

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, July 24, 1957.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR.

The SPEAKER—I notice in the Gallery a distinguished visitor in the person of His Excellency Mr. P. A. Menon, High Commissioner for India in Australia. The House would be honoured if he would occupy a seat on the floor of the House.

Mr. Menon was escorted by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and Mr. O'Halloran to a seat on the floor of the House.

QUESTIONS.**SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Education Week is to be celebrated in this State from August 11 to 17, and I understand that arrangements are well in hand for it to be celebrated in schools throughout the State. As many country members will be expected to take at least some part in the arrangements in their areas, would the Premier consider either adjourning the House for that week or at least sitting only on Tuesday and Wednesday so that members could return to their constituencies to take part in the latter portion of the celebrations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have had a look at this problem. In many districts there are also important functions on the Tuesday, and in those circumstances it would probably suit the convenience of members if the House sat after dinner next week and adjourned for Education Week. I think members generally would approve of that action.

MEDICAL BENEFITS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My question relates to Federal rather than State policy, but at the same time concerns assistance to be given to persons living in the State. Under the Commonwealth medical set-up, in connection with tuberculosis and other diseases, where the breadwinner can be said to be on a reasonable salary but on account of the sickness of his spouse is unable to live up to a reasonable standard after paying medical expenses, I understand provision is made for hospitalization through registered approved bodies, but in connection with medical attention his case for the recovery of the expense incurred is considered hopeless. Will the State Government endeavour to prevail on the Common-

wealth to make an allowance for medical attention?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is a departmental matter, but I will have the question examined and advise the honourable member in due course.

BULLS CREEK TO DOUBLE BRIDGES ROAD.

Mr. JENKINS—Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ascertain whether provision has been made for bituminising the road from where the bitumen ends at Bulls Creek through to Double Bridges?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Yes.

ILLITERACY AMONG MILITARY TRAINEES.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—In reply to a question by Mr. Dunnage yesterday, regarding the disturbingly high percentage of illiteracy in the recent intake of military trainees, the Minister of Education said:—

I am prepared to supply the honourable member or any others with any further information on what I am sure is a matter of very great public concern.

The Minister gave several reasons which could be adduced for the illiteracy or retardation in the last 10, 20 or 30 years, and he implied that such conditions no longer obtained. These young men's education, of course, does not go so far back as 20 or 30 years, or even 10, but only into comparatively recent years. I was perturbed by this statement in the *Mail* of Saturday last by Lieut. P. Shekleton, Central Command Education Officer:—

Many of these youths have had little chance. Most of them were in primary school between 1945 and 1952. In those years the Education Department had a great teacher shortage due to the war, ever-increasing classes and a great shortage of accommodation. These conditions are reflected in the present illiteracy rate among young adult males.

He also mentioned parent apathy as having something to do with the position, but, of course, that is a matter outside the control of the Minister. Does he not consider that at least in part the conditions named by Lieut. Shekleton, ever increasing classes, teacher shortage and a great shortage of accommodation, still obtain in our schools?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes, in part.

PUMPING COSTS ON MANNUM- ADELAIDE MAIN.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked yesterday in relation to pumping costs on the Mannum-Adelaide main now that it is in operation 24 hours a day?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I conferred this morning with the Engineer for Water Supply, Mr. Campbell, and I will give the costs at per thousand gallons because, obviously, the final cost depends on how much is pumped in a week. Mr. Campbell reports that, without taking into consideration interest and standing charges which remain static whether pumping continues or otherwise, the actual cost a 1,000 gallons of pumping water from the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline to Adelaide amounts approximately to 8.2d. The charges for electricity are the main item, at about 7.9d. This includes both off and on peak tariff. Because of the huge plant and the favourable tariff rate for electricity, the pumping cost to Adelaide compares very favourably with pumping much lesser lifts in other localities such as Murray Bridge where the actual pumping costs, again without taking into consideration overheads, amounts to 13.4d. per 1,000 gallons. The honourable member will see that we are pumping water at a very favourable cost because of the huge plant involved, the relatively low charge for labour and the very favourable electricity tariff. The quantity being pumped is over 50,000,000 gallons a day.

ST. KILDA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. GOLDNEY—Can the Minister of Works indicate what progress has been made in regard to a water supply for St. Kilda township and district?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The honourable member was good enough yesterday to indicate that he intended to ask this question and I have obtained the following information from the Engineer for Water Supply:—

Advice was received from the Mines Department last week that the bore at St. Kilda had been completed. An inspection was therefore made by the District Engineer, Engineering and Water Supply Department, and an officer of the Mines Department and they agreed that the supply in the bore would be suitable for the township supply. The bore is flowing at the rate of about 2,500 g.p.h. and the water has a total solid content of 118 grains per gallon. A test of the bore which is 8in. in diameter and nearly 400ft. deep, gave a capacity of over 8,000 g.p.h. The water reaches the surface at some pressure and arrangements have been made to cap the bore to ascertain

whether the pressure of the water at the surface will be sufficient to take it to an elevated tank. The Engineer for Water Supply states that this is doubtful, but, if it proves to be the case, a bore hole pump will not be required. As the bore has been successful, materials are being order so that the scheme can be completed.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES.

Mr. LAWN—In view of the number of Government departments being shifted from offices in Victoria Square to offices elsewhere in the city, for what purpose does the Government propose to utilize the offices being vacated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—For some time the Government has been paying very high rentals for office premises which it has been leasing. Under a complete scheme of re-organization we will be able to consolidate many departments and relinquish a number of leased buildings. I will in due course get a document setting out where the various Government offices will be situated after the re-organization so that members may know where the various departments are with which they have to deal so frequently.

ASIAN INFLUENZA.

Mr. TAPPING—During the past couple of days the press has contained reports concerning an outbreak of the disease known as Asian flu, and I understand that the liner *Stratheden*, which arrived at the Outer Harbour at 8 a.m. today, carried at least eight or nine cases of the disease. This has occasioned alarm to people in the Semaphore district, which is adjacent to Outer Harbour, the gateway to the State. In view of these reports can the Premier, as acting Minister of Health, say whether the position is now under control?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This epidemic, which I believe first occurred in South-East Asia, has spread through almost every country in the world. Fortunately, up to the present in Australia the outbreak has not taken on a very virulent form and I understand it has usually been no more severe than the mild type of influenza that we frequently experience in this country. I am, however, getting from the Director of Public Health today a report on this matter and I may be able to make it available for publication later this afternoon. We have tried to get from the Commonwealth as much serum as possible to protect our hospital services and those organizations that would be most affected if the outbreak became severe, but the amount of serum available is very limited. I personally believe, however, that before sufficient

serum becomes available to deal with the matter the major part of the epidemic will probably have passed.

SUBSIDIES FOR SWIMMING POOLS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Will the Treasurer say whether the subsidies provided for the construction of swimming pools are restricted to places where there is a local government body or will the Government favourably consider a subsidy for a place where, although there is no local government body, other finance may be forthcoming from the controlling organization of the community for such a project?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There is no reason why it should be confined to areas where there is local government and, personally, I would undoubtedly approve a project outside local government areas as willingly as I would approve one inside.

SCHOOL LEAVING AGE.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I was delighted to read in this morning's *Advertiser* an article under the heading "Fourteen too Young to go to Work" written by the Deputy Director of Education. The article stated:—

My outstanding conviction is that for most children, indeed for the great majority, 14 is too young for them to go to work. . . . For I am convinced that there is a considerable wastage of human ability because of children leaving school too soon. Able men and women do not always come from those who have the advantages of an early secondary and tertiary education.

In 1954 I directed the Minister's attention to the fact that for years legislation had provided that the leaving age might be raised, and I asked whether, failing that being brought into operation, he would consider compelling children who had commenced a secondary education year before reaching 14 to continue to the end of that year. Since then I have learned that it is the desire of the School Committees Association that this should be done, and I believe the School Teachers Institute also agrees. The Minister's reply three years ago led me to believe that he was sympathetic to the views now expressed by the Deputy Director of Education. Does he support those views, and does he contemplate any action to grant either of the requests?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Deputy Director submitted the article to me and I approved of its publication as a provocative and stimulating article on a matter of great public interest and importance. As the honourable member reminded me, in 1946 Par-

liament passed an Act authorizing the Government to raise by proclamation the present age of compulsory attendance at school to any age not exceeding 15 years, and in 1949 a special Education Inquiry Committee, of which Sir Edgar Bean was chairman, recommended that the school-leaving age be raised to 15 at an early date. As the honourable member stated, the School Committees Association, the Teachers Institute, the National Council of Women and a fairly large number of other interested parties also favour the early raising of the school-leaving age; and for what it is worth, I do as well. However, it has not been considered advisable up to the present to increase the age because of shortages of accommodation and of staff, to which I referred in my reply to the honourable member three years ago.

The shortage of staff applies particularly to highly educated and trained secondary education teachers. They are a special problem today, and the problem would be accentuated by the compulsory raising of the school-going age. Our total school population has doubled in the last 10 years, and, what is more important, our secondary school enrolments have doubled in the last seven years. It is unprecedented in this State and has no parallel in any other Australian State. Realizing all the difficulties involved, many interested parties have asked me to make a modest compromise in the meantime by making it compulsory for every child in South Australian secondary schools (other than those obtaining exemption allowed by regulation) to remain at school until the end of the year in which he or she reaches the age of 14, as distinct from the end of the term, as at present. In my opinion, this request has much to commend it, and after the results of the next recruiting drive are known and a number of highly trained and experienced secondary teachers arrive from the United Kingdom, I hope to be in a position to make a submission on the matter to Cabinet.

