

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 24, 1957.

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

QUESTIONS.

SNOWY RIVER WATERS AGREEMENT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier any further information to give following his visit to Melbourne yesterday to consult with an eminent constitutional authority as to what steps, if any, can be taken to protect South Australia's interests in relation to the Snowy River Waters Agreement?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Since the House last met the Government has received a copy of the signed agreement and has had an opportunity of studying its provisions. It contains three features: firstly, general clauses in which New South Wales and Victoria express concurrence in the Commonwealth's carrying out certain works in their territories; secondly, provisions relating to the allocation of water that will result from those works and, thirdly, general provisions regarding the allocation and sale of electricity. Among the works sought to be approved by this agreement is the diversion of the Tooma River into the Tumut River, which means, in effect, the diversion of water from the Murray into the Murrumbidgee. Although the catchment area of the Tooma is extremely small it carries an enormous quantity of water high up in the mountains and from the point of view of electricity production it is one of the good streams associated with the Snowy project. It was originally one of the last diversions contemplated, but I have been informed that that work is at present proceeding. When completed it will divert about 330,000 acre feet of water. Strangely enough, in order to give a semblance of compliance with the River Murray Waters Agreement, Victoria is to take debit for half of that water as if she had received it. It is true that in a subsequent paragraph of the Snowy River Waters Agreement Victoria has an assurance from New South Wales that a similar quantity will be fed back down the Murrumbidgee until the works are completed and water from the Snowy is brought into the scheme.

The provision to which my Government objects, and which we believe is contrary to the River Murray Waters Agreement and to the constitutional authority of the Commonwealth generally, is the diversion which

is taken out of the control of the River Murray Waters Commission. Provisions in the River Murray Waters Agreement make it necessary for any diversion to be under the control of the commission, but this diversion will be under the control of a different authority. The important feature of the River Murray Waters Agreement has been that it has given the commission physical control over the river. It is all very well to have rights set out on paper, but the important thing from the State's point of view is the physical control of the river, because it is the person who turns on the stop cocks who ultimately determines whether we get water on time and without any difficulties. If we were obliged to have a law case every time we were short in our allocation of water the River Murray Waters Agreement would obviously be unworkable. We object to the diversion of the Tooma without the necessary assurance that in time of drought water would be available for building up the storages on the Hume.

Under the Snowy River Waters Agreement, all the water that is diverted from the Snowy River—less the amount already involved by the diversion of the Tooma—is to be allocated between Victoria and New South Wales. This provision probably does not infringe the River Murray Waters Agreement when we are operating under ordinary circumstances. South Australia's rights under that agreement are for a specified quantity of water each month in normal times and for a specified percentage during a period of drought, but members will realize that if New South Wales and Victoria are allocated water from the Snowy River during a time of restrictions—and they are given that water as a pre-emptive right—it cuts across what we believe is a fundamental right under the River Murray Waters Agreement.

At the conference yesterday, Mr. D. I. Menzies, Q.C., stated that in his opinion all the water flowing in the River Murray is subject to the River Murray Waters Agreement. He also believes that the Commonwealth has no authority to do the work it is at present undertaking and that action could be taken in the court to restrain it. He is examining the points involved in section 30 of the agreement in relation to the diversion of the Tooma River. That matter, however, is to be further considered by Mr. Menzies. He says that he cannot see where there is any power for the Commonwealth to divert the Tooma River. We are awaiting confirmation

of his opinion on the best procedure to adopt, but I assure the Leader that the Government intends, to the best of its ability, to defend the State's rights concerning its share of River Murray waters.

Mr. STEPHENS—Can the Premier say when the River Murray Waters Agreement was made, who were parties to it, and whether any time has been fixed for its termination?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The agreement was first made in 1914 prior to the first World War. It has been amended from time to time, the last amendments being in 1954 when this and other State Governments approved of the capacity of the Hume Reservoir being increased from 2,000,000 acre feet to 2,500,000 acre feet. It is a continuing agreement, with no final date of operation.

NORTHERN RESERVOIRS.

Mr. HEASLIP—I am concerned about the possible shortage of water in our northern areas. During the past winter there has been no intake into our northern reservoirs, nor is it likely that there will be any this summer. Can the Minister of Works indicate the position concerning these reservoirs and say what the position will be if the rainfall is below average next year?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—As the honourable member was good enough to let me know that he would ask this question, I have been able to get from the Engineer for Water Supply a considered report. There have been practically no natural intakes into the three northern reservoirs during the past winter and the present storages are:—Beetaloo, 522,000,000 gall. (capacity 838,000,000 gall.); Bundaleer, 833,000,000 gall. (capacity 1,400,000,000 gall.); Baroota, 767,000,000 gall. (capacity 1,371,000,000 gall.). Since early in July, the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline has been operating for 24 hours per day and the surplus above consumption from this pipeline, amounting to from 40-44 million gallons per week, has been fed into the Bundaleer Reservoir to increase the storage so that summer demands can be met. A review of the position has been made and provided the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline is kept going at full capacity and the summer is not excessively hot and dry, it is anticipated that the demands of the northern district supplied by this pipeline and the above three reservoirs will be met without imposing restrictions. Regarding next year's supplies, we will have to meet the position as it arises, but on present indications the Engineer for Water Supply thinks that we can get through.

BAN ON SHARK CATCHING.

Mr. TAPPING—Yesterday afternoon's *News* contained a report of a proposal by the Commonwealth Fisheries Department for a ban to be imposed on the catching of gummy sharks during November each year by the Governments of New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether he will have to make regulations to implement this proposal?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Some time ago the Governments of Victoria and Tasmania requested that this Government should combine with them in imposing a uniform ban on the taking of both school and snapper shark during November. I conferred with the industry and also with fisheries officers in other States and it was decided that this Government would come into line with the proposal. I subsequently noticed that New South Wales had also come into line and that the Commonwealth Fisheries Department intended to combine with the States in imposing a ban on these two varieties, and on edible sharks generally, in waters outside those usually recognised as being under State jurisdiction. The necessary regulations have been prepared by this Government and approved by Cabinet, and I think they will be approved, subject to His Excellency's consent, in Executive Council this week.

UNIVERSITY FINANCE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yesterday morning's *Advertiser* contained a report of the following statement by Sir Keith Murray, chairman of the committee appointed by the Commonwealth Government to investigate Australian universities:—

The universities have not got the means to do their job properly—and by means I really mean money.

This morning's *Advertiser* contained the report of a statement by Sir Mark Mitchell (Acting Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide), who agreed with Sir Keith and said:—

Financial aid is needed quickly because of the time involved in erecting new buildings and obtaining staff.

In view of these urgent warnings, can the Premier say whether the Government will consider increasing the grant to the University of Adelaide in future years?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The remarks of the eminent visitor were general and did not apply particularly to the University of Adelaide. Indeed, he gave me to understand that our university compared very favourably

with those in other States. For a number of years the practice has been for the university to frame its budget at the beginning of the year and, so long as that budget did not seriously embarrass us with the Grants Commission, the university could expect the Government to accept it and provide the necessary finance. Over a period we have probably provided, on average, slightly more money than the university has been able to spend; therefore I would not accept the statement that the University of Adelaide has been adversely treated with regard to finance for carrying on its management. There is, of course, a limit to the money available, but up to that limit the requirements of the university have been met—in some instances at the expense of other State activities. Regarding capital expenditure, at the end of World War II the Government agreed with the university that permanent instead of temporary structures would be provided to meet the increased enrolments of ex-servicemen, and the Government agreed to take heavy financial responsibility with the Commonwealth for that expenditure. More recently the university submitted a programme for further building and the two most urgent items were immediately approved, substantially as the university requested. The third item was deferred pending the result of the present investigation by the committee appointed by the Commonwealth Government, but that was not the most urgent work. I assure the honourable member that proper consideration is being given to the requirements of the University of Adelaide and that the Government has, to the best of its ability, provided financial assistance for its activities. Indeed, the numbers attending the University, per head of population, are much heavier than in other States.

MURRAY RIVER FLOOD: COMPENSATION TO HELPER.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Minister of Lands a further reply to the question I asked on Thursday last about a constituent of mine who suffered an infection while working as a volunteer in the Murray flood?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following report from the Assistant Director of Lands, Mr. A. C. Gordon:—

The policy arranged by the Government covered volunteers against "bodily injury caused solely and directly by violent accidental external and visible means" and provided for a benefit of £12 per week (limited to 52 weeks) for total disablement with a maximum of £5 towards medical expenses. Mr. Harvey's disability through contracting dermatitis did

not come within the terms of the policy, but the insurance company agreed to pay him for six weeks' incapacity at £12 per week plus £5 medical expenses. Subsequently a letter was received from the Commonwealth Oil Refineries enclosing an application from Mr. Harvey for—

	£	s.	d.
Extra medical expenses	22	12	4
Loss of wages—six weeks at £2			
18s. 6d. per week	17	11	0
and upon receipt of this the insurance company agreed to make a special payment of £22 12s. 4d. Mr. Harvey then signed a form of discharge absolving the company from further liability in respect of this disability. The insurance company has not received any further claim, nor has it any knowledge of any recurrence of the dermatitis which has involved Mr. Harvey in further loss of time. In total Mr. Harvey received:			
	£	s.	d.
Six weeks' payment at £12 per week	72	0	0
Medical expenses	27	12	4
	£99	12	4

There is no standing arrangement or insurance policy covering volunteer flood workers. Volunteer fire fighters are dealt with in accordance with the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund Act, 1949, which authorizes the trustees of the fund to pay such compensation as they think fit (section 13).

FISHING INDUSTRY.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the Minister of Agriculture the figures on the fishing industry that I asked for last week?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have some information from the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game to the effect that this year's known production of fish (other than crayfish) amounted to 8,500,000 lb. This is a 30 per cent increase on last year's production and well over 1,000,000 lb. more than our previous best, namely, 7,350,000, in 1953-54. Crayfish production this year was also a record, with 4,385,000 lb. produced. These figures show that there is no foundation for statements that our fish production is seriously deteriorating.

HOSPITAL OUTPATIENTS' DELAYS.

Mr. LAWN—A letter I have received states:—

I would like to bring to your notice the long delays imposed on people that attend the Outpatients' Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Sick people are forced to wait long hours, sometimes for a period of three and four hours at a time. Patients are told they must report at the Outpatients' Department at 8.30 a.m. and almost invariably have to wait until 9.30 a.m., usually much later, before hononaries start to consult. We claim if some system could be evolved it would obviate long delays, and the unnecessary need for some

patients that are forced to rise early in the morning so as to arrive at Outpatients' Department at 8.30 a.m. I would like to give one instance—a woman patient that was discharged from hospital was told to report at Outpatients' Department at 8.30 a.m. To do this she had to rise at 5.30 a.m. and wash three young children, get the children and her husband's breakfast, catch tram from Glenelg at 7.35 a.m. and after arriving at Outpatients' Department at 8.30 a.m. did not see doctor until 11.15 a.m. I could quote a lot more cases but have just mentioned one as an example. Could you refer this matter to the responsible Minister and discuss with him the possibility of relieving this deplorable situation?

I suggest that outpatients should not have to be at the hospital more than about 15 minutes before the honorary staff are ready to consult, and I think that the outpatients requiring treatment could be rostered so that instead of all being asked to be there at a certain time they could arrive at, say, half-hourly intervals, such as 9 a.m., 9.30, 10, and 10.30. Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Health, consider those suggestions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I would be strongly in favour of a system of rostering the arrival of outpatients that are known to be coming for treatment; in fact, I think that some rostering is already being carried out. This matter has been giving some concern for some time. I think the honourable member will realize that the hospital authorities do not always know beforehand how many cases will be coming for treatment at the Outpatients' Department. In addition, other urgent cases may arrive requiring some treatment, but I will have the honourable member's question considered by the Hospital Board and in due course give him a report on what steps can be taken to rectify any undue delay which may be occurring.

