge?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The Commissioner of Highways reports:

(a) The Blanchetown bridge will be completed at the end of 1963 or very early in 1964.

(b) The design of the approaches for the additional ferries at Berri and Kingston are in hand, and it is expected that tenders will be called for the construction of the ramps towards the latter end of this year.

(c) It is not expected that the additional ferries at Berri and Kingston will be in operation immediately after the completion of the Blanchetown bridge, but as the ferries become available they will be installed immediately after the completion of the approach ramps.

PRIVATE ROAD BUS SERVICE.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (on notice):

1. Has a tender been let by the Railways Department for a private road service to operate between Gladstone and Wilmington?

2. If so, will this service supersede the rail-car service now catering for passengers in the districts of Laura, Stone Hut, Wirrabara, Booleroo Centre, Melrose and Wilmington?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. and 2. No tender has been let by the Railways Department for a private road service to operate between Gladstone and Wilmington.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 24. Page 118.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the motion, and wish to congratulate both the mover and the seconder of the motion on their splendid speeches. We in South Australia have recently shared the great joy of all loyal Australians in the visit of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth. We all have our special memories of that occasion, and I am sure that thousands of South Australian citizens will remember, as long as they live, the beautiful scene on the River Torrens as Her Majesty arrived to attend the Music Festival. In the opening of Parliament this year we had a further instance of the great interest His Excellency, Sir Edric Bastyan and Lady Bastyan take in all the activities of this community. We are always honoured by His Excellency's presence and we are very happy about the honour recently bestowed on him by Her Majesty. It is our earnest hope that Lady Bastyan is enjoying her stay in Great Britain and that she will have a safe return.

I returned to my seat in this Chamber with much sadness. In my absence abroad two honourable members who had shown great friendship and kindness to me died. I heard of the death of the Hon. Alec Melrose while I was in Canada. I was glad that I had seen him and said farewell to him during his one short visit to the Council after many weary months of illness. We shall remember him for his dignity in this Chamber, for his knowledge of procedure, for his thoughtful speeches, for his wise counsel, for his humanity and, not least, for his delightful brand of humour.

The Hon. Allan Hookings was not well when I left Adelaide, but I had good reports of his progress while I was in London. It was there that I learned of the high esteem and affection

accorded him by a number of members of our Mother of Parliaments and by the officers of the United Kingdom branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. During the weeks he had spent at the House of Commons in May, 1962, he had made a very fine impression on his fellow delegates and had brought nothing but honour to South Australia. It was therefore a grievous shock to many of us in Lagos to hear of his tragic and untimely death.

I would like to express my appreciation of the confidence shown in me by the executive and members of the South Australian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in sending me to attend the 8th conference of the association at Lagos, Nigeria, last October and November. Although I have given my formal report to a meeting of the association earlier this year, there are a number of observations which I would like to make as a direct result of my experiences on this trip.

The first is something that is well known to any South Australian C.P.A. member who has occasion to travel abroad. We all owe a permanent debt of gratitude to the care, vision and planning of the secretary, Mr. Ivor Ball. Again and again, I had occasion to feel thankful for his generous help and guidance. I believe that our branch can be very proud to have such a man, with high ideals and a firm belief in the British Commonwealth, as Mr. Ball in this key position.

Again, I wish to inform this Council of the excellent work being done in London by our Agent-General, Mr. M. A. F. Pearce. I had naturally expected him to give me the assistance that I might need, but I found his welcome very heart-warming indeed. He put the facilities of his office at my disposal and he and Mrs. Pearce gave me friendship and company at a time when I had been travelling alone for two months. They arranged various outings, including a day at Cambridge, and a visit to the new, beautiful Air Force memorial at Runnymede, which looks out over the Thames and England's "green and pleasant land", and where are inscribed the names of all British airmen who have no known graves. Moreover, I learned from many people in London of the great regard in which Mr. Pearce is held, of the speeches he is frequently called upon to make, and of the high standing he is giving to the office of South Australian Agent-General.

I would further crave the indulgence of the Council for a few minutes so that I might

comment on one matter concerning Nigeria which has a direct relationship with our own position as a member nation of the Commonwealth. Looking back now on the time I spent there, I feel that I was very lucky indeed to have been able to see so much of this vast West African country and its many races at this particular stage of its development, just two years after its independence. At a time when all colonialism is spoken of as something slightly shameful, when a new clap-trap term, "neo-colonialism", is heard daily, it was very educational for me to live among people who owe everything to the British colonial policy of the last 100 years, and who are prepared to say so.