WAR SERVICE SETTLERS' COMMITMENTS.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Can the Minister of Repatriation say whether applicants who have been placed on blocks under the war service land settlement scheme have met their commitments to the Government satisfactorily during the last year?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—A report I have received shows that most settlers have met their commitments. For the last four years an average of slightly over 92 per cent have

met their commitments in full, and the percentage was exactly 92 at April 30 this year. A week ago it was 96, so the position is very good. Even in some of the areas where there has been some concern the figures have been good. For instance, at Eight Mile Creek only one settler is in arrears, and only for a very small amount. There are seven settlers in arrears on Kangaroo Island, two in the lower South-East, four at Wanilla, one at Tumbay Bay, and four at Campbell Park. There are only 19 settlers in arrears, and some of them only for a very small amount.

TRANSPORT FOR OODLA WIRRA SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—A school bus has been operating from Oodla Wirra to Peterborough for a considerable period, driven by a teacher who lives at Oodla Wirra and teaches at the Peterborough school. According to my information, the bus is now so over-crowded that some children have been denied the right to travel on it. More recently, people at Oodla-Wirra have presented a petition to the Director of Education asking that the school there be reopened. This, of course, raises the question of providing bus transport between Ucolta and Peterborough because in the intermediate section the population is about the same as that at Oodla Wirra. Can the Minister of Education say whether this question has been examined by the department and whether any conclusion has been reached?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am familiar with the subject raised by the honourable member and have caused inquiries to be made by the department's transport officer, the local inspector, and the local headmaster, but I have not sufficient information yet on which to make a decision. There are two or three conflicting interests in the district, as there are in most districts, but I think I shall be able to solve the problem to the satisfaction of the honourable member, if not to the complete satisfaction of all residents concerned.

TAPLEY'S HILL ROAD.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I frequently use the Tapley's Hill Road at night and have some personal knowledge of its condition. It is now positively dangerous, not only to motorists but to pedestrians, from the Grange Road to the North Glenelg boundary. It is lit by small-powered lights at intervals of one-fifth of a mile between Grange Road and Henley Beach Road; between Grange Road and Airport Road there are four or five helium

lamps of a type similar to those on Anzac Highway; and from the West Beach Road turnoff to the drive-in theatre right over to the boundary of North Glenelg there is not one single light. A considerable volume of traffic uses this road and at night time it is very dangerous, because it is only wide enough for two cars. It is time the matter was enquired into by the Highways Department. Will the Minister take up with the Minister of Roads the question of the early reconstruction of Tapley's Hill Road between Grange Road and North Glenelg, and the installation of modern lighting, particularly the latter, which is most urgent?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM MCINTOSH—I will take up the question of the reconstruction of the road. The installation of lights is, I think, outside the jurisdiction of the Highways Department. Speaking from memory, legislation was passed authorizing the lighting of the Anzac Highway and Port Road, and fixing the amounts to be spent thereon. I will obtain a report from the Minister of Roads.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL.

Mr. LOVEDAY—On behalf of the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), and at his request, I ask the Premier if he has a reply to the question Mr. Riches asked in the first week of the session regarding the provision of additional beds in the maternity wing of the Port Augusta Hospital.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That report is not yet to hand, but will be in a few days.

STOLEN CARS.

Mr. TAPPING—A recent report discloses that the incidence of stolen cars has increased over the last 12 months. I am told that in Tasmania the Government is introducing legislation to minimize this rather serious offence. Can the Premier obtain a report from the Commissioner of Police on this matter, and also find out whether the penalties prescribed by the present legislation are a sufficient deterrent?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

WATER RATES ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED SWAMPS.

Mr. BYWATERS—On June 26 this year I asked the Minister of Lands what was the Government's policy with regard to water rates in reclaimed areas. Can the Minister now give a reply?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes. Under the present legislation there is no authority to remit water rates. However, the Government has considered this matter and a Bill now being drafted will give some relief to people who have suffered from the flood. This matter was also raised at a meeting in the Upper Murray, so it applies to all river areas where flood damage has taken place.

POLICE MOTOR CYCLES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I have been led to believe that police motor cycles are purchased at the cost of some hundreds of pounds and that they are kept in first-class order by well-trained and efficient mechanics. I am informed that while still in a good condition they are sold back to the dealer they were bought from at prices as low as £35, and later resold by the same dealer for at least five times that amount. Can the Premier say whether this information is correct and if so, is it possible to have these machines sold by the Police Department by tender or at auction?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know, Police Department motor vehicles are not sold until they have completed large mileages. I was examining this matter quite recently, in connection with the Budget figures at present being prepared, and was concerned to notice that many of the vehicles in use by the department, particularly those in the Traffic Branch, have been kept far too long and have travelled excessive mileages. I believe it would be profitable for the Government to change the vehicles more rapidly. Some have travelled more than 150,000 miles and that seems to be keeping vehicles beyond the economically best time for selling them. As far as I am aware—and I will advise the member if this is not correct—the buying and selling is always done strictly in accordance with the Supply and Tender Act, by the Supply and Tender Board. Probably it is a case of “trade-in.” The Supply and Tender Board is the authority that purchases and sells Government stocks and provides for the requirements of Government departments.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. KING—I understand the Minister of Lands recently made a statement at an R.S.L. Conference concerning the number of approved applicants for war service settlement land. Is the Minister in a position to indicate how many returned men are still eligible for settlement, and whether there are any proposals to settle them? I refer particularly to irrigation land.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have the report that I gave to the conference last Thursday. I do not know whether I can segregate irrigation lands from dry lands on the spur of the moment, but I think members will be interested in the overall picture of settlement of both dry and irrigation areas. I was asked recently by the R.S.S. & A.I.L.A. if I would classify all applicants who were still on the books regardless of the fact that in 1952 just over 400 were advised that it was doubtful whether they would secure blocks. A total of 713 were written to, but only 479 replied that they were still interested. These were then advised of the date, time and place—either in Adelaide or a convenient country centre—for an interview with the Land Board. Many of these meetings were attended by either the President or Vice-President of the league. The response to the circulars and interviews was:—

	Dry	Lands.	Irrigation.	Total.
No reply to circular ..	101		14	115
Circular unclaimed ..	43		3	46
Replied no longer interested ..	71		2	73
Replied still interested, but did not attend meeting with board ..	47		11	58
Did not attend as had been approved for single units ..	4		5	9
Replied still interested, and gave evidence to board ..	354		58	412
	620		93	713

The Land Board, which interviewed applicants, found that many would be unlikely to make successful settlers because of advancing age, doubtful health or loss of touch with rural activities. The board's estimate of the applicants was:—

	Dry	Lands.	Irrigation.	Total.
Average or above ..	100		15	115
Below average ..	170		21	191
Unlikely to be successful ..	84		22	106
	354		58	412

Of that number 65 dry lands applicants are on blocks, some of which are small and do not constitute living areas, and five are on irrigation blocks. Unfortunately, 55 dry lands applicants were not prepared to assist in the development of blocks, 13 were interested in single units only and 87 applicants classified for grazing were not interested in Kangaroo Island. After closely analysing the figures, I think it is a

fair statement that, excising from the 354 dry land and 58 irrigation land applicants 106 considered not suitable, 55 not prepared to assist in the development of blocks, and 50 of the 100 (87 who are not prepared to go to Kangaroo Island and 13 who will wait for single units), which would leave a balance of 201, 171 would be entitled to a dry lands block and 30 to irrigation blocks.

PILDAPPA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—On June 27 I asked the Minister of Works a question relating to a better water supply at Pildappa. Has he received a report on the second suggestion made, of collecting water from the rock area and the provision of a tank?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will make further inquiries and bring down a report.

COTTAGE FLATS FOR PENSIONERS.

Mr. TAPPING—A few weeks ago I asked the Premier a question relating to the trust's policy on building homes for pensioners. Has he a reply to my query?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received a report that the trust has already built 288 cottage flats, and at present 54 are under construction. A contract for the erection of a further 100 flats is to be let this month.

APPROACHES TO MURRAY BRIDGE BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—On June 27 I asked the Minister of Works a question relating to the bridge approaches at Murray Bridge, and asked whether warning signs and double lines could be put there because of the dangerous nature of the approaches to the bridge. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I have conferred with my colleague, who has informed me that the department intends to go even further than the provision of double lines this year, as it intends to make the approach on the eastern side safer. I have not received his reply to the question about double lines; that is a minor matter as far as costs are concerned, and might be helpful.

AMENDMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Minister of Works inform me whether the Minister of Local Government will introduce legislation to amend the Local Government Act this session?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—It is so intended, and the Bill is in process of drafting.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 23. Page 112.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, the members for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) and Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) respectively, on their excellent contributions to the debate. The speech of the member for Barossa was a learned contribution based, I believe, on what he thought were the facts. Probably I have other views on some of the actions of the Government than he has, but that does not detract from the excellence of the case he made out for the Government. The member for Eyre showed a knowledge of country problems generally, and particularly of his own district, which was beneficial to the House, and I also congratulate him on his remarks. Once or twice he raised a kindred feeling in my mind when he took the Government to task for neglect of road problems in the outlying parts of his electorate, just as I could fairly take it to task for its neglect of road problems in parts of my electorate.