THEVENARD BERTH DEPTHS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked recently about the depth of water at Thevenard berths?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I am glad to be able to say that the honourable member was misinformed about the depths. The General Manager of the Harbors Board reports that the official depth of water at the Thevenard Jetty is 26ft. at low water. Soundings taken relatively recently disclosed no appreciable diminution and where silting had occurred it was found to be inches only. At the present time, there is no warrant for maintenance dredging of these berths.

PORT PIRIE WHARVES.

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my question of last Tuesday about repairs to the western end of Federal Dock, Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I have been in touch with the Harbors Board and have been informed that the repairs now in hand to the Federal Dock have no bearing on the Harbors Board's overall plan for improvements at Port Pirie. They are designed to prevent further deterioration to the wharf. I would point out that during this financial year, the total expenditure on the Port Pirie wharves and for dredging from both Votes and Loans is to be £46,000; whilst for the preceding five years ended June 30, 1957, the total expenditure at Port Pirie was £371,148. Whilst the Government appreciates the need for improvements at Port Pirie, the funds available for this financial year will not permit of any further work other than above indicated being undertaken. The repairs now in hand do not in any way compromise the proposals for future improvements at Port Pirie.

MURRAY RIVER FLOOD RELIEF.

Mr. BYWATERS—Recently we were told in this House that the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund would soon be wound up and that money would soon be paid out to settlers for loss of production. Can the Minister of Lands say when those cheques will be forwarded?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The committee still expects the money to be paid out this month.

IRON ORE DEPOSITS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Premier any further information regarding the operations of George Wimpey & Co. who are drilling for iron ore in the Middleback Ranges for Ore Search Proprietary, and will the Government co-operate with them if good bodies of ore are found?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I understand exploration work is being undertaken. The company renewed the lease pegs which were in bad condition, and the leases are now being checked to see whether they are in order. I have no other information.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

Mr. LAUCKE—I understand that in a letter written to the Editor of the *Advertiser* by Professor C. M. Donald (president, South Australian Branch, Australian Institute of Agricultural Science, Waite Institute), which

appeared on September 20, reference was made to the lack of adequate staff to disseminate knowledge gained from the findings of research centres in this State. Portion of the letter said:—

It is noteworthy that New Zealand has as many agricultural instructors on the few thousand square miles of the Canterbury Plains as South Australia has in the whole State. Though the standard of our extension services is high, the numerical strength is quite inadequate for the task that lies before them. Research with long delayed application is research effort partly lost. Can we hope that the urgent need for more extension workers will be recognized side by side with the need for more research?

Will consideration be given to the engagement of further officers, if that is felt by the Minister to be necessary?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I anticipated a question on this matter and had some figures taken out to show the position, because an entirely erroneous impression may be arrived at through not knowing the full facts. For instance, in a leading article in the *Advertiser* of yesterday the statement was made that there are only two agricultural advisers on Eyre Peninsula. That is correct regarding persons with the title of agricultural adviser, but for the advisory services on the Peninsula in the combined sphere of agriculture and animal production there are seven officers. The position is similar in other districts. In the Mid and Upper North districts 12 people are engaged on extension work, five in the River Murray areas, 19 in the South-East, and four in the hills districts. In addition, actively doing country work, are 46 officers with headquarters in Adelaide, who are interested in various functions. They travel through the State and supplement the work of the locally placed advisers. At present, for the whole of the State, there are 93 officers operating advisory services and doing extension work in the various fields of agriculture and horticulture. In addition, there are nine research centres in various parts. They are fairly well staffed and do very important extension work in their various spheres. Each of them, for instance, holds a field day each year, which is attended by officers of the department, and to which the public are invited. The function is well attended and it does extremely valuable extension work in the district. Not only that one day in the year but every day the officers are available to all agriculturists who desire to confer with them on various projects and to see the practical work done at the centres.

We are also already engaged on the work of establishing regional centres where consolidated advisory services will be concentrated. We are keenly aware of the necessity to disseminate information. I have said frequently that if the department fails to get across to the practical people the results of the research and the application of new methods, it fails absolutely. We are aware of the need to concentrate on extension services. It is fair to say that there is not one matter upon which research has established solidly based findings that the department has failed to get across to the practical farmer. We have certain unfilled positions on the extension staff, and although that does not seriously hamper the extension services it is desirable that the positions should be filled, and when the personnel are available they will be filled.

Mr. HARDING—On what aspects of rural work do the 46 officers based in Adelaide and actively doing country work advise?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The following table shows the number of advisers based in Adelaide and engaged on each aspect of the department's work and how many of them operate in country districts:—

	Based on Adelaide.	Working in country.
Agriculture	12	12
Soil Conservation	6	5
Horticulture	8	8
Weeds	1	1
Animal Health	13	12
Animal Production	6	
Dairy	10	6
Poultry	3	2
Apiaries	2	—

In addition to the other advisory services to which I have referred, we have an Agricultural Bureaux system established over 50 years ago which I believe is peculiar to this State. It is under the direct aegis of the department and the Government pays its working and travelling expenses. At present it has about 11,000 members, all of whom receive a copy of the department's journal, a most up-to-date publication disseminating agricultural, horticultural, and animal production knowledge.

MARION HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister for Works a reply to the question I asked him recently about the non-use of Angaston marble in connection with the Marion High School?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I have received the following report from the Architect-in-Chief:—

In order to obtain an attractive effect, aggregate was selected on colour alone, and where possible to give that effect South Australian material has been used and/or specified and constitutes by far the bulk of the aggregate proposed to be used at the school. It was found that it was not possible to obtain full colour effect using local materials entirely. Manufacturers of precast slabs with whom we have conferred have advised that they are prepared to incorporate the small amount of interstate aggregate at no additional cost. It is coincidental that the best reds and greens come from New South Wales. The actual quantities of New South Wales materials required are as follows:—Red 7 tons, green 10 tons. It will be seen therefore that the amount of interstate aggregate is infinitesimal compared with the hundreds of tons which will be used from Angaston.

REHABILITATION LOANS.

Mr. KING—On July 24 last, in reply to a question concerning soldier settlers, the Minister of Lands indicated that a certain number still awaited settlement, both on dry lands and in irrigation areas. It is obvious that it will be difficult to find suitable land for these applicants, many of whom are no longer young. It would appear that their main hope is for the Government to find an occasional single unit property for one of them. Early in the rehabilitation period, through the State Bank, up to £1,000 was made available to settlers as a rehabilitation loan. Taking into account the declining value of money and the present-day difficulty of obtaining bank advances, and in order to enable the applicants to settle on the land, will the Minister take up with the appropriate authorities and Cabinet the desirability of increasing the maximum amount of such loans to £3,000 on terms no more difficult than those applying to the £1,000 loan?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It is true that a small number of returned servicemen still require blocks. It is my intention after Parliament prorogues to visit the irrigation areas and examine some of the localities that have been reported as suitable for planting under irrigation. From time to time I have inspected various areas, but often the land has not been suitable, nor has water been available from existing channels. I am interested in this question and will investigate the matter on my next visit to the irrigation areas.

MEDICAL OFFICERS' SALARIES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—According to a press announcement Cabinet has granted salary increases to medical officers at public hospitals, but the officers concerned are not satisfied. Can the Premier say whether the Public

Service Commissioner originally recommended the increases now approved by Cabinet, or whether Cabinet decided on some other figure than that originally recommended? In either case, can he say what the present proposed increases were based on?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The amounts Cabinet approved were not precisely as recommended by the Commissioner. Under arbitration laws, I understand, a female is only entitled to 75 per cent of the male rate, and the Commissioner recommended for one female doctor a lower increase than that being paid to males in her category. Cabinet felt there were strong grounds for her receiving a similar increase. The amounts for males were as recommended by the Commissioner. His recommendations were based on comparisons with salaries for similar positions in other States.

EX-SERVICEMEN AND DEATH DUTIES.

Mr. QUIRKE—My question concerns the widows of ex-servicemen who die before they receive their land titles or before they know what they may have to pay. Two cases have been brought to my notice where widows have been required to pay death duties representing a tremendously heavy burden. Can the Minister of Lands say whether provision can be made to help widows to meet such heavy dues?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This question cropped up some years ago between the State and the Commonwealth and it was then agreed that a property could be left to a widow who would be responsible for death duties. I was not aware that these represented a heavy burden, but if the honourable member will supply the names of the persons concerned, I will examine the position.

MILLICENT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN—Some time ago a petition bearing the required number of signatures was forwarded to the chairman of the Public Works Committee in connection with the proposed water supply for Millicent. Can the Chairman of the committee say what progress has been made in the investigation of this proposal?

Mr. SHANNON (Chairman, Public Works Committee)—The committee has the petition referred to and the matter will be reinvestigated. There was formerly a division of opinion in Millicent on this matter, but if the people there are willing to sponsor a water scheme and meet the costs I do not doubt that the committee will accede to their request.

WHEAT PRICES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Minister of Agriculture say what are the prices of wheat gristed in South Australia for human consumption and of wheat sold for export, either for gristing or as wheat?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will get that information for the Leader.

PORT PIRIE HARBOUR.

Mr. DAVIS—Can the Chairman of the Public Works Committee say whether his committee has finished taking evidence on the proposal to improve the Port Pirie harbour or whether it is awaiting a report from a department?

Mr. SHANNON (Chairman, Public Works Committee)—The committee has investigated certain aspects of the proposed improvement of the Port Pirie harbour and has issued a report on the deepening of the channel leading to the harbour and on the swinging basin. It is not the prerogative of the committee to suggest to a department a time limit for the presentation of its evidence and the committee is awaiting further evidence from the department on the improvement of the harbour. When that is obtained it will be considered and a decision reached regarding the outstanding factors.

DOGS IN SCHOOL YARDS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Recently the Flinders Park School Committee brought to my notice the trouble being caused in the school yard by stray dogs—sheep dogs, cattle dogs, big dogs, little dogs, and mongrel dogs—and from my observations I believe it is not the only school in my district that is having this trouble. Because the dogs urinate on school bags and cases, approaches have been made to local councils to see whether something can be done to prevent this, but, even though they combine for the purpose, councils are having difficulty in engaging a dog catcher. Can the Minister of Education say whether the Police Department or some other authority can be engaged to destroy these offensive, stray and uncared for dogs that trespass on school property?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I think the police will be pleased to co-operate in this matter. The department has inserted notices in the *Government Gazette* concerning this nuisance, but I will take up the honourable member's question with the department and advise him in due course.

NORTH TERRACE TO GLENELG RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. LAWN—It has been suggested that the old North Terrace to Glenelg railway land be converted to a second highway between the city and Glenelg and I understand that representatives of the West Torrens Council waited on the Highways Commissioner some weeks ago concerning this matter. Can the Premier say whether it has been considered and, if so, what has the Government decided? If it has not been considered, will he refer it to Cabinet?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government retained the land when the railway line was discontinued as it was considered that the time might arrive when it would be necessary for it to be used as an additional avenue of communication between Adelaide and Glenelg. That line is still intact except for two or three sections that were sold before the Government purchased it. A deputation from the West Torrens district expressed the view that it would be a good thing to open another road in that area. I said that the Government would be prepared to consider opening a road provided some financial contribution satisfactory to the Government could be arranged, but I understand that the West Torrens council is not interested in making any contribution. Under those circumstances the proposal has not been investigated further.

HOSTELS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—In view of the obvious need to secure the maximum benefit from the recruiting drive being carried out for teachers and because of the shortage of hostel accommodation in Adelaide, which limits the number of students who can come from the country to the city to become teachers or take the Leaving Honours course, can the Minister of Education say what steps the department has taken to increase hostel accommodation for students wishing to come to the city for those purposes?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I cannot give a comprehensive answer now because there are many problems associated with hostel accommodation, but I would be pleased to discuss the matter with the honourable member, because I know he is very interested, and let him have further information later.

FIREARMS LICENCES.