I know that in several different television interviews recently this viewpoint has not been expressed, but always the interviewer has framed his question in such a way that the reverse answer could be expected. Those honourable members who had a classics education will recall the two types of questions and the two types of interrogatives which had to be used, whether, in fact, the questioner was expecting the answer "Yes" or the answer "No". Therefore, when a question is framed in some such form as "But surely the Commonwealth means little to you today", the answer more likely than not is "It means very little". This is not the attitude I found in Nigeria, either in the highest ranks associated with our conference, or among the people of various classes. The Prime Minister, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, on moving the resolution asking the United Kingdom to introduce legislation towards independence, used these words: "I am grateful to the British Governments with which Nigeria has been associated and I am grateful to those officers who have helped us to catch up with the 20th century."

Again and again, I heard similar sentiments expressed. I became friendly, when in the western region, with a Nigerian woman, a graduate of the University of London and now one of the three top women civil servants in her region. She had, only a few months previously, attended in the United States of America a conference on education. She told me that she had not cared for certain aspects of American education and had found herself saying "We British do things rather differently."

It is well-recognized among educated Nigerians that it was through her official connection with Great Britain that Nigeria had peace, that human sacrifice, cannibalism and

slavery were abolished, that the seeds of efficient, democratic government were sown, and the rule of law established. It is well for us to remember that Great Britain colonized Nigeria and other West African countries, not as a nation seeking trade, not as a nation looking for a labour force, but as a Christian nation for purely Christian reasons.

To understand the way in which Nigeria has proudly maintained Parliamentary government since independence, I would refer members to an article appearing in the *Journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth*, Volume 43, No. 3, July, 1962, by Dr. Kalu Ezera, senior lecturer in political science at the new University of Nigeria. By very good fortune I met him and was able to spend some time at the University with him and one of his colleagues. He is himself a distinguished graduate of Harvard and Oxford. I will content myself by quoting only one of his statements:

Since independence, Nigeria has striven to show that she abides by the spirit and letter of democracy and, indeed, she has become the showpiece of parliamentary democracy in West Africa, if not in the whole African continent. The reasons for this are not far to seek. First Nigerian leaders seemed to be strongly determined to make a success of the experiment of parliamentary democracy and the concept of law and justice, legacies, which they, as well as their counterparts in other Commonwealth countries, have usually inherited from Great Britain.

In my trip around the world I have seen many parts of the British Commonwealth and how it works. I believe that the British nation has done an infinitely superior job in developing backward countries than any other country has done. Today, when it is commonplace to deride colonialism in all its forms, we, the people of the British Commonwealth, should be very careful in dealing with developing countries and not allow ourselves to be diverted from our traditional aims and methods.

In Australia an interesting thing has been happening in the educational world. I refer to the plan for educational co-operation between Australia and Africa, the exchange of teachers and educationists, a plan instigated by the Commonwealth Government and being given great assistance by the State Governments. I hope that our Department of Education will be able to continue its already excellent work and to expand its activity in this field. The international relations fostered by this scheme are invaluable to both countries, but probably chiefly to Australia. In this way, we do not merely help by guidance of other peoples, but we plant a

lively picture of Australia in their midst. To many people in these countries Australia becomes something real and important in today's world, instead of being an unknown and distant land, completely swamped, in current literature, in text-books, and in the press, by bigger and noisier nations.

While speaking on educational matters, let me say that I have been amazed recently at the constant grumbling about educational facilities in the various States of Australia, including our own. It seems to me that in a State with a population of 1,000,000 people the expenditure of £166,500,000 on education in the past 10 years is something of which we can be proud. It is obvious that, as the expenditure of the previous 10 years was only £35,500,000, our Government is making a determined effort to keep up to date with the requirements of our continually growing school population. Members will see from paragraph 13 of the Governor's Speech that the Government is giving great encouragement to students to take up teaching, and that not only are there 2,600 students at the three teachers colleges, but there are 3,000 preparing to enter training. I believe that our Education Department is being soundly administered and is pursuing a policy that is both enlightened and progressive. I consider much of the present propaganda about education to be deliberately designed to embarrass our Australian Governments, which are already straining the resources of a young and developing country and are giving to Australia, not ineffectively, what is frequently overlooked—one of the highest rates of literacy in the world.