In the speech with which His Excellency was pleased to open Parliament I find many matters that should be discussed in this debate. Firstly, I approve wholeheartedly of paragraph 2, in which His Excellency very modestly announced that Her Majesty the Queen had been pleased to extend his term of office for a further period of two years. I express my pleasure, and I believe that of the Opposition, at this extension. His Excellency has proved a very competent and understanding representative of Her Majesty, and has been eager at all times to visit the various parts of the State in order to understand the problems of the people and thereby become more familiar with the steps required to solve them. Lady George has been a gracious lady indeed and endeared herself to all sections of the community. I can say on this occasion, as I could on a former occasion, that South Australia has been very fortunate in the Crown's recent choice of Governors, and their sojourn here has been such as to add to the cohesion of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

I come now to other parts of His Excellency's speech about which I cannot wholeheartedly agree. In paragraph 3 he refers to a continuance of the prosperity which South Australia

has enjoyed in recent years. I suggest that although the authors of the speech did not say it in so many words they endeavoured to convey the impression that the Government was responsible for the prosperity, but I suggest that it was the result of a set of fortuitous circumstances. There has been such an impact on the economic life of the State that even this Government could not disturb it. I propose to refer particularly to the part the wool industry has played in promoting prosperity, and in submitting information I have taken for comparative purposes two five-yearly periods. The following table shows wool production and its value in the first period:—

Period.	Production. (lb.)	Value. £
1934-35	77,791,000	2,655,000
1935-36	81,709,000	4,058,000
1936-37	76,604,000	4,360,000
1937-38	86,606,000	4,070,000
1938-39	102,888,000	3,901,000
Total for 5 years	425,598,000	19,044,000
Average	85,120,000	3,809,000

Average price per lb.: 11d.

The position in the second period was as follows:—

Period.	Production. (lb.)	Value. £
1950-51	125,384,000	66,247,000
1951-52	135,484,000	36,197,000
1952-53	158,658,000	48,579,000
1953-54	145,509,000	44,434,000
1954-55	155,761,000	41,602,000
Total for 5 years	720,796,000	237,059,000
Average	144,159,000	47,412,000

Average price per lb.: 6s. 6d.

If it had not been for the increased production, due in the main to good seasons, and the increased price, due to the position overseas, our prosperity would not be anything like it is. Then there is the matter mentioned in paragraph 4 of His Excellency's speech:—

The basic wage in South Australia in terms of purchasing power is still the greatest in Australia.

How His Excellency's advisers expected members of this House to believe that one I do not know, because I think every member knows that the purchasing power of wages is determined by the cost of the articles the worker purchases with his wages. Prior to 1953, for purposes of determining the wage paid in this State, we took cost of living figures issued by the Commonwealth Statistician and made quarterly adjustments on that basis. In 1953 the Federal Government decided to

abandon quarterly adjustments of the basic wage and the Government of this State failed to take any steps to remove the link up between our State industrial court and the Commonwealth court's decision. It will be recalled that some years previously it had been determined that quarterly adjustments made by the Federal Court in accordance with the Statistician's figures should be applied to the living wage as determined by the South Australian Industrial Court and the Government simply permitted these conditions to continue, and as there was no increase in the Federal basic wage there was none in the State living wage. On the other hand, employees working under decisions of the industrial tribunals in all the other States received cost of living adjustments either wholly or in part—in most cases wholly—and in most of the States they are still receiving these adjustments, yet we are asked to believe that the workers of South Australia are better off than the workers of other States.

I have a lot of figures touching on this question but will refer only to the more important of them. Quarterly cost of living adjustments were suspended in September, 1953, and so the basic wage of South Australia remained at the then figure of £11 11s. a week until March 31, 1956. Between the September quarter, 1953, and the March quarter, 1955, there was not a very great increase in the cost of living and workers lost per week 2s., 3s., 2s., 2s., 5s., 5s. and 7s. in the respective quarters. I mention these figures because they are relevant to a point I shall make presently. Despite what we have been told again and again by representatives of employers at conferences, or before industrial tribunals, or wherever they got a chance to harangue all the people or some of the people on the question of keeping wages down we find that it is rising charges that cause the cost of living to increase. During the early stages, when the figures remained fairly static, the cost of living did not go up very much but once they found out that the gate was open and the cost of living could be forced up in this State without any corresponding increase in wages they certainly made hay while the sun shone, and the figures for the next 12 months indicate that for the first quarter the disparity between the cost of living wage and the actual wage in this State was 11s., in the next quarter 13s. and in the remaining quarters 15s. each as regards males; for females the figures were respectively 8s. 3d., 9s. 9d., 11s. 3d. and 11s. 3d. I want to relate those figures to

what the workers of South Australia have lost, for after all it is money in the pay envelope that creates purchasing power.

Mr. Lawn—If the wage earner lost it where did it go?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It did not go anywhere. It was never in circulation, but the employers of South Australia saved the amount that I shall now mention and to that extent had an advantage, not only as regards their own profits, but an advantage over their counterparts in the eastern States who had been compelled by Labor Governments to grant cost of living increases to their employees. The nearest approach I can get to the number of employees engaged in South Australia is 160,000 males and 40,000 females. I will admit that those figures are averages only and may err one way or the other to some small extent. I have used them again and again, other members of the Opposition and representatives of the industrial movement have used them as well, and they have never been challenged by the Premier, any of his supporters, the Chamber of Manufactures or Chamber of Commerce, so I think I am justified in claiming that they are reasonably correct. On that basis male workers have lost £12,515,000 and females £2,346,000, making a total of £14,861,000. Anticipating that someone may come to light with the bright idea that averages are different from actualities I hasten to state that the average cost of living wage for that period was £12 2s. 6d. for males and £9 1s. 9d. for females and the average Board of Industry wage which, of course, is the wage that was settled by the pegging of the Federal Arbitration Court was £11 14s. for males and £8 15s. 6d. for females. The average loss each week for males was 8s. 6d. and for females 6s. 3d., while the average loss for the period was £78 4s. for males and £58 13s. for females. So much for the claim that the workers of South Australia are the best off in the Commonwealth. These figures show conclusively that they are indubitably worse off than any other workers and it is sheer hypocrisy for the Government to put words into His Excellency's mouth claiming that our workers are the best off. I now turn to another statement in paragraph 4. Indeed, it is remarkable how much of the first page of His Excellency's Speech I completely disagree with.

Mr. Jennings—It is propaganda.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is an apt name for it. Paragraph 4 states:—

Sufficient Loan money has been obtained to enable the Government to carry on a controlled programme of public works throughout the year without serious disruption.

There are three reasons why a Government borrows and spends money: firstly, to provide permanent and reproductive public works; secondly, to provide amenities for the population; and thirdly, in times of unemployment to provide work for the unemployed. Very few public works of a permanent and reproductive nature have been provided by the huge Loan expenditure of recent years, although many amenities have been provided, amenities that have become necessary because of the almost cancerous growth of a metropolitan area to which population is being attracted not only from overseas, but also from the country districts of this State. The result is the necessity for all kinds of works to provide amenities at the expense of reproductive works. My colleague from Port Pirie will probably have something to say about the improvements necessary to the Port Pirie harbour, but from what we hear we understand that we will have to wait for years until money is available for that work. I remind members, however, that the ore traffic to Port Pirie passes over a railway line that runs through my electorate and I fear that unless handling facilities at Port Pirie are improved we shall lose at least some of that traffic to the New South Wales railways and that, once lost, that traffic will never be recovered. We should pay attention to that prospect now and not be told that the improvements at Port Pirie must wait until the Loan programme permits us to proceed with the work.

Most of the Loan moneys has been spent on providing amenities and maintaining employment, but I believe that its expenditure on the latter objective should be guarded in circumstances such as those existing in South Australia at present so that surplus funds may be available in the future to provide for a recession should one occur, although I hope, for the sake of South Australian workers, that one will not occur while this Government is in power. Paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech hints that the boots will be sunk into somebody, if not all of us, when it states:—

My Ministers may, however, be compelled to reconsider the charges for some services.

Since that statement was made, the fares charged on vehicles run by the Municipal Tramways Trust have been increased.

Mr. Jennings—No Minister had to consider that rise.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is so, but although the trust is not a Government show, Parliament has to find the money to keep the buses and trams running. In this connection, when members took the easy way out in 1952 they took the wrong way out, and I remind members that, when the Treasurer introduced a Bill to amend the Municipal Tramways Act, Opposition members argued that the trams should be taken over by the Government and placed under the control of a Minister who would be responsible to Parliament and be advised by a committee of experts on the most economical and satisfactory way to run them. We were told, however, that it was not the Government's job to provide money for metropolitan transport. Indeed, country members representing constituents who for years had had their wheat and superphosphate carted cheaply, said that the fares in the metropolitan area should be jacked up to make public transport pay its way, and the Treasurer came along with a scheme I will describe in a few moments.

I now turn to the effect of continually raising tram and bus fares. In 1944-45 the population of the metropolitan area was 365,000 and the trust carried 95,000,000 passengers. In 1955-56, despite the fact that the population had increased to 515,000, the service carried only 63,500,000 passengers, a loss of 31,500,000 in 12 years. I know that some of the loss was because motor cars and petrol had become more readily available than in the first period, but I submit that even so they would not have been used to the extent that they are today unless they were also cheaper than transport by tram or bus. Each progressive increase in fares on this public transport resulted in a loss of patrons. There have been two increases since the new board of management took over the undertaking, and as a result of these increases the number of patrons has continued to decrease. We are going to reach the stage, if we have not already done so, when the only people who will be riding on our public transport system will be those who cannot afford the capital cost of purchasing their own transport—the less privileged people of the community. They will have the cost of journeying to and from work and other travelling increased to unbearable heights.

Mr. Hambour—Would you not like everyone to have a car?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, and one of these days when the Labor Party's policy—

Mr. Coumbe—Which Labor Party?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—There is only one Labor Party and there has been only one since the beginning. I know that people like Mr. Coumbe are able to get weak-kneed persons, who have been hanging on to the Labor Party to gain something out of it, to start another Party under a new name. It is a great credit to the Labor Party that the Party which was first organized is the Labor Party today. Although I am comparatively young, I can remember a number of aliases under which the Party to which Mr. Coumbe belongs operated. When I began to take a very small interest in politics it was known as the National Defence League. It then became the Primary Producers Political Union, then there was an amalgamation with another splinter group and it became the Liberal Democratic Federation, later it became the Liberal Union, and then during the 1914-18 war it became necessary to change the names of certain South Australian towns in order to win the war! This, of course, had a most demoralizing effect on Kaiser Bill and influenced whole divisions of the best fighters in the German Army to go over to Moscow. In fact, it wrecked the German Empire. This Party was then called the National Party.