Mr. LAWN—About two years ago, when the House was debating the Police Offences Bill, the question of the registration of firearms and

the obligation to obtain permits to purchase firearms was raised. I requested the Government to more or less prohibit the purchase of firearms and the licensing of persons to enable them to carry them, except under certain circumstances. The Government replied that it was not necessary to make people get a licence to carry rifles and shot guns because they can be easily seen, but only to carry weapons that can be more easily concealed, such as revolvers and pistols. In view of the fact that shootings have taken place since, not with revolvers or pistols, will the Government again consider this matter with the object of tightening up the legislation to make it well nigh impossible, except when amply justified, for a person to get a licence even to purchase rifles or shot-guns?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The amending Act passed last year has been proclaimed, except for certain sections which have not yet been brought into operation because of certain difficulties, so Parliament has had this matter under review recently. Under those circumstances I doubt whether there is any case for a further amendment of the law at present, but I will refer the honourable member's question to the Commissioner of Police and get a report for him.

NUMBER PLATES ON INTERSTATE TRANSPORTS.

Mr. LAWN—Does the Government intend introducing legislation this session to make it obligatory on interstate hauliers to have a number plate or some other identifying disc or number attached to their vehicles?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As the honourable member knows, this question is involved in an action between interstate hauliers and the State Government in the High Court, and I am not prepared to express any view until the court has given its decision.

ELECTRICITY TRUST FUEL REQUIREMENTS.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—What were the costs per ton to the Electricity Trust for the financial year 1955-56, at both Osborne and Port Augusta power-houses of the following fuels—(a) New South Wales coal; (b) Leigh Creek coal; (c) Overseas coal; (d) coke; (e) fuel oil?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Chairman, Electricity Trust of South Australia, reports:—

Coal and oil are purchased by the Electricity Trust by competitive tenders, and to preserve

this system, the prices are confidential. The average cost of Leigh Creek coal delivered to Port Augusta power station for 1955-56 was £2 8s. 10d. per ton.

EYRE PENINSULA RAILWAY DERAILMENTS.

Mr. LOVEDAY (on notice)—

1. What are the details, together with the causes and the cost to the department, of derailments on the Port Lincoln Division of the South Australian Railways over the last four months?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to give consideration to submitting a monthly report to Parliament on such derailments?

3. In view of the excessive number of derailments is it the intention of the Government to state what steps it proposes to take to enable the Railways Department to eliminate this extremely dangerous situation?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Information is being obtained and will be available for the honourable member next week.

HOUSING TRUST OPERATIONS.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. How many houses has the Housing Trust built since its inception?

2. Of this number how many have been semi-detached houses for rental?

3. How many houses of all types have been built for sale?

4. Are any of these houses built for sale mortgaged to any other institution other than the trust?

5. What was the average purchase price to the trust of land bought and of houses erected thereon?

6. What was the average price paid to the trust by purchasers of these houses?

7. Does this price include road moiety and costs of footpaths and water-tables?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Chairman, South Australian Housing Trust, reports:—

1. As at 31st July, 1957, 30,984.

2. 11,993.

3. 12,646.

4. Yes.

5. This information cannot be obtained in the time available. In fact, to obtain the information would require some weeks' work.

6. A proper answer to this question would involve considerable research and time, and, therefore, the current sale prices are quoted:—

Two bedrooms £3,110-£3,480
Three bedrooms £3,400-£3,780

Contemporary designs and
two-storey six room
houses £4,150-£4,800

7. Where the trust subdivides the land itself road moieties are usually included in the purchase price.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. Does the Housing Trust accept tenders from about sixteen large building concerns only?

2. What was the output of bricks in South Australia for each of the financial years, 1955-56 and 1956-57?

3. Of this production, how many did the Housing Trust obtain?

4. Which institutions in South Australia will participate in the £4,000,000 allocated for housing in 1957-58, and how much will each receive?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. No, when tenders are invited, they are accepted from any builders.

2. If the question means clay bricks—1955-56, 74,818,000; 1956-57, figures not yet available.

3. 1955-56, 10,488,545; 1956-57, 9,680,000.

4. South Australian Housing Trust	£ 3,200,000
Co-operative Building Society of South Australia	125,000
Hindmarsh Loan, Land and Building Investment Society	40,000
Imperial Permanent Building and Investment Society	17,500
Permanent, Economic, Loan, Land, Building and Investment Society	17,500
State Bank of South Australia	520,000
Reserved for new societies	80,000
	<hr/> £4,000,000

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. What is the average weekly rental of Housing Trust semi-detached houses?

2. What is the average cost of maintenance of these houses over a period of five years?

3. What is the average cost of building a pair of semi-detached houses?

4. What are the respective average building costs of one, two, and three bedroom houses built for sale by the Trust?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. £2 7s. 11d. per week for a double unit house of five rooms in the metropolitan area.

2. This information cannot be obtained in the time available as it involves a considerable amount of work. Amounts ranging from 4s. to 10s. a week are included in rents for maintenance. Some of this is intended for future maintenance and the Trust now has a maintenance fund of £382,392.

3. Here again much work would be necessary to obtain this average, but current costs of a 5-roomed house in the metropolitan area are as follows—Building cost, £2,365; land and roads, £210—£2,575 or £5,150 for a pair of 5-roomed houses in the metropolitan area.

4. Current costs and sale prices are as follows:—2 bedroom, building cost £2,750; 3 bedroom, building cost £3,100; Timber house, 3 bedroom, building cost, £2,800. These amounts do not include cost of land or roads.

RAIL CARTAGE OF WATER.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Is water for railway purposes being carted from Burra to Terowie at present?

2. If so, for what periods has this been necessary since January, 1956?

3. During this period what has been—(a) the cost of water at Hanson; (b) the cost of pumping to Burra; (c) the cost of hauling water from Burra to Terowie?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. Yes.

2. Continuously, from 15/1/56 to 14/9/57.

3. (a) £2,616 12s.; (b) £2,616 12s.; (c) £21,986 4s.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FRUIT FLY COMPENSATION BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Agriculture) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to provide for compensation for loss arising from measures to eradicate fruit fly.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

THE BUDGET.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 19. Page 744.)

Grand total, £71,615,000.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—It is with no pleasure that I rise to speak in this debate for I do not believe the Liberal and Country Party has the right to occupy the Treasury benches.

That was clearly indicated at Wallaroo on August 31 by a section of the voters of the State. One member said the election showed that the Government enjoyed the confidence of only 43 per cent of the electors. I congratulate Mr. Hughes on his success. Prior to and during the campaign I was in the Wallaroo district and from the time the A.L.P. candidate was selected it was obvious that he would be elected.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—It was the candidate, not the Party.

Mr. LAWN—As usual, the Liberal Party and the press said the first thing that came into their minds; they did not make a proper analysis of the position. The press started off on the basis of maintaining the Playford majority in this House. That was the only issue when the vote was taken but when the result showed that Labor had won the Liberal Party changed its view and said that victory had gone to the most popular candidate. That was political hypocrisy. Senator Buttfield said it was dangerous to think that Mr. Hughes was a good man. The Premier placed the issue before the electors. He issued a pamphlet, had an advertisement in the press, and addressed three meetings in the district, and the electors showed what they thought of it all. One Friday I arrived at Wallaroo just about lunch time and by 5 o'clock that afternoon it was obvious to me that the townspeople would support the Labor Party candidate, and it was not a matter of his being the most popular candidate. I have not met Mr. Dowling, so I know nothing about him. Women at Wallaroo told me that their husbands had to go away on Sunday afternoons in order to do road work not far from Gawler. The men had to leave Wallaroo by truck on the Sunday afternoon, and through working long hours during the week they could return home on the next Friday afternoon. There was very little home life for them, and that was all the Playford Government could offer in the way of work.

The Attorney-General said his Government had encouraged the investment of £200,000,000 in South Australia, but the Wallaroo people knew that not one penny of it had been invested in their district. On this occasion the Labor Party was able to man all the booths in the Wallaroo district, something that is not always possible when a general election takes place. On August 31 I took some people to Kulpapa and Melton. I poked my head into the Kulpapa booth to let the presiding officer know that I was outside on behalf of the A.L.P. I was surprised to note that an old school building

was being used as the polling booth and that on every desk was a blue card asking the elector, when he sat down at the desk, to vote No. 1 for Dowling and No. 2 for Hughes. No L.C.L. man was outside distributing cards. Mr. Wilson, secretary of the L.C.L., called later in the day and explained that arrangements had been made for a man to distribute their cards outside the booth, but that he had not turned up. There was no need to have anybody outside, for the cards were set out on the desks inside. I told the presiding officer that he would have to take out those cards and that if any white cards came in supporting Hughes they also would have to be taken out. I did not go back to see whether that was done. Apparently somebody had put the blue "How to Vote" cards on the desks. I hope the Government will see that instructions are given to presiding officers to prevent such practices. The advertisement that appeared over the name of the Premier said:—

When you vote next Saturday, remember that on your vote could depend the Playford Government majority.

Then appeared the following personal message from the Premier:—

In recent years South Australia has achieved higher standards of prosperity and progress than ever before. The election issue on August 31 is whether you will maintain the Government which has provided the progress and which has at all times given a fair deal to every section of the community. The alternative would be to take from the L.C.L. Government its effective majority. This could prevent it from carrying out its progressive policy. In your own interests and the interests of the whole State you should support Mr. Dowling. He will follow the tradition set by the late member, Mr. Heath, and prove himself a splendid district member.

Government supporters should not say it was a question of popularity. The Premier, the Attorney-General and Senator Buttfield canvassed on behalf of the L.C.L. candidate and there was a personal message to each elector from the Premier. In view of this the Premier must accept the result—that the people did not want the L.C.L. candidate, did not accept that the State was prosperous and that the Government was providing progress for all sections of the community. They clearly indicated they did not believe it was in their interests to return the L.C.L. Government.

Mr. John Clark—They did not accept any of it.

Mr. LAWN—That is so. From the commencement of the campaign the people showed they had had a stomachful of the Government.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—The honourable member is embarrassing the new member for Wallaroo.

Mr. LAWN—He can speak for himself. My remarks do not concern Mr. Hughes. I am speaking generally of the electors of the State. We have a gerrymander in South Australia and the Playford Government should not be occupying the Treasury benches. I was pleased with the reaction of the electors during the few days I spent at Wallaroo. As members know, I made a fairly accurate assessment of the result of the election, for I said the A.L.P. candidate would have a majority of between 600 and 1,000 votes. Some of my colleagues telephoned me on the Sunday morning after the election and congratulated me on my correct assessment. During the campaign I had only one regret, and it was that the L.C.L. candidate was not Sir Thomas Playford: he would have met the same fate as Mr. Dowling. The electors would have shown what they think of Sir Thomas and his men. They would have shown their opinion of the one-man band we have in this State. They believe that all the instruments used by the band are wind instruments and that the Premier blows the trumpet. The Treasurer is the only one who makes any statements on behalf of the Government and none of his promises are worthwhile. On the eve of an election he promises deep sea ports and industries in country areas, but immediately after the declaration of the poll he forgets his promises. Country people know that the Government wants to concentrate industry in the metropolitan area and so keep the Labor vote concentrated.

Mr. Millhouse—Would you care to forecast the result of the next Federal election for the seat of Adelaide?

Mr. LAWN—The Australian Labor Party will win it.

Mr. Hambour—By how much?

Mr. LAWN—By more than 1,500. I will make a more definite estimate during the last week of that election campaign. If the Federal Government thinks it has any chance of winning Adelaide it has another think coming.

Mr. Millhouse—Your Federal colleague thinks so.

Mr. LAWN—As is normal, Government members have their feet in the cowyard and their heads in the clouds. If Mr. Millhouse thinks the Liberal Party has any chance of winning Adelaide, why doesn't he have a go at it himself? I would be glad to canvass against him.

Mr. Coumbe—Are you going to have a go at it?

Mr. LAWN—No, but I will be canvassing there on behalf of the A.L.P. Obviously members opposite do not know what canvassing means.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—If Labor's Federal prospects are so good, why is Dr. Evatt changing his seat?