Again, it came as a shock to me to find on my return my fellow-Australians so completely uninterested in world events and so completely unaware of the threat of Communism, which is so close to us, even in this loyal State of South Australia. Surely, all thinking Australians must be in agreement with and support all the efforts being made in this country to prevent Communism from undermining our determination and our integrity of purpose in international affairs and from undermining our loyalty to our Queen and our country in all institutions, including governmental and semi-governmental ones.

The dangerous work of Communism within Australia at the moment is perhaps not in the organizing of gangsterism and destruction but rather in laying a foundation of attitude among people prominent in the public eye, with a view to reducing opposition to its political intentions, both nationally and internationally.

One of the most dangerous of all Communist activities today is the reduction of any opposition to its underground intrigue, when discovered, by claiming that that intrigue is comparatively innocuous and that Communism is a political party entitled to the same fair treatment as all other political parties. This cannot be accepted if we compare the Communist Party with the other great political parties of Australia, which came into being with the country's good at heart, parties which sprang from idealism, from the desire to benefit the Australian people, parties that were Australian to the core. The Communist Party is a subversive organization conceived in a foreign country, pledged to destroy our way of life and to defeat our constitutional government. By demanding its acceptance as a political party, Communism then goes on to demand acceptance for all of its activities.

It has been announced from time to time during the last year or so by International Communism that its plans for subversion, and for the white-anting of any resistance to it in Western countries, are already ahead of schedule. With the gradual changing of South Australia from a primary producing State to a balanced economy with a large amount of secondary industry, there have been definite indications that we have not been neglected by Communist planning and that the development of both superficial and undercover Communism here has kept pace with our other growths; nor are South Australians less gullible or less sentimental than their fellow-Australians, as shown by a recent local government poll when the President of the South Australian Communist Party was able to gather nearly 700 votes. The public of South Australia, in common with the rest of Australia, needs educating in the dangers and activities of Communism. Therefore, I believe that the Returned Soldiers League is to be commended for its stand in this matter. Personally, I should like to see both Commonwealth and State Governments act more decisively in introducing methods of dealing with known Communists and their activities in spheres of public influence.

I, for one, am prepared to support the R.S.L. in its aims to protect Australia, and I hope that private individuals as well as Governments will do more to combat the poison in our land, a poison which, after all, is meant only to weaken us so that we may be subjugated by some power associated with modern totalitarianism. Australia's mania for doing nothing, for always giving the other fellow "a fair

go", may well, in this instance, prove Australia's doom.

We have been informed that a women's prison, about which I have spoken on a number of occasions over the years, is to be built and that plans are before the Public Works Committee. I hope that plan will come to fruition very quickly and that the department concerned will expedite the handling of this matter. There is, however, one criticism that has been brought to my notice. The new prison is to be built on a dormitory plan. Although this type of prison building has proved excellent for male prisoners, it produces a lack of privacy that is abhorrent to all women. I have already had severe complaints at this suggestion and I therefore hope that further consideration will be given to this matter.

In paragraph 24 of His Excellency's Speech, I was pleased to see that the Government was intending to bring in legislation whereby local governing bodies that contribute to the establishment of clubs for the aged will be given grants. The outcome of this legislation will be followed with interest at this time of our history when, as a result of advances in medical science, a higher proportion than ever before of our population is made up of people who are in the aged and retired groups.

It has also been announced that, at a recent meeting of State Attorneys-General, it was decided to draft uniform maintenance legislation. As this problem of the care of deserted wives and families has been a tragic one for many years, I hope that the Government will give such legislation very special attention.

The only other matter to which I should like to refer is women's jury service. I have recently been approached by a group of women representing a number of well-founded women's organizations with a view to making provision for women to serve on juries in South Australia. I know that the Government will shortly be approached in this matter by a number of citizens and I hope that it will give it early and earnest consideration.