Mr. Fletcher—Another splinter group?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It was not even a splinter, but a little seedling. The Labor Party does not object to people having their own motor cars provided that conditions are such that everyone in the community has an even break. We do not want the cost of travel to those who cannot afford motor cars jacked up to unbearable limits.

Mr. Lawn—As to pensioners.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, and others on the lower rungs of the ladder, with charges increased to great heights in order that this show can pay. I made some remarks in 1952 on a Bill which was before the House, and it might be just as well to refer to them again. In that year the Treasurer introduced a Bill reconstituting the trust, and giving it a free hand. He stated that a total subsidy of £1,180,000 spread over a period of five years would be sufficient to overcome the trust's financial difficulties. At that time I proposed the policy I have already mentioned as being the better of the two solutions, and I went further and said that it would be better for the Government to take the full responsibility of running this service and make

good the losses in order to keep fares down, because it was only by keeping fares down that we could have ensured a continuance of adequate patronage on this transport system.

The figures mentioned by the Treasurer as being necessary to provide this subsidy were:—1952-53, £450,000; 1953-54, £350,000; 1954-55, £250,000; 1955-56, £100,000 and 1956-57, £30,000—a diminishing figure each year. The actual amounts the Government has made available, according to the Estimates, and I have no doubt that they were expended by the management, were:—In 1952-53, £700,000 (not £450,000 as suggested by the Treasurer); 1953-54, also £700,000 (not £350,000 as proposed when we were asked to pass the Bill); 1954-55, £600,000 (not £250,000); 1955-56, £570,000 (not £100,000); 1956-57, £510,000 (not £30,000). The total provided in those five years was not £1,180,000, which we were assured would be sufficient to put the finances of the system on a sound basis, but £3,080,000—in other words, more than twice the amount we were asked to vote. The discrepancy was £1,900,000.

That is not all the story. The figures for the same five years disclose that the real loss on the undertaking was in the first year, 1952-53, £792,000 (£92,000 more than the Government provided); in 1953-54 it was £795,000 (£95,000 more than the Government provided); in 1954-55 it was £739,000; in 1955-56, £710,000; and in 1956-57, £710,000. The total loss for the five years was £3,748,000, or £668,000 more than the subsidy provided by the Government, which was £1,900,000 more than we were told would be necessary to effect the financial rehabilitation of the tramway system.

That is only one aspect of the unsatisfactory position of this undertaking. The other is the capital position, which, to say the least, is completely unsatisfactory. According to the best information I can extract from the Auditor General's reports the position of the trust as regards assets and liabilities is as follows:—

Year	Liability to Treasurer for		Assets.	Deficiency.
	Loan Money.			
1953 . .	5,552,000		2,368,000	3,184,000
1954 . .	5,717,000		2,448,000	3,269,000
1955 . .	6,779,000		3,371,000	3,408,000
1956 . .	6,386,000		3,187,000	3,199,000

The deficiency as at June 30, 1956, would have been £350,000 greater but for the fact that the Government remitted that amount of

indebtedness from the sinking fund. On this aspect the Auditor General stated:—

The Treasurer has advised the trust that he proposes to allocate annually an amount in reduction of the trust's debt based on the extent to which the cash grant is estimated to fall short of meeting the full loss on operations, including depreciation. Further, an attempt will be made to cover in like manner the extent of the unprovided depreciation during the three years to June 30, 1955. This will be subject, of course, to sufficient reserves being available to the Treasurer to permit such a procedure.

That is an indication that Parliament may have to vote even larger sums for the support of this undertaking, and I think that before long many people will doubt the wisdom of changing so quickly from tram to bus transport. However, I have never had any doubts on this subject. I have always thought that any change should be carried out over a long period and only after proper trials. Apparently the trust believes it has unlimited money to spend, and apparently it has. More than £3,000,000 of the money it owes the Treasurer has been irrevocably lost, for what assets has it to show for it? It has a considerable mileage of permanent way shown in the books at about £900,000, but the tracks are being pulled up and I doubt whether the trust is getting enough from the materials recovered to pay the cost of pulling them up. It has many trams, represented by a considerable sum in the books, but they are being offered to the public at only £20 each. When the final wash up takes place—

Mr. John Clark—Wash out!

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is the point. It will be a real wash out for the taxpayers of this State and a monument to the financial incompetence of this Government. The buses are knocking our roads to pieces and causing councils great difficulties, but they provide the public with less comfort than the trams. I am sure the financial losses would not have been so great if the undertaking had been placed under the control of a Minister responsible to Parliament, which was the policy of Labor in 1952, and is Labor's policy today. This should be the policy of any Government that believes in financial responsibility and democratic control, for if this Parliament continues to hand out unlimited sums to an organization not under its control it will find itself in sore straits. I am just looking through the Governor's Speech to see whether I can find anything to commend.

Mr. Hutchens—That will need hunting!

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I think it will. We have been given a few figures lately about the

cost of pumping water over the Mount Lofty range to Adelaide, and I am afraid they may be used to condition us for a further increase in charges for water. I hope the Treasurer will be more straightforward in making any announcements on water charges than he was when they were raised last. He said then, "Oh no, the Government will not increase water rates," but the Government then caused a new assessment to be made which resulted in a substantial increase in the charge for water.

Mr. Brookman—That is a very reasonable approach.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is not a frank approach to say that the Government will not increase rates and then jack up assessments to secure the same result. I do not see how the assessments can be jacked up any more, and I am therefore anxious to know whether the Government's next move will be a further increase in assessments or in charges for water. There will probably also be an

increase in railway freights and fares, and it will be interesting to see what the Treasurer produces in this respect.

Mr. John Clark—If our real prosperity is so great, why are these increases necessary?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is the point I am coming to. According to the Government, South Australia is the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth, but in order to prevent it from going bankrupt it is necessary to increase charges to almost every section of the community.

Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's speech mentions that a record 73,000,000 bushels of grain was harvested last year. I point out that the area sown to wheat in this State is diminishing, although the area sown to barley is increasing. To bring these two points into proper perspective I have again taken those two five-year periods that I referred to earlier in relation to wool and wool values. The figures are as follows:—

Period.	Wheat.			Barley.		
	Area. Acres. (Mill.)	Yield. Bush. (Mill.)	Value. £ (Mill.)	Area. Acres. (Mill.)	Yield. Bush. (Mill.)	Value. £ (Mill.)
1934-35	3.2	27	5	.3	6	.8
1935-36	3.0	31	7	.4	6	.7
1936-37	3.0	29	7	.3	4	.9
1937-38	3.0	43	8	.4	9	1.5
1938-39	3.0	32	4	.5	8	1.0
Total		162	31		33	4.9

The average price for wheat was 3s. 8d. a bushel and for barley 3s. a bushel.

When we come to the last five years we find that the area sown to wheat has dropped from 3,000,000 acres to 1,800,000 in 1950-51, to 1,600,000 in 1951-52, to 1,500,000 in the next two years, and to 1,700,000 in 1954-55. Over those years the yield has been fairly constant, but the value has leapt from £31,000,000 in the first five-year period to £118,000,000 in the last five years. Barley production has gone up. In 1950-51 and 1951-52 the area sown was 800,000 acres, in 1952-53 it was 900,000 acres, in 1953-54 it was 1,100,000 acres, and in 1954-55 it was 1,000,000 acres. The yield was 106,000,000 bushels and the total value was £71,000,000. The average price of wheat over the period was 15s. 5d. and the average price of barley 11s. 5d., a big contrast to the 3s. 8d. and 3s. respectively for the first five-year period. So prosperity is born! Let us hope that prosperity of this kind will not increase, because if it does I shudder to think of the fate of the people of this State.

The figures that have been quoted recently for pumping water over the hills from Mannum to Adelaide indicate to my mind the possibility of an increase in the charge for water. We are indebted to the statement made by the Premier in the *Advertiser* of July 16 with regard to these costs, which he gave as £650,000 for a full year, £594,000 of which was for power. According to my figures, that works out at over £11,000 a week for power alone. Let us examine this position. I said earlier that we had spent money on attracting population to the metropolitan area from within the State, from interstate, and from overseas, and it is because of this influx that the huge cost of pumping water over the hills has to be met. The £650,000 is not the total operating cost by any means. I was a member of the Public Works Standing Committee when the scheme was first investigated, and it was estimated to cost about £4,000,000. The last figures I saw at the end of the last financial year showed a cost of £10,000,000 up to that stage, and it is not yet completed. To this cost of

pumping must be added interest on the £10,000,000 or more and the other ancillary costs associated with the scheme. This scheme was implemented to prevent the workers from spreading out from the industrial districts of the metropolitan area. If they went out to places like Murray Bridge, Tailem Bend, and Port Lincoln they would build up a solid core of labour in those places and the fate of the Government would be in jeopardy, therefore the Government does not believe in decentralization. It takes no effective steps to bring this about.

Mr. Bywaters—It says differently at election time.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, Liberal Party members then speak with their tongues in their cheeks; it is a wonder they have not worn away the sides of their cheeks. The Premier is now giving his blessing to some pipe dream of somebody that we will have a population of a million people living on the plains between Adelaide and Gawler within 25 years. We will never have that population because we could not supply it with water, which is the life blood of any city. Why don't we seek sites in the country where alternative water supplies are available for the establishment of industries? There are ready-made sites beside the Murray River with water in large quantities. About 50 per cent of the water we are entitled to use under the agreement runs to waste. Steps should be taken to establish industries there, and elsewhere throughout the State where similar potentialities exist.