Mr. LAWN—That is in another State. I notice that the Federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister have seats like those now being offered to Dr. Evatt. There are issues concerning this State with which the Government is not concerned. It is only interested in blowing its wind instruments. Each time the Leader of the Opposition has asked a question concerning the Snowy River Waters Agreement the Treasurer has taken advantage of the opportunity to blow his trumpet and get a big press about what he intends doing to Mr. Menzies. Last week when the member for Whyalla spoke about loans being made available at cheaper interest rates to the States, the Treasurer said that the States have been trying for five years to get the Commonwealth to lend the £110,000,000 it collects by way of taxation back to the States interest-free or at lower rates of interest. In other words, since 1952 the States have been seeking such a provision, yet as late as November, 1955, in the Glenelg town hall, the Treasurer asked the people to return the Menzies Government. He said, in effect, "I can get more money out of them than I can out of the other crowd"—meaning the Labor Party. He also said, "Return the Liberal Government and leave the rest to me." Last week he said the States had been fighting for five years to get money at a lower rate of interest from the Commonwealth. As usual it has been a sham fight, as this fight over the Snowy River Waters Agreement is a sham.

The Treasurer has for months threatened the Prime Minister with legal action if a copy of the agreement were not made available before it was signed. Why didn't the Government take such action, because the Treasurer had seen and knew what the agreement provided before it was signed? There was a delay in the signing of the agreement. Mr. Cahill, the New South Wales Premier, delayed signing because the Federal Government had inserted clauses in the agreement permitting Victoria to receive a greater supply of power than New South Wales and at a cheaper rate.

Mr. Shannon—Where did you see a copy of the agreement?

Mr. LAWN—I have not seen a copy, but I am telling members that the Treasurer knew what it contained.

Mr. Shannon—That is kite flying.

Mr. LAWN—I challenge the member for Onkaparinga to ask the Treasurer to deny that what I am saying is a fact. There is a one-man band in South Australia, and the Treasurer had to lead a four-man band to Victoria on Monday. He could not leave the responsibility to our Crown Solicitor, but had to lead a contingent consisting of the Crown Solicitor, the Attorney-General, and Mr. Dridan. In this morning's *Advertiser* a cartoon depicts the Treasurer, with two guns at his hips, going down an alley—the border of New South Wales and Victoria—and everyone retreating before him. Everyone who knows the Treasurer as I do will realize that those guns were not loaded. As a matter of fact, the cartoon should have shown the four persons I have mentioned going down this alley and all blowing wind instruments—the Treasurer leading the band on his trumpet. If one examines *Hansard* he will see that for months the Treasurer has threatened legal proceedings against the Commonwealth, but has not taken them. Now he has had to lead a party to Victoria to seek legal advice.

Mr. Shannon—Your own Leader promised his support.

Mr. LAWN—The Government is indulging in political propaganda. The Leader has promised our unanimous support for any genuine action to safeguard the State's rights. We do not want to be parties to any mock war.

Mr. O'Halloran—It will be a real fight so far as we are concerned.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, we will do all we can to preserve South Australia's rights. We want no more mock warfare between Menzies and Playford. In 1958, when the next Federal election comes around, the Treasurer will be kissing in Menzies' pocket. He will ask the people to return the Liberal Government, because, he will suggest, he can get more money from Bob Menzies. Does he think the people of South Australia will fall for that all the time? He can fool some of the people all of the time and all the people some of the time, but not all the people all of the time.

Mr. Hambour—Mind your blood pressure! We don't want a by-election in Adelaide.

Mr. LAWN—The Treasurer and his band know they have a good press in South Australia. The *News* and the *Advertiser* are right behind the Government and compete to

give space to the Treasurer. In last Friday's *News* there was a photograph of the Treasurer and the Crown Solicitor taking a quick look at a copy of the Snowy River Waters Agreement, just as though that were the first time the Treasurer had seen it. He has known for months what the agreement contains. On page 16 of that issue of that paper is an article headed, "Pretences of a Prime Minister." It will be interesting to read what the press has to say about the Prime Minister during the next Federal election campaign. They will not write similar tripe then. Under the photograph of the Treasurer allegedly perusing the agreement for the first time there is the following paragraph:—

It was incomprehensible that the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, should make available a copy of the Snowy Mountains Water Scheme to a Victorian political Party before South Australia, the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) said today. The Premier received his copy of the agreement from the Commonwealth this morning.

The *News* of the same day also contained the following leading article, under the heading "Pretences of a Prime Minister":—

Rarely has an Australian Prime Minister been dealt a more devastating rebuke by a State Premier of his own political Party than Mr. Menzies received yesterday.

Fancy the Premier of South Australia rebuking the Prime Minister in such a devastating way as to make it a rare occasion! Of course it is rare; yet next year Sir Thomas will ask us to return Bob Menzies as Prime Minister. In the meantime, of course, the Treasurer indulges in this trumpet-playing publicity to fool the people of South Australia.

Mr. Hambour—We'll buy you a triangle to play.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member would not know how to play a triangle: he has only been schooled in wind instruments. The leading article continues:—

The Premier expressed the indignation and resentment of South Australians at the insolently cavalier attitude towards this State shown by the Prime Minister over the Snowy Waters Agreement. The ultimate rights and wrongs of the water diversion are a matter for lawyers. What matters to the people of this State is the way they have been treated in Canberra. It had been thought since Federation that an elected Prime Minister represented all States.

The Treasurer has told us more than once that the best Federal Treasurer he had to deal with was Ben Chifley.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—He invented the scheme of raising taxation and charging us interest on it.

Mr. LAWN—Since the member for Burnside mentions inventive genius, I point out that the only sign of that shown by the Playford Government in its 19 years in office is in the electoral field. That is their specialty for they are the only ones who could have invented the gerrymander we have.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The honourable member supported it.

Mr. LAWN—Never! The electoral gerrymander was the greatest discovery of our time. I did not vote for it: it was originated by the Butler Government and perpetuated by the Playford Government. As soon as the Playford Government saw the electoral gerrymander was becoming ineffective it further gerrymandered the electorate; and as soon as the electoral system again becomes no good the Premier will again call upon little Gerrymander to gerrymander the electorates again.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The honourable member voted for the present subdivisions.

Mr. LAWN—Although Government members may say that we framed the gerrymander, they know all about the Bills introduced by the Labor Party asking for an independent commission to divide the State into equal electorates, which would be a democratic method. The gerrymander perpetuated by the Playford Government precludes anxiety and neurosis and is a boon to those who would normally worry about election results for there is no need for anyone to worry about the results of elections for the South Australian Parliament; and it also keeps Sir Thomas Playford in power. The leading article in the *News* continues:—

It has been taken for granted that he will be most scrupulous in avoiding any impression of favouring his own State, still more careful of making himself a spokesman for the larger States in defiance of the interests of a smaller community. For a Prime Minister to assert blandly that he does not think it "desirable" for a vitally affected section of the Australian community to know anything of an agreement directly affecting their major source of water until after it is finalized by others, is something new in Australian politics, as the Premier indicated. The Prime Minister's instruction to his junior, Senator Spooner, to offer to come and discuss his *fait accompli* with the South Australian Premier, met yesterday with the resounding slap in the face it merited. A united State stands behind the Premier in this matter. If Mr. Menzies feels that South Australians can be treated as second-class citizens of the Commonwealth, he may find his assumptions of omnipotence are in for a jolt.

I can only assume that the press believed that what the Treasurer said in this House was correct: that he did not know the contents of the agreement. I say, however, that the Treasurer knew its contents and that this

Government kept quiet merely to help Menzies and Bolte effect the agreement. Only when the agreement was signed did this Government take the action it had talked about.

Mr. Hambour—Is that your opinion or the opinion of your Party?

Mr. LAWN—It is my opinion.

Mr. Shannon—It's a guess.

Mr. LAWN—I would not suggest that I am so clever as to guess so accurately, but if the honourable member likes it that way that is all right. Let the Treasurer deny that it is true. I assure the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) that I did not guess it because I do not give myself credit for guessing so accurately on those lines.

Mr. Laucke—You say the Treasurer's statements are untrue?

Mr. LAWN—I say that, if the Treasurer said he did not say what the agreement contained until last Friday, that is untrue.

Mr. Laucke—You accuse the Treasurer of wrongly stating the position?

Mr. LAWN—I made the statement more than once this afternoon when the Treasurer was in the Chamber. I challenged him, and I challenged the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) to ask him to deny the allegation that the Treasurer has been indulging in Playford publicity. The Treasurer did not deny that this afternoon. These are the facts: he knew the contents of that agreement, but as soon as it was signed, the Playford Government took the action it had threatened for months. It did not take action before because it wanted to help Menzies and Bolte effect an agreement favouring the Bolte Government. I do not know the final outcome of the argument between the Commonwealth and the States concerned, but the Treasurer of South Australia withheld action until the agreement was signed. Immediately prior to the next Federal election will the press and the South Australian Treasurer talk about the Menzies Government as they are talking about it now? No, they will be well behind it, but today, when they think they are not on the eve of a Federal election and because they believe that electors have a short memory, they indulge in all this by-play and criticism.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Mr. Menzies holds the record for length of service as Prime Minister, which is very good.

Mr. LAWN—So what? We have a Premier who holds the record for State Premiers, but how has he got it?

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—By your support.

Mr. LAWN—No, by the gerrymander, and the Minister knows it.

Mr. Shannon—I suppose the Federal electorates have been gerrymandered?

Mr. LAWN—No. I would like to see our State elections conducted on the same lines as Federal elections. If a Party loses by one or two votes in an electorate it means the loss of a seat, and, although the Liberals had only a slight overall majority of votes at the last Federal election, it was sufficient to give the party a substantial majority of members.

Mr. Shannon—Who won the third South Australian seat in the Senate?

Mr. LAWN—The Liberal Party, because of the preferences of the Santamaria Party.

Mr. Laucke—Now that the Treasurer is back in the Chamber will you repeat your accusation that he had seen the agreement prior to its signing?

Mr. LAWN—I did not say that. When the Treasurer was here earlier this afternoon he heard me say more than once that he knew what the agreement contained before it was signed. I was going to say he had a copy, but I corrected myself and said I did not know whether he actually had a copy. However, he knew the contents of the agreement before last Friday.

Mr. SHANNON—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think we are getting to a stage in this debate where honourable members, especially the Treasurer, are being charged with making false statements. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) charged the Treasurer with making false statements about the contents of a certain agreement that the Treasurer alleges he had not seen, but which Mr. Lawn alleges he had seen.

Mr. Dunstan—Don't misrepresent Mr. Lawn.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not want to; I only want to nail him down as saying what he said not once, but many times in this debate. I deplore his statement and think he should be called to order at once and asked to withdraw his allegations that the Treasurer, in effect, led this House to believe he did not know anything at all about a certain agreement, which the honourable member says he knew all about. I think Mr. Lawn should be asked to withdraw his statement.

Mr. LAWN—I had finished with this matter—

Mr. SHANNON—I do not agree. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it is not finished with and I propose to ask that those allegations be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN—The statement by the member for Adelaide has been objected to.

Mr. LAWN—I ask Mr. Shannon to repeat my statement to which he objects.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member alleged that the Premier had said in this Chamber that he had not seen a copy of the agreement dealing with the Snowy River Waters Scheme, and whereas he had, in fact, seen it and knew what it contained. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that allegation.

Mr. LAWN—That statement is not correct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN—Will the member for Adelaide say what he said?

Mr. LAWN—I only returned to this matter at the request of Government members. I said that the Premier knew the contents of this agreement prior to receiving his copy last Friday.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I did not.

Mr. SHANNON—Are we going to permit the member for Adelaide to impugn the veracity of the Leader of this House? Is that the way this debate is to continue?

The CHAIRMAN—The member for Adelaide must withdraw the statement.

Mr. Lawn—What statement?

The CHAIRMAN—That the Premier knew all along what was in the agreement. Objection has been taken to that statement.

Mr. LAWN—I will not withdraw words I have not uttered.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I object to the statement the honourable member has made that I said in this House that I knew the contents of the agreement before I received it. I did not know them. I told the Leader of the Opposition, in answer to a question, what I believed to be in the agreement, but I did not know the contents. I could not know them until I had received a copy of the agreement, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

The CHAIRMAN—I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. LAWN—I will withdraw the statement to which the Premier has objected, but in my opinion it is still correct.