We in South Australia are at the moment being blessed with a particularly satisfactory season, when many parts of the State that have suffered drought and poor conditions are being rejuvenated by splendid rains. With this continuing good fortune, together with the wise and generous proposals of the Government, as instanced in His Excellency's Speech, the State should be facing a new surge of prosperity and development. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and compliment the mover and seconder on the excellence of their contributions. I am well aware that they have spoken previously in the Chamber, but this is the first occasion on which either has spoken in the Address in Reply. Their speeches indicate that the high standard of debate here will be maintained while they are members.

I wish to express my appreciation to the members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in South Australia for the opportunity to attend the seventh Area Conference held in Canberra recently as one of the delegates for South Australia. I agree with what the Hon. Mrs. Cooper said in relation to our secretary: I found him of great assistance to the delegates. The conference was a good one and a report will be made at a later meeting of the association. It was arranged for us to be taken over the Snowy River scheme and this was an interesting experience on which I shall comment at the meeting of the association.

His Excellency the Governor, in opening this session of Parliament, referred to the deaths of four members of Parliament in the past 12 months: Sir Cecil Hincks, the Hon. Alex Melrose, Ron Ralston, and the Hon. Allan Hookings. I was fortunate enough to know each member and was able to appreciate their great worth. To have known them was to respect their ability and to respect them as friends. I, too, join with previous speakers in expressing my sympathy to their families.

As the last speaker commented, earlier this year we were honoured with a visit from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. This was a happy occasion and we were pleased to hear during the tour that further visits were contemplated. We were particularly pleased to hear that other members of the Royal Family were likely to take part in such visits. There has already been mention of a visit next year of Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother to coincide with the Festival of Arts, and I am sure that if this eventuates she will receive a warm welcome from the people of this State.

In regard to the visit to this State of Her Majesty the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh in February this year, there is only one feature of the arrangements of which I am prepared to be critical. I refer to the schoolchildren's rally at the Victoria Park racecourse. Even before this function was definitely included in the arrangements, many people expressed concern because of what might occur if the event

took place on a hot day, and they suggested that the function should be replaced by something else. Assurances were given at that time that the schoolchildren would not be required to be at the racecourse for any lengthy period before the arrival of Her Majesty. However, the worst fears of those who counselled against such a function were realized and it turned out to be a fairly hot day, as could be expected at that time of the year. Some children from schools within two miles of the racecourse were not included in the general transport arrangements and were required to march to the surrounding parklands, which was the assembly point. Before they reached the racecourse quite a number of children were affected by the heat. I noticed myself from the grandstand that one particular group of children drawn up in the full glare of the sunshine in front of the grandstand had their hats taken away from them some considerable time before Her Majesty arrived, and this resulted in their feeling the intense heat. This group was the 3,000-strong children's choir, and many of them suffered extremely from the heat; in fact, a considerable number fainted.

It is interesting to read a comment published in the *Advertiser* on February 22 when an ambulance officer was reported to have pointed to a pile of hats on a seat and said, "They have the hats piled there and we have the children piled in the casualty room." The report continued that the 3,000 children who were part of the choir had been at the racecourse an hour and a half before the Queen arrived and there were 250 children treated for heat exhaustion and bleeding noses brought on by the heat. The wisdom shown by other States in deleting this type of function was completely vindicated by the distressing results at the Victoria Park racecourse. I am sure Her Majesty must have felt concerned because she could not help noticing that so many children were affected by the heat.

With the possibility of a visit next year by the Queen Mother it is to be hoped that those in charge of the arrangements will learn by their mistake on this occasion and think seriously before holding a similar function at that time of the year. The other functions of the Royal tour were apparently well planned and well conducted, and in my opinion the highlight of the tour was the Festival of Music which took place at Elder Park. I congratulate the organizer of that festival, Mr. John Finlay, on his fine effort in organizing a programme for which there was nothing but praise extended by those who were fortunate enough to be present. The singing of the

schoolchildren was a credit to them and to the teachers who trained them. Another fine item worthy of praise was the one called the New Australian Pageant, and special thanks are due to the producer, Mrs. K. L. Litchfield, and also to our friends from overseas who have come to live amongst us and who gave us such pleasure on that evening. I think that a word of praise should be extended to the Police Force and to the workers in transport services who so efficiently and courteously handled the large crowds on all occasions when the Queen was present.