Mr. Brookman—Would you compel industries to go there?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No, but I would not spend taxpayers' money, which can never be recovered, in establishing them on the Adelaide plains between here and Gawler.

Mr. Bywaters—But you would encourage industries elsewhere?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes. I would provide the necessary amenities in country areas rather than in the city.

Mr. Hambour—Are you opposed to the Mannum pipeline?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I doubt if the honourable member knows the story of that pipeline, but, for his enlightenment—if he is prepared to be enlightened or capable of enlightenment—I was a firm supporter of the proposal because at that time it was essential to safeguard the water supply for the then existing population of Adelaide. I am opposed to this talk of a million people on the Adelaide plains because such a population would necessitate the provision of one or two

more pipelines. Steps should be taken to encourage some of the new population to settle on the Murray. I am not satisfied that the reservoir potential of the ranges north of Adelaide has been sufficiently exploited. If it were exploited it would assist in establishing industries at centres such as Orroroo, Quorn and Peterborough.

We hear much about land development and have been told that 920 ex-servicemen have been settled on the land in South Australia since the end of the war. That is not good enough. I realize that the figures quoted by the Minister of Lands today indicate that there are not a great number of applicants waiting for settlement, but if we expect them to wait for a few more years they will be too old to go on the land. That is precisely what has happened. A number of the original applicants have tired of waiting and turned their eyes to other opportunities and no longer seek land for settlement. In this respect I do not blame the State Government as much as the Federal Government for the tardiness with which the land has been made available. The Federal Government should have assisted in expeditious land settlement after World War II. Although 920 men have been settled since the war the number of landholders has decreased alarmingly in recent years. In 1938-39 there were 31,123 individual landholders, but in 1955-56 only 28,092—a reduction of over 3,000.

Mr. Heaslip—A lot of them went broke.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I do not think many went broke between 1939 and 1956, but even if they did go broke whose fault was it? There were Liberal Governments in power in the Federal and State Parliaments and they did nothing to keep those people on the land. They protected the first mortgagees and that was all they were concerned about.

Mr. Brookman—You can't blame the Government for a man going broke.

Mr. Hambour—What about the depression and the Scullin Government?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I cannot answer two interjections at once so I will deal with the more sensible of the two first. If it had not been for Government assistance a great many more primary producers would have gone broke in that period, but that assistance was not sufficiently widespread. In reply to Mr. Hambour, the late Mr. Scullin was one of the greatest men who ever held power in this country. He was crucified by the money power of England. He had not been in office a week before they threatened to put the

bailiffs in, which they subsequently did. The result was the Premiers' Plan, designed to protect no-one except bond holders and first mortgagees, creating unemployment unprecedentedly high in the State's history—unemployment which the people will never permit again. They would never stand 30 per cent of their numbers being out of work in future. Some old-timers in the Federal Parliament, even though Conservative, remember what happened to the primary producers in the 1930's and are holding out against bank legislation aimed at destroying the power of the Commonwealth Bank. We will never again have such a state of affairs as we had in 1929, 1930 and 1931, and I do not want to see it. I am not one of those who go around with a placard on my back saying that I am an anti-communist and that I am fighting communism. Nevertheless, I hate communism because it is a denial of fundamental human rights. The way to fight communism is to destroy the conditions that breed and educate communists.

I shall now deal briefly with the number of persons employed in primary occupations, because I have heard it said that rural production is becoming more efficient—that although the number of holdings has diminished, more people are working in primary occupations, and other such nonsense. In 1938-1939, 41,421 males and 2,942 females were employed in primary industries in this State, a total of 44,363. In 1955-1956, 37,335 males and 4,670 females, a total of 42,005, were so employed. The number diminished by 2,357 in that period. Of course, as the number of females increased, the number of males diminished more than that in the period. I have a suspicion that the number of females might have increased by recognition of the fact that certain members of farmers' families were eligible to be classed as employees in the industry for taxation purposes. I do not oppose that; I think it is right, for if a farmer's daughter is prepared to help on the farm, the farmer should be able to claim a taxation concession just as if she were an employed hand. However, the number employed on holdings has decreased.

Mr. King—That is mainly due to mechanization.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The number of holdings has not decreased because of mechanization. Mechanization should be increasing primary production, but members can refer to the figures I gave relating to the wool industry—

Mr. Heaslip—You have not quoted livestock.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have quoted wool figures, which show that the production of wool has doubled, yet that industry cannot be mechanized to any appreciable extent. I now come to the housing position. His Excellency said:—

Although an improvement in the housing position is now evident, the unsatisfied demand for houses is still strong, and is likely to remain so for some time. The Government therefore proposes to continue a vigorous policy of using all available agencies to assist home seekers.

Mr. Jennings—Where is improvement evident?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is what I want to know. It is not evident in the latest figures I have been able to secure. I think the number of houses that the trust has been able to provide for applicants is a fair guide. In 1952-53 there were 7,904 applicants for trust homes, and 4,126 units were built; in 1953-54, 9,807 applicants, 3,555 units built; in 1954-55, 10,806 applicants, 3,268 units built; and in 1955-56, 11,751 applicants, and only 3,238 units were built. From these figures it can be seen that the number of units built by the trust has diminished while the demand as shown by the number of new applicants—and I emphasize that these figures are of new applicants, not a carryover of applicants from previous years—has increased.

Mr. Jennings—We are losing ground.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—We are, rapidly, yet we are told that the position has been improved. In that period there were 40,268 applicants, of whom only 14,187 were satisfied by the trust. A small proportion, of course, might have been satisfied elsewhere, but the figures show conclusively that we are losing ground, not gaining. That is something we will have to face up to in the very near future. We hear a great deal about child delinquency and about some trainees taken into the army not being up to the required educational standard; some are even illiterate. Nothing brings about child delinquency or illiteracy more than bad housing conditions, and we have to accept our share of the responsibility for not pressing on with a proper housing programme. Some figures relating to cottage homes for pensioners were given in reply to a question today. They are more up-to-date than my figures, which indicate that 887 applications were received from these homes during 1955-56, and that the number of flats built for that period was 100.

In conclusion, let me say that His Excellency's Speech is not such a record of good

government, sound prosperity and hope for the future that yesterday we were led to believe it was; rather, it is something that should cause us to sit up and take notice and to see whether something cannot be done to improve the state of affairs in South Australia, to provide homes and education for the people, and land for those thousands of unsatisfied land seekers throughout the length and breadth of South Australia, and finally, to take real steps to bring about the effective decentralization of industry on which the future progress and prosperity of this State undoubtedly depends.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—I have pleasure in supporting the motion so ably moved yesterday by Mr. Laucke and seconded by Mr. Bockelberg, and today so ably supported by the Leader of the Opposition. I, too, congratulate His Excellency on the extension by Her Majesty of his term of office as Governor of South Australia. This has been a most popular appointment, as both Sir Robert and Lady George have endeared themselves to our people, especially to those in the country who have had the opportunity to meet the vice-regal couple on their country trips. This debate necessarily deals with matters mentioned in the Governor's Speech, which is divided into two main sections. The first relates to the progress of the State in the past year and the second outlines proposed legislation this session. The first makes interesting reading; in fact, it is almost exciting, not only because it shows the consolidation work done by Government departments, but because it outlines the rapid and in many ways spectacular growth and prosperity of the State. I am proud to be a South Australian for I believe this State is a land of opportunity, with a great future. The Governor's Speech deals with things to come and confirms the opinion I hold. Prosperity and faith in the future is the keynote of the speech, despite the efforts of the Leader of the Opposition to try to convince himself and other members to think otherwise.

South Australia's population increase through migration is almost double the Australian figure. This is a reflection of our favourable standard of living and sound economic conditions. The Governor's Speech reports record production in wheat, other grain, beef and dairy cattle, sheep and the number of lambs marketed. Most important, it speaks of the highest wool production in the history of the State. This was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition and it is one of the significant points in the Governor's Speech. It is important to the State that primary production has increased so

remarkably and that the value to our economy is so significant, because secondary industry is so dependent on primary industry. When the man on the land flourishes so does the man in the metropolitan area.

We read that new reservoirs for water catchments are being constructed, new trunk mains installed and extensions made to the pipeline from the River Murray. This all points to an extension of the already expensive water reticulation system to meet the needs of the increased population, and with it goes an expansion of our railways. The foresight of the Government some years ago in introducing diesel locomotives on our railway system is now showing the results expected. We have examples of startling economies being achieved. We read that increased services are being introduced in some districts, some to Elizabeth and some to districts farther north and to the south.

I note with appreciation that it is reported that the Highways Department is spending a greater amount of money this year on roads to assist councils in their work. Naturally I am mainly concerned about work in my electorate and whilst some reconstruction has taken place since the conversion from trams to buses there is still much to be done. This work is related to the problem of outlet roads from the city, particularly to the north. In my district there are four of these main roads. The north-east road to Teatree Gully has been reconstructed. The Main North Road, the chief outlet, is due for conversion from trams to buses in November, and Prospect Road will be done next year. If the proposal I made last year in this House had been accepted and land purchased at the end of Prospect Road at Kilburn, an additional outlet along this road would be assured. When the reconstruction of Churchill Road through Ovingham, Prospect and Islington, which is a necessity at present, is completed a large portion of the traffic could by-pass Nailsworth and link up with the Gawler and Port Wakefield Roads at Cavan.