The CHAIRMAN—I ask for an unconditional withdrawal.

Mr. LAWN—I withdraw it unconditionally, but I think honourable members know my views. There are other matters about which this Government could be just as concerned as it is about the Snowy Waters Agreement. We now have a large number of unemployed in this State, and it is of no use saying that they amount to only a small percentage of our

total population because that is no consolation to the men and women who are unemployed. The Premier would get better publicity for his Government if he would put up a genuine fight with the Commonwealth Government to provide sufficient money for additional works to be carried out so that our workless could get employment. The Australian Labor Party believes in a policy of full employment, but members of the Liberal and Country League do not. Last year, and again this year, the Treasurer gave me figures of the number unemployed in South Australia and the number receiving unemployment relief.

Mr. Jennings—Only some of them.

Mr. LAWN—At any rate, I have to accept the figures supplied by the Treasurer, and they show that between March, 1956, and July this year there was an increase in unemployment. Only recently I referred in this House to letters I have received from people who go to the Commonwealth Employment Bureau to get work, but they are always told "We have nothing for you, come back again next week." Recently a competent time clerk asked me if I could help him to get work. Wherever he went he was told he was too old, and the Commonwealth Employment Bureau could not find employment for him for the same reason. He was in his 40's, yet was told he was too old. That is a shocking state of affairs, and that is what has happened under an L.C.L. Government in this State and in the Commonwealth. I can remember when we had L.C.L. Governments when a man was too old at 35, but since that time the Curtin and Chifley Labor Governments have shown that it is possible to have full employment. However, L.C.L. Governments believe in having a percentage of people out of work, and one of their spokesmen, Professor Hytten, suggested that the percentage should be 7½. Last year the Treasurer told me that in March 1956 there were 586 males and 522 females out of work, and that in September 1956 there were 1,701 males and 714 females out of work. In February, 1957, there were 2,228 males and 737 females out of work, and at the beginning of July the figures were 2,261 males and 1,102 females. In the financial statement attached to the Budget there was a reference that at the end of July there were 2,600 males unemployed, which was a substantial increase on the number at the beginning of July. The numbers receiving unemployment relief were:—March 1956, 31 males and 33 females; September 1956,

529 males and 145 females; February 1957, 556 males and 115 females; and July 1957, 730 males and 324 females.

Those figures show that the number of males unemployed increased by 1,675 between March 1956 and July 1957, and the increase in the number of females unemployed was 580, and the Government cannot say that this increase was the result of seasonal conditions. That is a glaring example of what this Government has to offer to the people of South Australia, yet it says that it has brought prosperity to this State. The Government is asking the people to maintain that prosperity, but I would like to accompany Government members to the Commonwealth Employment Bureau in Currie Street and ask the unemployed whether they know anything about the prosperity that the Playford Government has brought them.

The Government should take up with the Commonwealth Government the question of lending money to the States that it has obtained through income taxation. The Commonwealth Government has lent £110,000,000 from this source to the States and is charging 5 per cent interest on it. If the Playford Government will fight the Commonwealth on that issue the Opposition will support it. The States should be getting that money without having to pay interest. The bad state of repair of many of our roads and bridges is causing grave concern. The money collected by the Commonwealth in taxation on petrol is supposed to be returned to the States for the construction and maintenance of our roads, but we get only a percentage, though I admit that recently the Commonwealth has increased that percentage slightly. Of course, the problem of constructing and maintaining roads is a difficult one, and even if there were a change of Government it could not be solved in a year or so.

Mr. Jennings—Has our Minister of Roads any policy on this matter?

Mr. LAWN—I do not think the Government has any policy on anything, other than to depress the wages and conditions of the workers with the object of giving business interests a better deal. Many accidents have occurred on the Hilton Bridge. The Government's attention has been drawn to the bad state of this bridge for years, and three people lost their lives recently when their car crashed through the fence. There was a controversy between the Railways and Highways Departments on who owned the fence, and a statement appeared in the press that the responsibility for the bridge rested with the Highways Department and that the Railways

Department was responsible for the condition of the fence, but that was subsequently denied. I stress that it does not matter to the people who owns the bridge, for it is still a Government responsibility. There is too much dead wood in the Cabinet, but I think that practically every member will agree with me that the Premier has little material with which to replace the dead wood. He may have a green sapling, but that is about all. I was so sick and tired of bringing the matter to the notice of the Minister that I referred it to the Premier. This bright young Minister of Railways told Mr. John Clark, who complained about the lack of toilet facilities on the Gawler train, that facilities were available at the railway stations. The passengers would need to be very efficient contortionists and like greased lightning if they had to synchronize their movements in order to make use of the toilet facilities whilst the train was passing through the station.

Mr. Dunstan—The Minister has had a special suite put into his office.

Mr. LAWN—He does not have to synchronize his motions and other movements as he wants train travellers to do. He has had a lavish suite installed in his office. The Government has much dead wood in its ranks, and it is really a one-man band. The Premier handles everything; no other Minister has the opportunity. We can see that when the Premier rises to answer matters raised in debate. The Minister of Railways cannot even provide proper working conditions in railway workshops. The men are seething with discontent over this matter. I was a member of a deputation which waited on the Minister and with little exception the requests of the union were refused.

The sooner the Government is changed the sooner will the people reap a benefit. Recently I asked the Premier how many men were employed at the Wallaroo grain distillery and he told me 30, mostly in the pole yard. I have since had letters from people in the area and others have told me that only one man is employed in the distillery, and that he is a boilermaker. I challenge members opposite to deny that the Premier made that statement. A man offered to take over the land, the plant and employees in order to continue making poles for the Electricity Trust; and that is where the 30 men are employed. I wanted to know how many men worked at the distillery. I would like Mr. Shannon to ask me whether I am making a true statement on this matter. We have heard a lot about

industries being established in the country but they all seem to be established in the city. The Government would not establish any in the Wallaroo district because it might prejudice the Government's chance of winning the seat. The same can be said about Flinders and Eyre. Government supporters do not mind what is done so long as they continue to occupy the Treasury benches.

Our housing position is not improving. The Premier has repeatedly refused to consider increasing the amount of advance to a prospective home purchaser. He has always said that only a certain amount of money is available for the purpose and that if the amount of £1,750 were increased fewer people would be able to get an advance, but now he says the Government intends to increase it, which is an admission that housing construction costs are going up and that prospective purchasers cannot find the necessary deposit. If things are as prosperous as the Government says, the amount of £1,750 should be reduced.

Mr. Hambour—That does not follow. The money is available and the Premier is therefore increasing the advance.

Mr. LAWN—If £1,750 was sufficient in the past, and the State is as prosperous as we have been told, we should not be increasing the amount. The Government is not giving proper attention to the economics of the position. The Commonwealth Government spoke about putting value back into the pound, and the Premier said, "Return my Government and leave the rest to me. I can get more money from the Menzies Government than from a Labor Government," but as soon as the election was over he complained about the Commonwealth Government reducing the amount of money allocated to this State for housing.

I give full marks to Mr. Quirke for saying the Commonwealth Government should enter the hire purchase business. Many trading banks are entering it in order to get better returns. Last year I wanted to borrow some money but could not get it from the Commonwealth Bank so had to go to a hire-purchase firm. I was charged an interest rate of 19 per cent. Six months later I found a bank that would lend me the money at 6 per cent. The bank was satisfied with that rate, but the hire-purchase people wanted 19 per cent. I would like the Commonwealth Government to enter the hire-purchase field and make money available at 6 per cent, or less. That rate is too high, but it is preferable to 19 per cent.

We are not providing sufficient accommodation for our aged people. About 400 people

suffering from senility are in our mental institutions because there is no other place for them. I have complained about this, and so has Dr. Birch. A Liberal Government has occupied our Treasury benches for about 24 years, and Sir Thomas Playford has been Premier for 19 years. The Government has had ample time to provide accommodation for aged people, but it has not the desire nor the ability to tackle the job. If a workman cannot be freed from house worry he cannot be efficient at his work. If a man is out of work, but knows that his family is adequately housed, he has only the worry of seeking employment. However, how can a man concentrate on his work if he knows his family has no accommodation and it is raining? We believe this matter so important that we advocate the creation of a Ministry to deal with housing problems.

Last week Mr. Dunstan cited figures concerning hospital accommodation in Australia which revealed that South Australia lags behind all other States. The Liberal Party has held office here for 24 years, but there have been changes of Government in the other States. This State is supposed to be prosperous, but we have less hospital accommodation. Our industrial legislation is the worst in the Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, this Government would not occupy the Treasury benches if we had a fair electoral system. If the people had the right to change the Government they would have done so long ago. In introducing the Budget the Treasurer said:—

Members will recall that at this time last year I indicated that the Government was faced with the prospect of a shortage of ready funds with which to finance a heavy accumulated deficit, and also would have to meet considerable costs in protective and relief measures for the River Murray floods. Accordingly, it felt bound to increase a number of its charges and taxes beyond what it would otherwise have contemplated in order to keep the deficit within manageable proportions.

In South Australia the Government has created a Housing Trust over which it exercises no control. Similarly it exercises no control over the Electricity Trust and the Tramways Trust and it places the railways under the control of a commissioner. The Tramways Trust announces increases in fares: the Treasurer does not do so in his Budget. The Electricity Trust is increasing the cost of all hire appliances and will increase charges soon. The Housing Trust can increase rents. None of these increases appears in the Budget.

I believe some mention has been made in the Budget of an average increase of 12½ per cent in rail fares, but I know that some fares have increased by over 50 per cent. I have been advised by people that the fare from North Adelaide to Islington has been increased from 18s. to 29s. a month. In the last 12 months this Government has, for the first time, applied a charge in Government hospitals. We have recently been told that the price of bread is to be increased. Notwithstanding all these increases there has been no adjustment in the basic wage. This Government is not interested in the worker. The people do not know where the prosperity to which the Treasurer has referred exists. I suggest it exists only in the Treasurer's mind and on the front pages of the press and I condemn this Government.

If the Government is sincere in its proposal to fight over the Snowy River Waters Agreement; if it is genuine in its fight to secure money from the Commonwealth at a lower rate of interest; if it is genuine in its fight against the Commonwealth in regard to finding work for the unemployed; and if it is genuine in its fight for a greater allocation for housing, it will have the support of the Opposition. I will not support any Government that puts up a sham fight.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I congratulate the Premier on a well-balanced Budget which is designed to provide for continuity of public work throughout the State and to maintain employment at as high a level as possible. An amount of £13,789 is proposed for the Fisheries and Game Department. Last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question relating to the industry because I had seen in *Hansard* a statement to the effect that it was slipping back. Figures were not available at that time, but they have now come to hand and they certainly belie the suggestion that the industry is slipping back. Firstly in respect of crayfish—that valuable crustacean which earns such welcome dollars for South Australia—there was a catch of 4,385,000 lb. last year and the total production of fish last year was 8,500,000 lb.—a record. I think that probably the member in another place who suggested the industry was slipping back was referring to some inshore fishing grounds which are becoming depleted. That is so in a number of cases, but generally speaking the industry is on the up and up. We are fortunate in having the South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative

Limited which is the best fishing co-operative in the Commonwealth. On page nine of its last report the following appears:—

The main reason, of course, is that South Australia is the only State in the Commonwealth where the fishermen are organized in one State-wide co-operative and, particularly organized of their own free will and choice and having full control over their own affairs. This is different from many other States where the fishermen are under Government control and very often have no choice where to sell their fish.

I understand that the co-operatives in other States receiving Government assistance are told where their fish must be disposed of. Our co-operative company first received financial assistance during the time when the Hon. A. W. Christian was Minister of Agriculture, but there are no strings tied to any of the assistance given to our body which can market fish as it desires. In the opening paragraph of its report the following appears:—

We have exported a record quantity of cray tails and have received a higher price than ever before and this year, for the first time, your society has earned over 800,000 dollars. Your society has earned, since it started exporting cray tails to America, over 4,000,000 dollars.