His Excellency, in paragraph 8 of his Speech, referred to the concern of the Government at the frequency of industrial accidents. A study of the statistics in regard to industrial accidents reveals that there is need for concern and room for improvement in the sphere of industrial safety. It is true that the Department of Labour and Industry has apparently recognized this fact and is making an attempt to educate people in industry to appreciate the great need for improvement in this regard. The trade union movement has long recognized this need and continually pressed for the improvement and extension of safety clauses in the industrial legislation of the State. There is room for considerable improvement in this type of legislation and for its application to the whole of the State.

Trade unions have also gone to a fair amount of expense in educating their members about the need for industrial safety, and some of the larger unions have produced films illustrating industrial hazards and educating their members to be fully safety-conscious in this respect. Trade unions are very anxious to protect their members. I believe, and this is probably true, that it is often necessary to protect workers against themselves. Industrial safety campaigns have been conducted by the Department of Labour and Industry and have received the co-operation of the people in industry resulting in a fairly representative attendance at meetings and discussion groups for the period of one or two weeks of the campaign, but unfortunately the co-operation of people in industry does not extend very far beyond that.

The only way in which safety can be assured is by a three-way co-operation between management, the workers and the Government, and unless this co-operation is forthcoming there is very little hope for improvement in the situation. Everybody should recognize the principle that the safety of the individual should take precedence of production and profit interests and that the urgency of any industrial operation must never result in safety measures being

neglected. It has been suggested that safety committees be set up in workshops, factories and on building jobs, and this could result in a reduction of accidents. If such committees provided for the adequate representation of workers and management and had an effective voice on the planning of industrial safety, they could prove a successful means of reducing the number of accidents in industry. However, if they were established not in the true spirit of co-operation, but only as a token of acceptance of the principle of employee-employer representation, then they are doomed to failure before they start. Failure to co-operate between the interested parties will leave no alternative but strong provisions of safety in State Acts and regulations, and strict enforcement of these provisions.

The seriousness of this matter is borne out by statistics. In three Acts of an industrial nature in this State provisions are included that require accidents which cause loss of life or incapacitation for certain periods of time, as set out in each of these provisions, to be reported by the employer to the Chief Inspector of Factories. These Acts are the Industrial Code, the Country Factories Act and the Scaffolding Inspection Act. In the Chief Inspector's annual reports of the last four years the figures of reportable industrial accidents are as follows: 1959—4,451 accidents (7 fatal); 1960—5,242 (5 fatal); 1961—4,467 (3 fatal); and 1962—4,855 (20 fatal). These figures are disturbing and demonstrate that, despite industrial safety campaigns and conventions of recent years, there has been no improvement over the period to which I have referred. The figures of fatal accidents are particularly disturbing.

Statistics issued by the Deputy Commonwealth Statistician on industrial accidents in South Australia show that the situation is much worse than would appear on the figures of the Chief Inspector of Factories. I understand that this is because the statistician's figures cover all industrial accidents in South Australia causing absence from work for a certain period and those of the Chief Inspector of Factories cover only the accidents reportable under the three Acts I have mentioned. The Deputy Commonwealth Statistician's figures show that there were 8,971 separate accidents in industry in South Australia. Each of those accidents was described as having caused a compensated work injury resulting in death, permanent disability, or absence of the injured person from work for seven days, excluding journey cases, accidents occurring during recess periods and disease cases, the excluded cases not

being entitled to compensation in this State, although they are in other States. Only persons who have the coverage of the South Australian Workmen's Compensation Act are included. Other notable exclusions are self-employed persons, employees receiving wages or salaries exceeding an average of £45 a week and all Commonwealth Government officers.

I have not been able to find any figures giving the number of accidents involving people outside those entitled to compensation under the South Australian Workmen's Compensation Act. Because of the number of people excluded there would probably have been a fairly high number of such accidents and these would increase the accident level of nearly 9,000 to a higher level again. Taking only the figure of 8,971 we find that there is an accident happening in South Australia every 13 minutes of working hours. These figures are frightening. When one considers that the figures quoted refer only to accidents resulting in at least seven days' absence, and realizes that there must have been countless accidents resulting in a somewhat lesser degree of incapacitation, only then can one realize the full picture. Each of these accidents must have resulted in some degree of suffering both to the victim and to his family, who are required to live on a much lower wage during the incapacitation of the breadwinner. During his reception of compensation payments, or because of permanent disability, his earning capacity is reduced. The same applies should an accident prove fatal. For that reason, and that reason alone, there is ample justification in asking that every effort be made by everybody concerned to bring about safety in industry.