From a conversation I have had with the newly appointed Town Planner much of this depends on the master plan which has been promised and which will be a great asset, but which I understand will not be ready for several years. In the meantime, I appeal to the Government and the Highways Department to give serious consideration to the proposal I made, because with the population of the metropolitan area increasing as it is the problem of main outlets from the city is becoming more serious day by day. Mr. John Clark

will appreciate my remarks on this matter. We read further in His Excellency's speech that increased harbour and wharf facilities are to be provided, that increased production of coal from the Leigh Creek field will be achieved, that more houses are being built and that the Electricity Trust is expanding its activities. We learn that more land is becoming available for settlement through drainage and that greater output of timber from Government forests is being achieved. I submit that all this record of achievement indicates a vigorous growth of the resources of the State and vindicates the policy of progress and expansion formulated and carried out during recent years by successive Liberal Governments—Governments with the welfare of the people of the State at heart and with a keen appreciation of the spirit of private enterprise in the development of our industries, both primary and secondary.

Mr. Bywaters—Are you in favour of decentralization in industry?

Mr. CUMBE—I have no objection to it wherever it is possible. The appreciation of our people was shown last January when our Premier received the richly deserved honour bestowed upon him by Her Majesty the Queen. This honour was highly appreciated and, in the words of my namesake the Clerk, it received the imprimatur of the populace.

Of all the expansion that has taken place the most spectacular has been in the field of education. Enrolments in our schools have doubled in the last 10 years and this enormous increase has, of course, involved the Government in a terrific expansion programme in both buildings and staff. The greatest need has been in the primary schools, and although the enrolments are still increasing enormously the rate of increase is slightly lessening and it is now the secondary schools that are feeling the impact. It naturally follows that before long the effects of this increase will be felt in the field of tertiary education—the school of Mines and the University. Both, of course, have large building programmes in hand. I find, in moving about in my electorate, that there are at least 18 schools, State and denominational, in it and there is a keen appreciation of the work of the Education Department in pursuance of the new policy of expansion introduced in recent years under the guidance of the present Minister, the Hon. Baden Pattinson. It is also worthy of note that in the last few years the number of University colleges has increased from one to four, and it is of some significance that all

have shown excellent taste in being founded in the electorate of Torrens. More and more students are taking advantage of secondary education as more facilities are provided for them to continue their studies and as greater opportunities are provided for them in the widening fields of commerce and industry.

The only reservation that I make on this score is on the question of credit restrictions. Although I realize that certain curbs on over-free spending and unwise investing have been necessary in order to slow down inflation, I believe the time has now come to ease some of these restrictions in order to give industry and commerce the opportunity to keep pace with the terrific expansion taking place and continue to play their part in the development of the State, with, of course, consequent benefits to the people through increased employment. The benefits that will flow from this easing of restrictions must in due course be reflected in the finances of the Government. If only for this reason I appeal to the Treasurer to take this question of credit restriction easement before the appropriate Commonwealth authorities when he is next in Canberra.

The announcement that a private company is negotiating with the Government for the establishment of a tug and small ship building yard at Port Adelaide, and the further announcement of the likely installation of an oil refinery as well as the establishment of an oil-tanker building yard, possibly at Whyalla, are all indicative of the confidence of overseas and interstate investors in the future of South Australia. The discovery of extensive deposits of good quality iron ore in the Middleback Ranges means that the future prospects of our steel making industry are extremely bright and sure. This will be reflected in the manufacturing industries because the number of manufacturing concerns that are vitally interested in and dependent upon the supply of steel is truly amazing. A most important point, and one often overlooked by people who do not think deeply enough, is the all important question of employment. The figures for factory employment for the past four years since June 1953, show that the percentage increase in South Australia is greater than the Australian average. The proposed undertakings that I have mentioned, our expanding economy and the more rapid use of employment are bound up with, and in due course will be reflected in, the welfare and the conditions of the people, and I here pay a sincere tribute to the workers of our community. I maintain

that the prosperity and good standard of living cannot be achieved without increased output in our factories. Although the Government may give a lead, and though management can provide the means of production, it still remains with the man at the bench or the machine to achieve the actual production. The fact that we have so few strikes and shut-downs shows that our employees generally have a very sane outlook and that they are truly appreciative of the benefits and the conditions they enjoy. This emphasizes that, given the opportunity and the wherewithal, the Australian workman can produce goods equal to the world's best. I find, however, the curious fact that, although many workers have voted automatically for Labor, in the most industrialized State (N.S.W.), which has a Labor Government, the man hours lost *per capita* through industrial disputes are more than those lost in South Australia. Further, the cost of living in Sydney is higher than it is in Adelaide, which lends support to the claim that the Playford Government has achieved so much for the South Australian worker through progressive and enlightened industrial legislation. Indeed, it is safe to say that in this State the Liberal Party is regarded as the workers' Party and this statement is borne out by the results of the last Senate election.

Mr. John Clark—We get the best Labor vote in Australia.

Mr. CUMBE—I refer the honourable member to the figures at the last Senate election. Indeed, His Excellency's Speech contains further evidence of the progressiveness of this Government when it foreshadows further industrial legislation to extend increased benefits to the worker.

Mr. Loveday—South Australia is one of the last States to get them.

Mr. CUMBE—From some of the comments I have heard members opposite seem to be opposed to them. Having made this remarkable progress over the first hundred years of responsible Government, South Australia now enters a new era of expansion and confidence under the leadership of a Government whose policy certainly is progress and prosperity.

I now turn to a subject not covered in His Excellency's Speech—civil defence. Although I realize that defence matters are in the main within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Government, I point out that, in peace time at any rate, matters concerning the welfare and defence of the civilian population of this State come within the scope of this Parliament. Hardly a day passes without our news-

papers printing, in a prominent position, an article on atomic warfare, whether it be concerned with the testing of a new bomb, the remarks of an eminent scientist on radiation fall-out effects, stock piling by Russia and the free world, or plans for disarmament. Members have only to look through the windows of this House across King William Road to see on the very walls of Government House the following slogan printed by a vandal: "Ban all A-H Bomb Tests." This proves that this matter is really topical, yet with all the publicity it receives I have found, from conversations with various sections of the community, that great apathy exists among the public. It may well be that the reports are so confusing and contradictory that apathy results, but I am sure many people do not fully realize the full consequences of modern nuclear warfare. Unfortunately, the feeling is all too prevalent that it simply could not happen here—a feeling similar to that which existed in the years immediately preceding World War II.

A few months ago I was privileged to attend a civil defence school at Mount Macedon in Victoria. Organized by the Commonwealth Government, it was attended by members of Parliament who came from all States and represented all Parties. It was designed to show the real threat of nuclear warfare and to demonstrate the steps that could be taken to protect civilians. I had hoped that the Premier could have attended a special course that had been arranged for State Premiers, but I understand that that course fell through because it was not known who the next Premier of Queensland would be. In the event of attack what would be the real threat of nuclear warfare to this country? At present a nuclear bomb could be dropped from an aeroplane or launched from a submarine, and I remind members that submarines of a foreign power have been sighted in the Pacific and to the north of Australia.

Mr. Loveday—That would be handy with most of the population in the metropolitan area.

Mr. CUMBE—This may be a plea for decentralization later. I point out that the submarines that have been sighted have a terrific cruising range and it would be simple to project a bomb from one of them to a shore target. Further, an inter-continental bomb that is launched in one country to be exploded in another has almost been perfected. That is a frightening thought indeed because the bombs that could be launched by the methods I have

indicated are at least 500 times as powerful as those dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan during 1945, and all members know the terrible suffering that occurred there. The modern bomb would cause complete devastation through the combined effects of blast, heat and rays over an area $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles in diameter. Moreover, irreparable damage would be caused up to $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles, and severe to slight damage over an area of up to 12 miles in diameter. Indeed, on a clear day the latter area could increase to one with a diameter of 20 miles depending on the distance above ground at which the bomb exploded. Members will realize that from a military and tactical point of view it would be logical in any attack on Australia to concentrate on the capital cities. What would happen if a bomb were launched on Adelaide on a clear day?

Mr. Corcoran—We know all that, but what are we going to do about it?

Mr. COUMBE—As I said earlier, there is great public apathy on this subject at present, and in this Chamber we hear the comments of apathy coming from members opposite.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I know just as much as you do about this sort of thing.

Mr. COUMBE—I do not deny that. I am pleased to hear the honourable member has that knowledge and only wish more people were aware of the subject. If one of these bombs were launched on Adelaide on a clear day everything would be wiped out almost as far away as Gawler. Not only would complete devastation be achieved, but all services the rest of the State relies on, such as railways, hospitals and ambulance services, would be wiped out and everything would be chaos. Further, very often our defence projects are in the metropolitan area and with their destruction the will of the people to defend the country would probably be seriously undermined.

I emphasize that there is no known way of intercepting these bombs once they are discharged, but there is a means whereby civilians outside the bombed area can protect themselves and give aid to others if there are any survivors in the stricken area. For instance, there are means of decontaminating the target area and carrying out some rehabilitation work. On the question of decontamination, it is interesting to read that British nuclear scientists have just evolved a bomb which they call a clean bomb—one which has very little radiation fallout. They have persisted in their efforts to prove this bomb against strong agitation from Russia and some of her sympathizers. The civil defence organization

of the Commonwealth has studied the effects of nuclear warfare in all its terrifying aspects, and has evolved a scheme to give protection to civilians and enable some communities to carry on. That would depend to a great extent on the decentralization of installations and services, and as I said earlier I favour decentralization in some respects. To bring these facts before the people of Australia and make them aware of this terrible threat is still another matter. It means that much energy, time and money will have to be spent.

I have always found from my reading that it is difficult in peace-time to persuade Governments and the people to provide for war-time defence. I feel that a fully representative committee should be set up in each State to study the position and co-operate with not only the Commonwealth and State Governments, but the Federal Defence Planning Committee, and make provision for the future. We can safely say that a little money spent now will save lives and greater expenditure in time of attack. It is evident that the threat of a nuclear attack is very real and I consider that the effects of such an attack would be so devastating that we must endeavour, on a diplomatic level, to maintain national peace; but at the same time we must be very careful that we build up our nuclear reserve to act as a deterrent to any adversary.