The crayfish catch last year was about 100,000 lb. above the previous year although it was not as high as the record catch of 1955. There is no indication that the crayfish grounds are being fished out to any extent, although more fishermen are operating on them. Prices are increasing for crayfish and shark. The net payments for the past three years have been:—1954-55, 1s. 11.43d. a pound; 1955-56, 2s. 2d. and 1956-57, 2s. 5.27d. That is quite a marked improvement which is very good for the trade. In addition, successful experiments in the canning of pilchards are being carried out and, if successful, this will be a valuable extension of the industry, for South Australian waters abound in pilchards. Shark prices reached as low as 10d. a pound two years ago, but the following year increased to 1s. 3d. and at present the price is 2s. a pound, although that possibly is seasonal, because in another month or so, with the greater catches, the prices will fall again. Fishing is a primary industry which is a very valuable one for the State and is certainly not slipping back. With a fishermen's co-operative conducted on lines such as this one the industry has a great future, for it has agencies throughout the whole State, from the South-East to Port Lincoln and Ceduna, and,

as well, conducts the fish market in the Central Market.

My main purpose in bringing this matter forward was to talk about the regulations being applied to shark fishing, namely, the imposing of a close season on all edible sharks during the month of November. Some time ago I was informed that the trade would fall into line with the eastern States during the month of November, and I received the following letter from the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game, Mr. Moorhouse:—

Re Snapper sharks: I thought you would like to know that the other States have again raised the question of a close season and have suggested that November shall be the month. I understand that South Australia is to fall into line and will declare a closure in sympathy with the other States.

I was not greatly concerned with that as snapper sharks do not greatly affect the fishermen in the area I represent; not more than two or three dozen would be caught during the whole season, but when I heard last Thursday that the regulation was to impose a close season during the month of November on all edible sharks, it became quite a different story, although I realize that I am too late to do anything about it. However, I should like to have something to say on the matter so that my remarks may be taken into consideration on some future occasion.

Along the South Coast fishermen operate set nets from now on through the summer and take salmon, butterfish and several kinds of gummy shark. If this regulation is applied it will mean that nets will still be set for other fish, but will catch the usual number of sharks. These are, in the main, dead when taken out of the nets, and under this regulation will be thrown overboard and thus be a complete loss to the fishermen and the fish consuming public. Consequently the regulation will not contribute to the conservation of the species as intended. On the contrary, it will be a means of the loss of considerable income to fishermen and a waste of tons of good, edible fish. May I point out that a year or two ago, when the Hon. A. W. Christian was Minister of Agriculture, a similar agreement was made with the eastern States, but it broke down with the result that the regulation did not come into operation. I was very surprised therefore when the Minister told me that it was the opinion of members of the Fishermen's Co-operative Societies that the regulation should apply to all edible sharks. I do not know what proportion of the fishermen are engaged in shark fishing, but I should think it would not

be very great. However, I think I can understand why they take this attitude and I have a considerable amount of sympathy for them. Sharks differ from most other fish which lay their eggs in the sand to be fertilized by the male fish afterwards. Sharks, however, retain their eggs inside the female and the eggs transform there to the young fish which are nourished until large enough to be expelled usually in November. Snapper sharks may have anything from 15 to 30 of these young, which are about 12in. to 14in. long when they leave the mother fish. Some other species have fewer and they are about 10in. to 12in. long. Along the South Coast very few snapper sharks are caught in the set net areas, but a large number of other kinds are. Snapper sharks are the main type caught by the cutters, which may operate as far as 100 miles out to sea, and they are a particularly good and edible fish.

I feel that the regulation is entirely unnecessary as there appears to be no scarcity of sharks in southern waters. Last year there was virtually a close season for months all along the South Coast imposed by the floodwaters the River Murray discharged into the sea. Sharks will not stay in fresh water, so needless to say almost none was caught in set nets in that area while the floodwaters prevailed. Although a close season during the month of November would undoubtedly conserve some young fish, it must be realized that for months prior to that the females are carrying their eggs or young fish and they are, of course, being caught all that time. As I have said, the cutters operate over great areas as much as 100 miles away, and consequently fish over only a few acres of the sea bottom. When we realize the vast areas yet untouched and the hundreds of miles of coastline along which these fish breed and where no net fishing, or other fishing takes place, we must conclude that the few fish which may be saved by the regulation will be so small in number as to have little or no impact on the whole, even over several years.

I believe that the regulation will be reviewed from time to time and I hope that the Minister, when considering whether we fall into line with the other States, will take into consideration some of the points I have made, all of which I think would be verified by the Chief Inspector of Fisheries.

I am pleased indeed that the Minister for Highways has had the reconstruction of the Mount Compass to Victor Harbour Road commenced. The work is going on very well

indeed and is a credit to that department; it has done a wonderful job in the few weeks that operations have been in hand. However, there is one aspect that I can hardly understand. There are about four or five miles of unmade or gravel road between where the bitumen road from Myponga ends on Nettle's Hill and the Hindmarsh Valley road. This piece of road washes out with every rain and is very rough indeed. I have inquired about it from time to time and was told, firstly, that they were trying to survey a road around the reservoir, and later that this was not found feasible and that there was likely to be a reconstruction of the Nettle's Hill road. Later again I was told that another survey was to be made to try to find a way around the reservoir. However, nothing has been done although the Minister has informed me that there was enough in the fund for the construction of those three or four miles of road over Nettles' Hill. I should have thought that it would be a good thing to complete that work before starting on the Mount Compass-Victor Harbour section, because the route *via* Myponga through the Tiers over Nettle's Hill is only about 1½ miles longer than the Adelaide-Victor Harbour route *via* Willunga, and had the work been completed first much of the traffic could have been diverted from the new work whilst it was incomplete.

I should also like to mention the Langhorne's Creek-Wellington road, which cuts up badly every winter and costs a tremendous amount in maintenance. I think that road could take quite a lot of the traffic off the Murray Bridge road, although it may necessitate either a new bridge or a better ferry service at Wellington. With reference to the Ashbourne-Double Bridges road, the stretch between Milang and Double Bridges is complete, except for about half a mile of new construction which has been left to consolidate. After that is done the Bull's Creek to Ashbourne road could well be considered, because it is a floating gravel road which carries quite a lot of traffic and entails a good deal of maintenance. I support the first line.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—It is not my intention to speak at any great length at this stage because later we will have further opportunities for discussion when dealing with individual lines. When dealing with Estimates, whether Revenue or Loan, we are in the unfortunate position of not being able to move to increase a line. Only the Government can do this, and there is not much chance of having any

alteration made unless we can convince the Government that it is right. The Premier referred to the public debt, and said:—

The public debt of the State for 1956-57 was 276,444,000 which represented an increase of £20,350,000 for the year.

This should cause some concern to every person. Our interest bill is increasing every year, and if we allow this to go on it will be like the old saying "Borrow or bust." The public debt is allowed to increase every year, and nothing is done to reduce it. I think it is time for us as a Parliament to say we will not allow it to increase any more. The Auditor-General in his last report stated:—

The public debt (bonds, bills, stock and debentures) and other interest bearing indebtedness of the State at 30th June, 1957, was £296,844,000, equivalent to £339 per head of population. The increase for the year was £24,281,000 compared with £23,541,000 for the previous year; the increase per head of population, £28, being the same as in each year.

He went on to point out that the increase per capita would have been greater but for an increase in population. The State Public Debt in 1949 was £127,501,000, or £187 14s. a head, and this increased to £249,640,000, or £304 12s. a head, in 1955. We are getting further into debt every year, and the main reason is our enormous interest bill. We are in the hands of moneylenders, who have always prevented progress, and have always been regarded as the worst section of the community. I can remember when I was a child my father, who was a preacher, quoted from the Bible to show how moneylenders treated people. The interest bill is the reason why every Government department is in a bad position now. The Railways Department would be making a big profit but for the interest bill, and this applies to the water supply and every other Government undertaking. It will not be long before the system will crash, as we will have a financial collapse in Australia.

Recently I received a pamphlet from the Savings Bank about money collected in public schools. A big amount is paid by children into school banks on which they get 2½ per cent interest. What happens to that money? The Education Department borrows it back for school equipment, buildings and other things. Why should the banks come in between? Could it not be arranged for the children's deposits to be used by the Education Department at a smaller rate of interest, and for the children to get a better rate? Recently one of my sons wanted to purchase a house, and I went to the Commonwealth

Bank at Port Adelaide to see if I could get some money for him. The bank's rate for a mortgage was 6½ per cent, yet my other son, who had deposited £1,200 in that same bank, received only 2½ per cent. I got the two boys together and they agreed that one would withdraw his money and lend it to the other at 4 per cent, which was of benefit to each. If this could be done by individuals, why could not the Government do the same? Our Public Debt is increasing every year because public institutions are losing money because of the interest bill they have to pay. As members know, the only way to get rid of the interest bill is to provide our own bank.

Much has been said recently about the condition of our State hospitals. Some years ago I said trouble was brewing, and but for the hard work done by the girls employed at the Adelaide Hospital there would have been more serious problems than there have been. Several years ago there was trouble with the nursing staff because of the disgraceful wages they were paid. Their wages and conditions are typical of those applying generally throughout the State and it is easy to understand the present staff shortage. Our workers are on the tail end of increases in pay and reforms in conditions. Our arbitration system has failed and unless it is improved serious trouble will result.

Mr. Millhouse—What do you suggest?

Mr. STEPHENS—For the court to give justice to the people. I would not allow prices to be increased as they are being increased every day without adequate wages being paid to the worker. In his book *New Province of Law and Order*, Mr. Justice Higgins said the basic wage must be held sacrosanct, yet today we are always hearing of increases in the cost of living. For instance, we are now told that the price of bread is to rise again.

Mr. Heaslip—Why is it rising?

Mr. STEPHENS—Because of the action of the millers' combine. Recently, a man asked me to witness his signature to an agreement that he would buy flour from certain Adelaide milling companies and not from country millers. If he did not sign the agreement he would get no discount. Some years ago I was walking along Peel Street when I overheard a gentleman of my acquaintance say, "Now that he has agreed to join up with us, what about increasing the price of flour?" Thus, it was decided in Peel Street to increase the price of flour. I immediately rang the manager at the Port

Adelaide Co-operative Bakery, of which I was the chairman of directors, and told him to buy up as much flour as possible in anticipation of the rise. He did that and the co-operative was able to sell its bread for some time at a 1½d. a loaf cheaper than other bakers and also pay a higher dividend. The same conditions apply today. The bakers want to raise the price of bread, so they meet and tell their troubles to the Prices Commissioner. For instance they say that wages have increased.

Mr. Heaslip—That is not the reason this time.

Mr. STEPHENS—The honourable member may talk about export prices, but we were given all those excuses years ago.

Mr. Heaslip—The bakers aren't making much profit out of it.

Mr. STEPHENS—We are always told that, but the financial columns of the press reveal the enormous profits being made out of the hides of the workers. The time is fast approaching when the employers will be sorry that the rights of workers have been taken away under the so-called arbitration system. I fought hard for arbitration and I was the first layman to conduct a case in the Arbitration Court in this State, but I am fast losing faith in arbitration because of the unfair things that have happened under it. Today men, women and children are being legally robbed of their rights.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—That's a reflection on the court.

Mr. STEPHENS—Yes, the court is often instructed as to what it should do. I now turn to the activities of the Harbors Board. As the member for Port Adelaide, I appreciate the good work that the board has done not only at Port Adelaide, but throughout the State generally. I have had many dealings with the Harbors Board, particularly concerning the acquisition of land for the Greater Port Adelaide scheme. I am pleased to say that a satisfactory settlement has been reached in that matter and that not one case went to the court. I hope the Minister of Marine and the board will be able to comply with a request by a man who wishes to run a show boat on the Port River. Apparently the board feels that adequate berthing space is not available for the vessel, but I believe it could be found for there is plenty of room on the river for it. Admittedly, the board may believe that higher priority should be given to other vessels, and I do not blame it for that.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—It will be

difficult because other people have prior rights and this man will probably want to tie it up indefinitely when he is not running.