However, there are other reasons crying out for something to be done. Let us consider the cost to industry and to South Australia of these accidents, which costs are passed on eventually to the general public in one way or another. The Deputy Commonwealth Statistician's figures show that the time lost in South Australia last year as a result of the accidents referred to was 37,782 weeks. The amount paid in compensation for wages lost, hospital and medical expenses and lump sum settlements for permanent disabilities or death amounted to £947,300 and it has been estimated that in Australia the direct loss through the payment of compensation amounts to more than £30,000,000 a year, while indirect losses from interruption of work, damage to equipment and materials could amount to £120,000,000. The economic loss to

Australia is enormous and to minimize it in future years safety measures must be introduced and enforced.

During the Budget debate last year I referred to apprentices and the shortage of skilled workers. As this is a subject in which I am keenly interested I listened with interest to the Governor's Speech in the hope that there would be an indication that the Government intended to improve the position under the Apprentices Act, but I found no such indication. Many people in industry and technical education were as surprised as I was. I understand there has been no lack of advice to the Government about the need for amendments to the legislation. According to my information, the Apprentices Board has on more than one occasion since the Act was passed in 1950 recommended to the Government that it be amended. One amendment has been submitted on at least two occasions but nothing has been done about it. Also, the Labor Party has introduced two Bills during the period, but neither has been passed. The Chairman of the Apprentices Board is the Superintendent of Technical Education, and the Deputy Chairman is the Chief Inspector of Factories. Two representatives were appointed on the nomination of the Minister of Education. One member was appointed on the nomination of the Chamber of Manufactures; another, of the South Australian Employers Federation; and another two, the Trades and Labor Council. Because of the way in which the board is constituted, surely it is the most appropriate body to recommend amendments to the Act. All its members have had a wide experience of apprenticeship in industry or technical education, and, therefore, their recommendations should carry some weight. Since the end of the Second World War apprenticeship, with a view to providing more skilled tradesmen in industry, has been the subject of much investigation. During that period more has been said and written about apprenticeship and skilled workers than ever before in Australia.

It is an important subject and an adequate supply of skilled tradesmen in industry should be of interest to everybody. This shortage has been accentuated by the change in the Australian economy, with the emphasis on increased industrial activity. The change has brought about the need to investigate the reason for the shortage of skilled tradesmen. The shortage has resulted from the rapid expansion in industry between the end of the Second World War and the credit squeeze late in 1960. There is still a shortage of skilled

tradesmen, despite a slackening in the rate of expansion. Another contributing factor has been the failure of many employers to take the number of apprentices permissible under awards. Also, there has been a lack of attraction in apprenticeship for many lads. A group of people came together in February, 1962, representing the Commonwealth and State officials in technical education, employer organizations and trade unions. It found as a result of its deliberations that about 50 per cent of employers took the full number of apprentices permitted, 25 per cent took fewer than was permitted, and 25 per cent took none at all.

At a Premiers' Conference in 1950 a resolution sponsored by the Commonwealth was carried to the effect that the Commonwealth and States should inquire into apprenticeship matters. The terms of reference were wide and they covered the selection, training, and terms and conditions of employment of apprentices. It was not until February, 1952, that the composition of the body to make the inquiry was announced. The chairman was Mr. Justice Wright of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. There were four representatives of apprentice and technical authorities, two of employers and two of trade unions. Public meetings were held and many people with experience and knowledge of apprenticeship matters gave evidence to the committee. A long report, which included a number of findings and a large number of recommendations, was submitted in 1954. Anyone who has studied the report knows that many of the matters recommended were already in force in some States. When the report was available our Premier referred it to the Apprentices Board for examination and report.