I submit two main suggestions to the Government and the people of South Australia. First, there is an urgent need for making the Australian public more civil defence minded. We know of the wonderful work done during the last war in civil defence; this would be an extension of that work. My second point is that the States and the Commonwealth, as a matter of urgency, should seek agreement on ways and means of implementing a co-ordinated and over-all plan of civil defence. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I join with those who have supported the expression of thanks to His Excellency the Governor for having opened Parliament, and on behalf of my constituents I express pleasure at the extension of His Excellency's term. I assure Mr. Coumbe that people in the metropolitan area have an appreciation equal to those living in the country of the work done by our Vice-Regal couple. I did not have the pleasure yesterday of listening to the speeches of the mover and seconder of the motion, but have read with interest their remarks, and I join with others in congratulating them on well

prepared speeches. The speeches given today were also of a very high standard, but the Leader of the Opposition was the only one who really gave any new facts to the House regarding our economic position and our industrial and rural development. After examining the Governor's opening speech, I was forced to the conclusion that it was nothing more than a squib, characteristic of a decrepit Government which has no confidence in the future of this State, and one incapable of giving any lead to the people.

We know that the Governor's speech is prepared by his Ministers, and that it is really the Government speaking through the Governor. One can find nothing in the speech but platitudes and a repetition of old and barren statements. Those speakers who support the Government have done nothing more than echo its policy. I draw attention to paragraph 3 of the Governor's speech, which has been repeated in substance by every Government supporter who has spoken so far, and it is as follows:—

The rapid growth of our population is being maintained by the development of natural resources, progress and Government undertakings and housing, and increase in production and commerce.

And in the very next paragraph appears the following:—

The recent restriction of credit did not halt the upward trend, though the rate of expansion in secondary industries slowed down a little.

How can we have increased production in commerce and at the same time have secondary industries slowing down?

Mr. Brookman—You quoted only parts of the paragraphs.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Surely the honourable member does not want me to read the entire speech? If I have missed any point which is advantageous to him and his Party, let him take it up. I will make an examination of the position. His Excellency also said:—

In primary production the season of 1956-57 was notable for a number of remarkable records.

I do not know whether the Ministers have X-ray eyes or are supermen, but they were apparently able to supply record figures five days before the end of the financial year, for His Excellency delivered his speech on June 25. The figures given were estimates, but that sort of thing is undesirable. I tried to get the relevant figures, but they were not available from authentic sources. I shall quote figures supplied from official sources, and the latest regarding some items are for the year 1954-55. I shall compare them with the figures for 1938-39 for two reasons—firstly, because that was the year

prior to the war, and secondly because that was about the beginning of the prolonged, pilfered painful Playford period.

The Leader of the Opposition was challenged when he said that some credit should be given to the increased use of machinery for increased production. I admit that there has been an increase in the production of wool in keeping with increased population. In 1938-39 South Australia produced 105,000,000 lbs. of wool, which was about 176 lbs. a head of population. In 1955-56 we produced 174,000,000 lb., or 203 lb. a head. On the present price of wool that amounts to about £6,500,000 income to the State, but at what cost? That was the point the Leader of the Opposition was making. South Australia's population increased by about 259,000 between 1939 and 1956, but the world's population is increasing by about 43,000,000 a year. Therefore, it is not good enough for primary production to keep pace with our population. Australia, and South Australia in particular, should take advantage of the increased markets becoming available.

Total grain production of South Australia in 1938-39 was 73 bushels a head, but in 1955-56 it was only 71 bushels. The Leader of the Opposition spent considerable time in drawing attention to the decline in the production of wheat. The figures are alarming, for in 1938-39 we produced 53 bushels of wheat a head, but in 1955-56 we produced only 34 bushels.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—Many farmers have changed over from wheat to barley production.

Mr. HUTCHENS—If the Minister had been listening he would realize I admit that, but Australia is running a grave risk in reducing wheat production because more markets are becoming available every year.

Mr. Hambour—That has only just become the position. Last year farmers were told to grow less wheat.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The honourable member's argument only helps my case, and I appreciate his unintelligent remark. Any move to reduce our primary production is based on insanity, for it must be increased for many reasons. The fall in the production of wheat has had an effect on the production of flour. In 1938-39 South Australia produced 146,000 tons of flour, but in 1955-56 we produced only 142,000 tons, despite our population increase of 259,000. That amounted to a reduction of about three-quarters of a hundredweight a head of population. Whatever way we look at those figures they amount to a lot of dough.

In 1938-39 South Australia produced 57,000 tons of bran and pollard, but despite the increased population we produced only 53,000 tons in 1955-56. Consider the effect of the reduction in primary production on other industries. I agree with the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) that primary production has a mighty effect on secondary industries. Of course, secondary industries rely on primary industries for their survival. As a metropolitan member I say that with no apology, believing it to be true. I am concerned that primary industries are declining on a *per capita* basis, and that decline is evident in the pig and poultry industries. The pig slaughtering in 1938-39 amounted to approximately 150,000, and in 1955-56 it was down to 136,000. It means that per head of population we produce about one-third of the pig meat we produced in 1938-39, and yet the advisers of Her Majesty's representative have the audacity to say that we are keeping pace with the rapid growth in the population.

Mr. Bockelberg—You forget the increases in sheep and barley.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I do not forget it at all, and if the honourable member had been here a few moments ago he would have heard me make admissions in regard to those items. Dairy production must give cause for alarm. In 1938-39 we produced 34 pounds of butter per head of population, but in 1955-56 it was down to 23½ pounds, and no-one can say that that is keeping pace with the rapid growth in population. In 1938-39 the number of milking cows indicate that in those years we had a milking cow for each three persons, but in 1955-56 we had only one milking cow for each five persons. With regard to egg production, it is not possible to give figures for 1938-39 because it was not until the early 1940's that the Egg Board commenced its operations, and because of the conditions operating in 1945 I do not propose to quote figures for that year. However, in 1946-47, which was quite an average year, the egg production was 22 dozen per head of population, but in 1954-55 it was only 14 dozen per head of population. I cannot understand how one can come to this House and argue that we are keeping pace with the growth in population. The member for Eyre was inquiring about beef and mutton, and I admit that there has been a slight increase in production of those items.

I am supported in my remarks by people other than members of my Party, for instance, by a very learned gentleman who has recently made his mark in the public life of this

country. I refer to Dr. Forbes, the member for Barker in the House of Representatives, and it is interesting to hear his remarks in regard to rural production. I had the pleasure of hearing his maiden speech, and I propose to quote from it from the *Commonwealth Hansard* of March 19, 1957. I give Dr. Forbes credit for being a student and being honest in his opinions. Dr. Forbes said:—

Our capacity to import the capital goods we require for development depends upon the export income with which we pay for them, and that income is the most important single factor in our progress. Those who believe that, and who recognize that for a very long time to come, and probably for all time, we shall depend for the bulk of our export income on our rural industries, will admit that the present situation must give some cause for disquiet. For example, although the current volume of agricultural production is about 23 per cent above pre-war levels, it is less than the percentage increase in population. It can be estimated, roughly, that on present rates of population increase only 24 years will elapse before we become importers of butter, and an even shorter period will elapse before we shall have to import certain other commodities that we now export. For all dairy produce it will be 19 years, for beef and veal seven years, for mutton four years, and so on. These figures are only approximate, and are worked out on the basis of present percentage increases in production and present per capita consumption levels, but they are, nevertheless, most disturbing.

Mr. Brookman—Is he talking about Australia?

Mr. HUTCHENS—He was talking chiefly in regard to South Australia; he was playing up to his South-Eastern electors to the detriment, I feel, of the Government, but he was stating facts.

Mr. Brookman—Did he quote South Australian figures?

Mr. HUTCHENS—He did not quote South Australia, but he was basing his argument on this State. The point I am trying to make is that it is wrong for a Government to give the impression that all is well when it is not. We are suffering a decline in many of our primary products when we should be making a big increase, and that was admitted by the honourable gentleman whose remarks I have quoted. The Leader of the Opposition drew attention to the decline in the number of rural holdings. I confess that there is a slight difference between the figures I have obtained and those given by the Leader, but they are only very slight. The Pocket Year Book for South Australia shows that in 1938-39 we had 31,280 people employed on their own account on rural holdings, but in 1954-55 this had been reduced to 28,029. It means that on a per capita basis one holding in 1938-39 had

to support 19 people, but in 1954-55 it had to support 29 people. That shows that we are having a decline in rural production.

Mr. Hambour—Tell us how to fix it up.

Mr. HUTCHENS—We all know how these things can be done. When the primary producer is encouraged by stabilization in his industry we know what will happen. The situation could be remedied if we had a sympathetic Government with a truly Australian outlook. The number of holdings has decreased by 3,188, but the Auditor-General's report of 1956 indicates that, through the Commonwealth Government making £50,000,000 available, 776 new rural holdings have been established under the war service settlement scheme. In other words, without that scheme the holdings would have decreased by almost 4,000.

Mr. Heaslip—Our primary production is up.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I wonder where the honourable member has been. I have been quoting figures to prove that production is down on a *per capita* basis. I challenge the honourable member to prove me wrong. The Government has claimed that the rapid growth in population has been matched by a corresponding increase in production. It is a political sin to make such a claim when facts prove it completely untrue. The Governor's Speech contains old and barren statements. About 25 years ago when a young man was elected to this Parliament the press stated that he was one of the promising young Liberals. He is still promising. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said the Governor's Speech told us of things to come. Paragraph 8 states:—

Preliminary work for the proposed Myponga reservoir is completed and tenders will shortly be called for the construction of the dam . . . Other proposals under investigation include new storage reservoirs at Clarendon, Kangaroo Creek and Smith's Creek on Kangaroo Island. What does this mean? An examination of previous speeches will prove conclusively that these promises mean nothing. They are not promises of things to come. In 1941, in his policy speech, the Premier promised sewerage for country areas. Nothing happened, but in 1943 the Premier went a step further and promised extensive sewerage schemes for country areas. In 1944, paragraph 12 of the Governor's Speech contained this statement:—

Investigations made by my Ministers show that in a number of country towns sewage systems are not only desirable but practicable.