Mr. STEPHENS—The Minister may be willing to meet the owner of the vessel.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—I do not control the allocation of berths.

Mr. STEPHENS—Although I do not ask the Minister to override the decision of the board, I believe that discussions between the Minister, the board and the owner may be fruitful. Surely, a vessel 112ft. long should be able to berth somewhere on the miles of wharves we have at Port Adelaide. Even if room cannot be found for this vessel at a wharf, there should be room for it in the river where pleasure boats are moored now. The Harbors Board will have the say in this matter, and I think it should be able to come to some gentleman's agreement with the owner of the vessel. All other States have their show boats or pleasure boats, and surely if they can make satisfactory arrangements this State should be able to too. We have increased the size of our harbour and the length and standard of the wharves, yet it seems that we cannot even find room for a vessel 112ft. long.

We have show boats and pleasure boats on the Murray and the Torrens, so surely room can be found for such a boat at Port Adelaide, which I am pleased to refer to as the hub of the universe, so that we can advertise our port, which is the front door of the State. Many people want to see Port Adelaide. We often speak about the improvements to our wharves, but we cannot show them to the people. They have to get in a motor car and go around the wharves, whereas they should be able to get on a motor boat and have a good look at the river. Some years ago members of Parliament were taken down the river in Government launches, but we do not have those trips today. I hope the Minister of Marine will do his best and try to get the Harbors Board to find a berth for the vessel to which I have been referring.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I would first like to tell the member for Port Adelaide a few facts about the increase in the price of bread. He blamed the millers and arbitration and other factors for the increase, but they have nothing to do with it. The recent increase in the price of bread will benefit no-one except those employed in the milling industry. The grower will get nothing additional, and neither will the miller. The increased price of flour must be passed on, and has resulted in an increase in the price of bread, but it only

represents an endeavour to keep the milling industry going in Australia. The big subsidies being paid to wheatgrowers overseas enable other countries, particularly France because of the revaluation of its currency, to undercut Australian millers, who cannot now compete on overseas markets.

Mr. Stephens—So the people of South Australia have to pay more for bread so that producers can get more for flour overseas?

Mr. HEASLIP—That is not so. Everyone in Australia is paying a little more for bread in an endeavour to keep the milling industry going, and the milling industry means the employees in the milling industry. If the mills closed all the employees would have to get the sack.

Mr. Stephens—Why not sell more flour?

Mr. HEASLIP—We cannot sell it in competition with other countries, and this recent increase in the price of bread will help to enable our millers to compete with other countries. The honourable member was right off the track.

Mr. Stephens—Don't put me on the wrong track.

Mr. HEASLIP—Those are the facts. The Leader of the Opposition said a lot about primary production. I usually agree largely with him when he speaks on this topic, and I realize that he has an extensive knowledge of it. He has gone through the school and usually knows what he is talking about, but on this occasion he seemed to be right off the track. He started by saying that he had read the Treasurer's Budget speech and had been struck forcibly by the change in the tempo of his opinion of the prosperity of the State. He compared the contents of the Budget speech with the contents of the Opening Speech of His Excellency in March, six months earlier. Conditions in our primary industries have changed materially in that time, and seasonal conditions have a big bearing on the Budget. Therefore, I agree with the Treasurer's remarks:—

The seasonal outlook in this State is also such that the immediate future cannot be confidently predicted. Rains since the opening have been barely adequate . . . consequently, there is an urgent necessity for follow-up and late spring rains.

In preparing the Budget the Treasurer must try to ascertain what the State's income will be in the ensuing 12 months, otherwise he may be millions of pounds out in his Budget. The Treasurer reviewed what had happened since the Governor's Opening Speech, and it is even more apparent now that the outlook has

changed considerably. The Leader of the Opposition went on to say that there was no need for panic, and I agree with him entirely, but then he said that the country north of Spalding was in as good heart as in any normal season in the past. He was quite wrong there. The season we are experiencing is the most abnormal I have ever known. Firstly, it is one of the driest we have ever had. We had far more rain in 1914, yet we are having a far better season than then. We have far more feed than we had then. I would not call this season a drought, but it is certainly abnormal. Considering the amount of rain that we have had I think we have more fodder than in any other year.

Mr. Corcoran—There was not much superphosphate used in 1914.

Mr. HEASLIP—That is true, but in that year we did not get a good germination, but this year we have. Conditions are quite different today from what they were in 1914, and different from those in any other drought year. We have greenfeed throughout the country, but north of Spalding, through lack of rain, conditions are getting worse and worse. I have been told on good authority that 7,000 sheep were driven to a waterhole that had been poisoned. They all died after drinking and a bulldozer was used to pile up the bodies and then bury them. We are certainly having an abnormal year. It would not be economic to bring stock in outback areas to the abattoirs. The Leader of the Opposition said that producers had not taken advantage of the fodder that was available. He said:—

In referring to the possibility of a deterioration in the Budget situation the Treasurer said, "South Australia has not faced for 12 years a season with such threatening possibilities to its rural economy . . . real comfort can be taken in the fact that over the last two decades rural South Australia has been able to build up substantial reserves against such a catastrophe."

He then went on:—

I would like to know where these substantial reserves that have been built up by rural South Australia are.

He followed up that by saying that some producers had baled hay but had not covered it and it was now black heaps of ruin, and he implied that producers had not taken advantage of the good years and stored up fodder. I have never seen so much fodder stored as I saw last season, and this was due to the improved storage methods. Our agricultural advisers gave the farmers credit for that. However, we then entered one of the driest summers we have ever experienced, and with

the record number of sheep in the State those fodder reserves disappeared. We are approaching another summer, having eaten our reserves, with a record number of 15,000,000 sheep in the State.

Only on four occasions prior to 1951 had we ever exceeded 10,000,000 sheep in South Australia, and each time we have exceeded that number we have dropped back. From 1940 to 1944 we had just over 10,000,000 sheep, but in 1946 our numbers were reduced to 6,000,000. We had overstocked, and then we lost them. Today we are carrying an all-time record number of 15,000,000 sheep and we cannot continue that, even in a normal year, because conditions have to be abnormally good before we can carry that number. We are now facing one of the leanest periods we have had during the past 12 years, and it is inevitable that we must suffer tremendous losses in livestock.

Mr. Bywaters—Do you believe people have overstocked?

Mr. HEASLIP—People have not overstocked in the seasons we have had in the past 12 years, and if these same good seasons had continued they still would not have been overstocked.

Mr. Bywaters—Those good seasons don't carry on for ever.

Mr. HEASLIP—That is so. We just cannot hope to carry anything like 15,000,000 sheep permanently. It is necessary to get rid of the surplus every year in order to make room for the natural increase but today we just cannot get rid of them because there is no outlet whatsoever. The sheep which I was selling 12 months ago for £5 will not fetch £1 today, and they are now on the market for 15s.; I cannot even get that. That is the position confronting every primary producer. We have 3,000,000 sheep to dispose of to make room for the natural increase which we hope will take place, and we cannot get rid of them. Those 3,000,000 sheep are eating the fodder that should be there for the flocks one normally holds. There is no doubt that things are grim. The Leader of the Opposition criticized the Minister of Agriculture for instituting a plan whereby one can get stock to the Abattoirs and the Abattoirs Board is prepared to pay 3s. 6d. a head and give us the skins, but I would say that the Minister has done something that will give great confidence to the industry.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that he would sooner slaughter stock than accept 3s. 6d. a head because that amount

would probably be absorbed in freights, but the point is that one is able to get rid of the stock. I have tried slaughtering them and it is utterly impossible. Try to imagine cutting the throats of 2,000 or even 200 sheep! Having cut their throats it is then necessary to skin them, and this has to be done in the paddock with one's back bent and the sun streaming down. Having got the skin off one then has 200 carcasses to dispose of, and one can only burn or bury them, both major problems. Under this scheme proposed by the Minister the primary producers who know that they cannot dispose of the stock elsewhere can at least get 3s. 6d. a head for them at the abattoirs. Even if transport costs 4s. or 5s. a head it is a way of getting rid of them and it is cheaper than trying to burn or bury them. I commend the Minister for introducing that scheme and giving that confidence to primary producers.

The Leader of the Opposition is out of touch when he refers to what he calls the pernicious habit of burning off stubble. The Leader of the Opposition said:—

Not only did much of rural South Australia fail to store fodder, but during this year the pernicious policy of burning off was again resorted to. It almost made me cry when I was travelling north in the autumn to see fires raging all over the country with stubble, and even grass land, being burned off.

The actual position is that when primary producers went to sow their oats, barley or wheat this season, it was impossible even with modern tillage machines to get through the grass on the land, and there was no alternative but to burn it off or allow it to remain there. If the acreage were to be put under crop it was necessary to burn the grass off, and there was great difficulty in many cases in getting the combines through to sow the crop where it had been impossible to burn off. Circumstances alter cases.

Mr. John Clark—That grass would be better off in the soil.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, if one could possibly get the machines through it, but once it becomes wet that is impossible.

Mr. John Clark—Couldn't it be done earlier?

Mr. HEASLIP—The practice is to sow the seed after the rains have come. Once the rain comes the grass drags in the implements and it is impossible to get through it.

Mr. Bywaters—I saw a man cutting and baling his stubble in the summer time, and he is reaping the benefit now.

Mr. HEASLIP—Anybody who does that will reap the benefit. The burning off which the Leader of the Opposition was referring to was of stubble after harvest, and of grass prior to seeding. It is not possible to burn off before February because the law will not allow it. Normally I do not agree with burning off, but in the season we have just experienced the growth was such that it was impossible to sow the crop unless one resorted to burning. I do not think the primary producer was doing anything bad in burning off to enable him to get his seed in. Unfortunately, of course, it looks as though the seed will not come to very much. Even if we get two inches of rain tonight or tomorrow we cannot hope to reap a normal crop. I travelled through the country as far north as Wilmington over the week-end and saw crops which were 6in. out of the ground when they should have been 18in. or 24in. high, and every day one can see more red ground between the rows instead of less. The primary producer has already suffered to the extent that he cannot expect even an average return. In many cases they will have a complete failure, and in other cases they certainly will not receive a normal return. I think there is real reason for concern. I do not believe in panicking, but I think the position is really serious. Some relief is being afforded through Western Australia taking some of our stock, but the eastern States are in much the same position as we are.

People should be made aware of the serious position of the primary producers in South Australia today, because ultimately what happens in primary production is reflected in the secondary industries. I agree with the Premier that we have a more balanced economy in South Australia because we have built up our secondary industries, and what might happen in primary production will not be so drastic because we have our secondary industries to fall back on. However, if the earning power or income of primary producers is reduced by half, that spending power is ultimately reflected throughout the community, and what is happening in primary industry today must cause repercussions throughout South Australia.

Despite reassurances by the Minister of Works I have for some time been concerned regarding the supply of water in the northern areas. It may surprise members to know that Booleroo Centre is still experiencing water restrictions; and I am fearful of the time when the whole of that area comprising

Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, and districts served by the Bundaleer, Beetaloo and Baroota Reservoirs will also have water restrictions.

Mr. Bywaters—Many people are carrying water now.

Mr. HEASLIP—The summer has not commenced, so what will it be like at the end of the summer! The only answer is a deviation or duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, and that cannot be built in six or 12 months. We have not even received a report on it, and after the Government gets a report the matter has to be referred to the Public Works Committee for a recommendation. We may be able to get through this year by pumping for 24 hours a day, but what is to happen next summer? If we have another lean year we will have to try to replenish three reservoirs from the Murray pipeline, and this is an impossible task. If we cannot replenish these reservoirs the whole of that northern area must be subject to water restrictions. I hope the Government will take some notice of what I am saying with regard to these areas.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—The position at the moment is that we are putting in more than we are taking out.