Evidently between March 1954 and late 1958 the board considered the report and gave its findings to the Premier, because when the late Mr. O'Halloran introduced a Bill to amend the Apprentices Act the Premier referred to the board's report in his second reading speech. He quoted the board as reporting that it should have more power in certain directions, and that the apprenticeship system in South Australia could be improved by amending the existing legislation. Despite that report the 1958 Bill was defeated, as was one introduced last year by the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Frank Walsh). Both measures were designed to amend the Apprentices Act in various ways. In the opinion of

the Labor Party and the Trades and Labor Council it would have made the Act able to cope with the present trends in Australia and overseas. Not only did the Labor Party and the trade union movement say this, but an appropriate body of employers also said it, as is illustrated by the following extract from the official journal of the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce in September, 1962, under the heading "Urgent need for amendments to the Apprentices Act":

A good deal of reluctance of motor trade employers in South Australia to employ apprentices under State awards can be traced to anomalies in the Apprentices Act, which in effect make an employer-apprentice disagreement a potential civil law suit. The absurd situation exists where an employer might have to prove breach of contract by a minor in a court of law to rid himself of some irresponsible jackanapes doing damage to his business.

The problem is brought about by the innocuous wording of clause 30, paragraphs (1) and (2), of the Apprentices Act, which deal with the functions and purpose (if there is a purpose) of the Apprentices Board in relation to the transfer, assignment or cancellation of indentures. These paragraphs read as follows:

30. (1) Upon the application of any apprentice or the parent or guardian of any apprentice or the employer of an apprentice, the board may investigate any matter arising out of the indentures of apprenticeship.

(2) Whereupon any such investigation it deems it advisable to do so, the board may suggest arrangements for the assignment of the indentures of apprenticeship to another employer or may suggest such other arrangements as seem desirable to the board as to the transfer or cancellation of the indentures.

We have underlined the offending word "may" which occurs three times and completely removes any meaning or purpose from the paragraphs.

In contrast to the futility of this clause in the South Australian Apprentices Act, Federal awards provide for a Board of Reference both directed and empowered to make decisions. Under Federal awards, therefore, either the employer or the apprentice may approach the board confident of some positive result without the prospect of becoming involved in legal battles with their attendant costs.

There is, in short, an urgent need for alteration of this State Act, to give the Apprentices Board positive power to act in cases of dispute, which it does not at present possess.

It should be emphasized that this need is in the interests of both employer and apprentice, if only on the score that more apprentices are likely to be employed in South Australia, under conditions where the employer is assured of reasonable control of his staff.

That is not the only employer: other employers are not covered by Commonwealth awards. There have been other individual

employers asking what can be done to give the board some control over the transfer, suspension or cancellation of the indentures of apprenticeship because they feel that the present situation is not satisfactory.

In most Commonwealth awards covering industries in which provision is made for apprenticeship there are clauses providing effective solutions to the problem of transfer, suspension or cancellation of indentures. Usually, it is covered by a board of reference, which is set up in this way. There are one, two or three representatives of the employers and one, two or three representatives of the employees in the appropriate industry. There is also an independent chairman who, in most cases, is the Deputy Industrial Registrar of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in South Australia. They have effective power to deal with these matters. The system works satisfactorily for both employers and employees. I have heard very little criticism levelled against it when used for apprenticeship matters.

The Bill introduced in another place last year suggested the same type of provisions for the Apprentices Act so that the system that had worked so effectively in the Commonwealth sphere could work likewise in the State sphere. The need for this type of amendment cannot be dismissed by stating, as some people have stated in the past, that not many apprentices or industries are not covered by Commonwealth awards. If that argument is sound, why do we go to the expense of keeping a State Industrial Court in South Australia, if there is little industry other than that covered by Commonwealth awards? Several apprenticeship occupations come under State industrial jurisdiction. Two that spring readily to mind are carpenters and joiners, and hairdressers, neither of which is covered by a Commonwealth award. Also, there are people and establishments that have come into being following the issuing of a Commonwealth award, not being joined to the original dispute by a roping-in award. They are award-free and must come under any State jurisdiction that covers the industry unless they are members of perhaps an organization or association that is itself the respondent to an award.

As a result of this circumstance, there must be many apprentices and employers not covered by Commonwealth awards who find themselves in difficulties over the matters I have referred to regarding the transfer, suspension or cancellation of the indentures of apprenticeship. Under the present provisions of the Act, the

Apprentices Board may go only so far as to suggest some arrangements in regard to these matters. If either party chooses to ignore its suggestions, the matter rests there as far as the board is concerned. The alternative then is a civil action for breach of contract. After one experience in this regard with an apprentice, resulting in a civil action instead of a simple board of reference or Apprentices Board decision, an employer is reluctant to take on further apprentices.