In 1946 His Excellency said:—

A Bill will be introduced to authorize the construction of sewerage works in country towns.

We heard nothing more of this subject until 1950 when the Premier, in a policy speech,

said that proposals for sewerage at Victor Harbour, Port Pirie, Murray Bridge, Gawler, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Bordertown, Naracoorte and Mount Gambier had been referred to the Public Works Committee and that schemes had been completed for Whyalla, Strathalbyn, Balaklava, Kapunda and Eudunda. There is no mistake about that statement for in the 1950 Governor's Speech the following appeared:—

Sewerage schemes prepared by the Government for Bordertown, Gawler, Murray Bridge, Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta and Victor Harbour have been accepted by the local governing bodies concerned.

That was seven years ago and nothing has been done since. We will never get these services while the present Government is retained. The Premier has made many other promises which have led people to believe that something was in the offing. In 1947 we were told of proposals to electrify our suburban railways. In 1950 we were told of a power station on the lower Murray to utilize Moorlands coal. We heard of a proposal to continue the railway from Morgan to Barmera, with the construction of two bridges across the Murray. In 1951 the Government, through the Governor's Speech, went so far as to name Cadell and Kingston as the sites for the two bridges. That subject has been forgotten. One cannot forget the promises of a deep sea port at Cape Jaffa. That project was approved by the Premier in his 1950 policy speech but was subsequently rejected by the Public Works Committee as being just too silly. In his 1956 policy speech the Premier promised a meat-works at Kadina. We were told that an agreement had been reached: everything was in order. We have not even got the carcasses at Kadina at the moment. I mention all these things to show the fallacy of members opposite getting up and saying, "This is what will come." The time these things take to come is amazing. You might ask what this has to do with the Myponga reservoir, and the reservoirs at Clarendon, Kangaroo Creek and Smiths Creek. Here we have the greatest leg-puller of all times. Item 13 of the Governor's speech in 1948 sets out:—

Two alternative sites for reservoirs to supply water to the districts south of Happy Valley are being investigated by the Government's geological staff. If the report is favourable the Government will give immediate consideration to a scheme for supplying water to the Yankalilla, Normanville, Willunga and McLaren Vale districts

In 1949, His Excellency said:—

Exploratory work is being done to find a suitable site for a reservoir to supply Willunga,

Normanville, Yankallila and McLaren Vale districts.

In 1951 the Governor said:—

A site on Myponga Creek has been selected for a reservoir to supply the Noarlunga, Aldinga, Yankallila, Normanville, McLaren Vale and Willunga districts.

In 1952 he said:—

Preliminary investigations are being made and plans are being prepared for additional reservoirs on the Onkaparinga River and the River Torrens, and for a reservoir at Myponga.

In 1953 we had the same old story. In that year His Excellency said:—

The geological investigations for additional reservoirs at Kangaroo Creek, Clarendon and Myponga are continuing.

In 1954 he said:—

Preliminary work in connection with a number of other projects is in hand, including reservoirs at Myponga, Kangaroo Creek and Clarendon.

In 1955 this promise still went on, when he said:—

Investigations have been continued into the proposals for reservoirs at Myponga, Kangaroo Creek and Clarendon.

I want the House to take notice of the 1956 speech, in which His Excellency said:—

The designs and specifications of the proposed Myponga reservoir have been completed, and tenders for construction of the dam will be invited shortly.

This year His Excellency said:—

Preliminary work for the proposed Myponga reservoir is completed and tenders will shortly be called for the construction of the dam.

Thirteen months later we had identical phrasing about this proposal. Is this reservoir to go the same way as country sewerage schemes, the scheme for electrification of the suburban railways, the power station on the Murray, the railway between Morgan and Barmera, the deep sea port in the South-East and the Kadina meat works? Is it to be damned before the water it proposes to catch is dammed? All these things are answers to members opposite who say that the Governor's speech was an indication of things to come, because these matters have been mentioned year after year yet they have been put into the wastepaper basket and forgotten about.

As a member of the Opposition, I regret having to take the time to make these things known. However, I feel we have been compelled to make known what has happened in relation to these promises, because the Government has said, "This time you can depend on the Government. This time we are not going to let you down." This Government cannot be trusted to keep any one promise it has ever made, and it is necessary for the Opposition to

show that this worn-out type of thing cannot go on so that the Government will not be returned to office, despite the gerrymander, if it does not keep its promises. In paragraph 4 His Excellency referred to credit restrictions. He said:—

The recent restrictions of credit did not halt the upward trend, though the rate of expansion in secondary industries slowed down a little.

I have only press statements of unemployment figures, which show that 51,000 people were unemployed this month. I know full well, as does every member, that the position is even worse than the figures indicate, because many people do not register as unemployed, but get out and try to obtain work for themselves. This statement in the speech was subtle political propaganda. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) referred to credit restrictions this afternoon, and the Premier in a very shy manner said that the Commonwealth Government was responsible for the credit restrictions operating today, that they are naughty boys and should have their ankles spanked. I say that the Premier is the most guilty man in Australia for the position we are in today with regard to credit restrictions. All who take an interest in political affairs in this country know that he went to the public before the last Federal elections and said, "Return the Menzies-Fadden Government and leave the rest to me." The Premier, who poses as the Almighty in politics, must take the responsibility for the credit restrictions that are penalizing the expansion of secondary industry, and to some degree, primary industry. The Labor Party has always said that the colossal waste of money created by the debt burden of interest should stop. We have had a policy of using the issue of credit for public works, which would save the country the burden of interest charges. Today, because of colossal borrowing by the Government, we are paying an interest burden every year of £127,000,000. I have one or two other matters but as I want to deal with them in full I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. B. Pattinson—No.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member must continue his remarks.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Paragraph 9 of the Governor's Speech said, in effect, that there had been a decided improvement in the financial position of our railway system, which is of vital importance to the transportation of goods. I hope the Governor's remarks on the matter were made with an honest intention. I have asked previously in this House that

attention should be given to houses of permanent way railwaymen. If it were not for the work of these men we would have no trains, no matter what type of rolling stock we had. The permanent way must be kept in good condition, yet these men have the worst conditions of any railwaymen and possibly any workmen in the State. It is disturbing to note the lack of attention given to railway cottages.

I have had information supplied to me about the condition of cottages. At Kalangadoo the fences around the cottages in February last were on the ground, yet no provision was made for their repair. Children living in the cottages were continually in danger. There was a shortage of water and the rooms of the cottages were dark and poorly ventilated. At Keith there was an old stable-type cottage occupied by a packer with nine children. It was in a bad state of repair. The walls were damp and the children suffered from chronic ailments. Pleas were made for repairs to the cottage, but nothing was done. The one at Glenroy was in a bad state of repair. The walls were cracked and the rain seeped through on to the furniture, which was ruined. For years we have been told that when manpower and materials were available these cottages would receive attention, but as soon as men were available for repair work we were told that the necessary money could not be found.

There seems to be always a waste of money when repair work is done to railway cottages. At Caltowie the station was being painted and there had been an application for repair work to be done to the cottages, but despite the presence of the gang doing the painting the repair work did not follow. Everything was got ready by the occupants of the cottages, but the gang was transferred to another place. The incomplete work done at some cottages is amazing. I know the people living in one of the cottages at Hanson and they made no complaints, but I saw that the outlets of two rainwater tanks faced the wall of the cottage, and every time the tanks overflowed the water ran down the wall. The bathroom walls were obviously made of secondhand material. Nothing was done to provide decent accommodation there. At Glenroy there was a wait for the department to connect a water pipe from an overhead tank, which had been erected and a bore and mill provided. All that was needed was a few feet of piping, but nothing was done. On behalf of those who are doing important railway work I ask for better conditions to be provided as quickly as possible.

This is an opportune time for me to express appreciation of the work done by some members of the police force. I pay a tribute to the work done by Detective Collaton, who had a clear cut case and could have secured a conviction. The investigations were of the fullest possible nature and Detective Collaton came to the conclusion that the young man concerned was suffering from some illness and was not really responsible for his actions. He persuaded him to seek medical advice, and no charge was laid. As a result of this action the young man now occupies a Housing Trust home and is a good citizen bringing up a fine family. I also express my appreciation of the attitude of Detective Marker and others I mentioned last session in regard to the sale of secondhand cars, but because of the peculiar situation circumstances surrounding this case I feel that I should not develop the matter further. I make it clear that I am not reflecting upon other members of the Police Force for I believe that our force is unsurpassed by any in the Commonwealth. However, I feel that one administrative mistake could be remedied with beneficial results. In the metropolitan area police officers of all departments are required to telephone headquarters at regular intervals to indicate their position. The crash gangs are connected by radio with headquarters and can be instructed by wireless to attend, say, a man suffering from a haemorrhage. If, while applying themselves to the task of saving life, they fail to make a call to headquarters they are called to book. I feel that this is just too silly and an unwarranted state of affairs that ought to be remedied.

I wish to make a few brief remarks about child welfare as this is something to which I have devoted considerable attention and something which is concerning many people. Quite a lot of vandalism is taking place, and the member for Light, by interjection, said it was arising out of the 40-hours that people worked. I shall not enter into a debate on that issue because wise counsel has determined that 40 hours shall comprise the working week of our people. However, it follows that many, particularly young people, have a certain amount of leisure. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the hour is getting somewhat late and as I should like to develop this theme a little further I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 25, at 2 p.m.