Another circumstance that acts as a deterrent to the number of people offering for apprenticeship and affects a parent and his boy who is entering into a contract binding him for several years is the lack of control over places of employment of apprentices. Anybody who has been associated with industry will agree with me that there are suitable and unsuitable places for the training of apprentices. The suitability or unsuitability of a place for the employment of apprentices is governed by the equipment of the establishment, the variety of work, the ability of those responsible to train the apprentice and the willingness or otherwise of the employer to provide for the adequate training of the apprentice.

There is nothing in the Act at present to prevent an entirely untrained person without any skill in a particular occupation from indenturing an apprentice to that occupation. Practically the only legal redress for the apprentice then is to wait until he completes his apprenticeship and sue his employer for breach of contract to teach him the trade. I am still referring to the employer who is not covered by a Commonwealth award. I have been told of a case—I do not think it is a hypothetical case—where a greengrocer decided to set his wife up as a ladies hairdresser. Neither he nor his wife had had experience in hairdressing. The greengrocer advertised for an apprentice and entered into an indenture of apprenticeship. The apprentice attended the Apprentices School of Hairdressing and then proceeded to teach his employer the trade.

This can happen in many occupations and there are probably many similar cases. The training of skilled tradesmen cannot be left to such a haphazard method if industry is to be efficient in the future. Experiences of this nature deter many prospective apprentices from entering into indentures. Parents cannot be blamed for discouraging their children from entering into apprenticeships when they cannot be sure that they will be adequately trained. Provision in the Act giving power to the Apprentices Board to

approve of places of employment for apprentices would eliminate this unsatisfactory feature. This approval could be given or withheld at the recommendation of the appropriate trade committees which are at present constituted under the Act. The employer who conscientiously carries out the terms of his contract to teach the apprentice his trade could not and would not object to this type of amendment. It is only the employer who does not conscientiously train his apprentice who would object to such an amendment.

Another thing which is turning boys against apprenticeship in this State is the provision under the regulations compelling the apprentice to attend the trade school at night in his own time. Admittedly he has to attend in the employer's time too, but then the employer gets the benefit of the boy's training in his industry. It has been said by some that if employers are prepared to release apprentices for training in the day time so should the boy be prepared to attend school at night. There may be some sound argument in that, but the tendency overseas and in other parts of Australia is to abolish night attendance.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Not with the interstate apprentices.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I differ from the honourable member on that. The widely held belief, even by the apprentice himself, that apprentices are the only section of the community of their age group subject to compulsory education in their own time has discouraged many from entering into apprenticeship. The Metal Trades Award provides that no apprentice under the age of 18 shall be required to work overtime unless he so desires. It seems an anomaly to me that an apprentice should be under legal compulsion to attend for any other aspect of his training outside ordinary working hours. The attendance by the apprentice at night classes creates considerable hardship in some instances. Some apprentices, because of the distance they have to travel to work, are away from home for a considerable number of hours on the days they attend trade school.

The tendency these days for people to reside further away from the metropolitan area, and trade schools being shifted out into the suburbs, only accentuate the position. One boy who lived at Marino was away from home for 15 hours on the day he attended night classes. Another boy at Christies Beach who worked in the metropolitan area had to arrange with friends to stay in town on the nights he attended school because he could not get home by public transport, the last bus to Christies Beach leaving at 6.30 p.m. The elimination of compulsory night classes for apprentices in this State will result in more boys entering into apprenticeship. Earlier I mentioned that the Apprentices Board had reported on the findings of the Commonwealth-State Apprenticeship Inquiry. This was prior to the introduction of the 1958 Apprentices Act Amendment Bill. The Premier then asked the board to report upon that Bill, which the board has done, and in its report I believe it again recommended amendments to the Act. This report has been in the hands of the Minister of Education for a long time. In answer to a question I asked the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Education, in this Chamber on October 18, 1961, I was told that the report was being examined. It is now about two years since the report from the board was forwarded to the Minister and the Government has yet to take some action along the lines recommended by a board primarily constituted under the present Act for the purpose of advising the Government on apprenticeship matters.

I hope the remarks I have made will bring to the notice of the Government the urgent need for making some amendments to the Apprentices Act in the manner I have stated. I support the motion.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

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