Sitting suspended from 6 p.m. to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I congratulate the new member for Wallaroo, Mr. Hughes, on so ably supporting the motion. He has all the qualifications needed by a member of this House and will be an acquisition to the place. We need men of his calibre and I wish him well whilst he is here. I think he will have a long and successful stay. During the Address in Reply debate last year Mr. Coumbe said:—

This session, because of the retirement of older members and the re-alignment of electoral boundaries, seven new Liberal members take their seats. That is a great achievement at any time. I remind honourable members that seven new Liberal members comprise one-third of the Government Party, and with this new blood there is an upsurge of spirit and a renaissance of thinking in this already great Party which augurs very well for many future years of sound enterprising government in this State.

In my maiden speech last year in that debate I said:—

Mr. Coumbe said there were seven new members on his side of the House, but I point out that we have two new members on this side. He said that new blood had been infused into the Government, but I assure him that Mr. Loveday and I will enter vigorously into the debates to come.

That prediction has come true because last week Mr. Loveday made a fine contribution to

the debate. I wish I could say that Mr. Coumbe's prediction had come true; I have yet to see it fulfilled. Mr. Coumbe has an excellent delivery and, because of his experience, could add a great deal to the debates in this place, and he has done it at times, but there are some matters he could well leave alone. I did not like the way he castigated Mr. Dunstan, who also made a fine contribution to the debate. Whether or not we accepted everything he said, what he did say contained much merit and could be exploited for future reference. When we get innuendoes and interjections like "Is that the Party policy?" it does not make for good debate. I was pleased to hear the Treasurer say in completing his Budget speech:—

It is significant that in that time the Treasury staff has not increased. In fact, it is slightly smaller now than it was 15 years ago, yet the work of the Treasury is without parallel in the Commonwealth or any other State. I express to Mr. Drew, the senior officers and the remainder of the Treasury staff my sincere thanks for the way in which they control the financial affairs of the State. They carry a heavy responsibility and do their work excellently. I assure members of the Opposition that if ever they have occasion in the dim and distant future to want financial advice there will be available to them a Treasury staff that is without parallel in Australia.

Mr. Hambour—He has trained them very well.

Mr. BYWATERS—There is no doubt about that, and they deserve all the credit due to them. I have had nothing but the best treatment from them and I agree entirely with the Treasurer's statement. However, my point is that previously there was no indication of the possibility that the present Opposition would be in government and have access to the Treasury. Certainly the Treasurer said "In the dim and distant future," but that is far better than anything we have had previously. It is pleasing to know that he has condescended to imply that the Opposition will eventually be in government. He seems to have a premonition that we will be there in the not too distant future. In 18 months' time I think South Australia will see a change of government. The Treasurer has seen the writing on the wall. I think that has come about because of the interest taken in decentralization. Mr. Hughes is here because of the decentralization policy he and his supporters expressed during the Wallaroo campaign. Last week I saw in the press that a committee had been appointed at Balhannah to discuss with the Premier and Mr. Shannon the possibility of getting industries there. That is not an isolated case; I

have brought up the matter in connection with Murray Bridge, and Tailm Bend has appointed a committee in a bid for industries. This interest in decentralization spells the death-knell of the Government Party.

Mr. Brookman—It is a good tendency to have these committees.

Mr. BYWATERS—I am glad that people are alive to the position and that they want industries established in the country. That was not the position in the past. Nearly every country newspaper is talking about decentralization, and that will prove sufficient to defeat the Playford Government at the next election. In this debate Mr. Tapping spoke about the system of uniform taxation. The Treasurer said he did not altogether favour it, but Mr. Tapping pointed out that it was only because of the system that the State had gone ahead. It had encouraged industries to come here. They were able to get more favourable conditions here because of uniform taxation. That was not always the case. We have been criticized on many occasions for our policy of socialization and have been charged with being "red." I make no apologies for our policy. In fact the present Government has adopted our policy on occasions to the benefit of the State. The Commonwealth Bank—a socialistic venture—has made a difference to Australia. Dr. Coombe has referred to the healthy future of Australia and has mentioned that the bank made a profit of over £20,000,000 this year. An amount of £10,500,000 has gone back into consolidated revenue. The Trans-Australian Airlines for the first year has become Australia's top airline in tonnages, freight and mail. Figures for the financial year ended June 30 revealed that T.A.A. has gone to the front by a small margin of 247,500 ton miles. That reveals that socialistic undertakings have come to the fore and have been a great asset for Australia. Last week a friend of mine, desiring to come to this State by air, was unable to secure accommodation with T.A.A. He would have had to book a long time ahead but he was able to secure passage on another airline almost immediately. This is a clear indication of the popularity and confidence that is reposed in T.A.A. The Postmaster-General's Department—another socialistic venture—brings about £3,000,000 annually to the Treasury. With all this money going into the Treasury one would have thought that taxation could be reduced or more money provided for public works. That would be the position if we had good administration in this country.

It is time we commenced a State insurance company. On a recent visit to Queensland I ascertained that the State insurance company there had operated with great success and returned much money to the Treasury. In its first year of operations it reduced premiums by 68 per cent. There is no doubt that insurance does return a great profit. One needs only to look at some of the large insurance buildings in Adelaide to realize that. Recently I received a letter from a lady complaining bitterly that she had been deprived of money that was rightly hers. For 20 years she had been paying 1s. a week on a small policy and she desired to convert it to a fully paid up policy. As a pensioner she felt she could no longer afford the payments and she anticipated that the £52 she had paid into the company could be used by her children in the event of her death. To her amazement she discovered that as a paid up policy, although she would not get the premium money immediately and the company would still gain interest on her investment, it was only worth £36 17s. That is all wrong. It is no wonder insurance companies can afford such big buildings if this situation applies generally. The company concerned has recently constructed a new building which the Premier opened.

During this debate much criticism has been levelled at our hospitals. It has been constructive and if any good comes from it it will have been worth while. There are some factors that need rectifying in relation to our subsidized hospitals. Recently all members received a report compiled by the South-Eastern groups of subsidized hospitals. They complain because they are not being fully subsidized for the various items they have purchased. They consider that they should receive a greater subsidy. Figures from other States have been quoted, to the disadvantage of this State. They say that they are contributing by taxation to Government-owned hospitals and are providing the wherewithal from their own pockets to build district hospitals, but if they are obliged, through sickness, to use subsidized hospitals they must pay from £20 to £30 a week for a bed. They believe this situation is unjust and that measures should be taken to remedy it.

Mr. Hambour—They are subsidized pound for pound on capital expenditure.

Mr. BYWATERS—Yes, but not on replacements.

Mr. Hambour—They come under the heading of "maintenance."

Mr. BYWATERS—They may, but they are paying both ways. Let us consider the situation at Tailem Bend. Tailem Bend is really a Government town, as its population comprises mostly railway men. It has a hospital that was originally intended to be a cottage hospital when the town was small, but which has grown out of all proportion. It is now hard placed, as it gets a grant of only £350. This hospital has to cater for all accident cases along the very busy interstate highway, and quite frequently when insurance companies have taken some time to settle accounts it has been placed in a serious position. The hospital is at times overcrowded, and I believe that the Government should consider assisting it with its very necessary building programme. The people who go there for treatment are not always in a position to pay, as often they are pensioners and working people, and the hospital has to struggle on. At times it has found the going very hard.

I am privileged to be a representative of the Labor Party on the National Fitness Council. This organization is doing very good work. It has a job with the youth of today that is unparalleled in the history of this State. This work is growing daily, and the organization is filling a need all over the State. The National Fitness movement was first launched by the Federal Government in 1940, and the National Fitness Act was passed in 1941, when grants were made to each State to National Fitness Councils to train leaders, provide advisory and promotional assistance for voluntary sports and youth organizations as well as to establish youth camps and hostels, to State universities to establish departments of physical education for the training of teachers in the subject, and to State Education departments for the training of teachers in physical education and for encouragement of school camping and hosteling. In 1946 the amount available for the Commonwealth was £72,500, of which the State now receives £5,742 for National Fitness councils, £2,100 for State universities and £2,833 for the Education Department. The State Government first assisted by a grant of £2,750 in 1949. This was increased to £3,500 in 1951, to £4,500 in 1953, and it has been increased by the present Budget to £5,750. I am sorry the Minister of Education is not here tonight, because I believe that it is he who is to be thanked for his assistance in seeing that this amount has been increased this year.

The National Fitness Council now receives £11,500 annually from Government grants, £1,200 from fees charged for the use of its two fully developed camps and six youth hostels, and £500 from leader training fees and the hire of promotional equipment—a total of £13,200. The National Fitness Council is required from this amount to provide an office to house staff and the technical library of books, films and promotional equipment sufficient to satisfy inquiries on all aspects of youth clubs and sports as they concern more especially the 14 to 25 age group. Also from that amount salaries are paid to four professional officers, four typistes and two resident camp wardens.

After 16 years in leased inadequate premises, the council is now buying its own headquarters at 70 South Terrace, and is paying off £1,000 a year plus interest. The State Government provided £1,250 for building alterations in November, 1956. Again, we thank the Government for that. The council provides services to those working in the youth recreation field by its technical library of books, films and records and equipment. Data on pools, halls, recreation space and promotional equipment are available, together with the advice and help of trained professional staff. Examples of staff work are the preparation of a report on the recreation space and needs of Adelaide municipalities, active promotional work in the establishment of the Women's Amateur Sports Council and the Memorial Playing Fields project at St. Marys, the inauguration and nurture of the Youth Clubs Association for independent boys, girls or mixed clubs not able to affiliate with other organizations, the introduction and nurture of the game of softball, the establishment of the Youth Hostels Association and the Gymnastic Association, the introduction of new sports and the conduct of coaching and "learn to play" activities in sports that are not yet firmly established, such as court cricket, athletics and volleyball.

Wherever facilities are provided, such as the soccer ground at Enfield, the basketball centre at Forestville or the Community halls at Northfield, Blackwood or Elizabeth, they are immediately put to full use. There is a need then for professional organizers of community activity for youth in city and country. More National Fitness Council staff could be of great value. Two excellent camps, fully equipped for 62 campers, have been developed at Mylor and Parnanga. Six youth hostels are a boon to walkers. Moves are now on foot

to assist youth camp projects at Port Augusta and Port Pirie. Regional staff should be available to assist these projects and to organize leadership courses in provincial centres.

Money was available to subsidize projects of voluntary youth organizations, local National Fitness Committee and sports groups in the establishment of new clubs, purchase of equipment, development of camps and erection of halls and sports facilities. Such subsidies have helped materially in the building, among other things, of a hockey pavilion at Port Adelaide, a community hall at Northfield, various youth camps around Adelaide, sports fields at Monash, Mallala, Bradbury and so on. This valuable feature of the council's work has had to be greatly curtailed. Above all, we must be awake to the increasing number of young people in our community who need the attention of voluntary organizations to provide them with social training and physical recreation. The National Fitness Council is an established organization that can train and help leaders, and its services could possibly be extended for the benefit of the rising generation.

It must be appreciated that the National Fitness Council is not another youth organization to be joined; it is a Government sponsored body with the specific tasks of developing an awareness of the need for a policy on youth recreation in our community and of doing all in its power to assist the voluntary sports and youth organizations and kindred groups that work in the youth recreational field. It is an independent agency to assist and, if desirable, co-ordinate the activities of all organizations that directly affect the recreational activities of young people.

I have given this information because I felt that something of the work of the National Fitness Council should be placed before the public. This body is doing a great job in looking after the youth of today. We read and hear about many cases of juvenile delinquency, and this body provides one way in which it can be combated—by competitive sport and by properly organized leadership. The National Fitness Council does just that. Not long ago I read that the Premier made money available to the Returned Servicemen's League for its youth club, and also to the Boy Scouts movement for its activities. Both the Returned Servicemen's League and the Boy Scouts Movement can gain something from the National Fitness Council in the way of training for youth leadership and I commend them to it. The need is there, but unfortunately, as in so

many other avenues, money is short. In view of the needs of the youth of today who will be the citizens of tomorrow, this is a cause worthy of even more support than this Government is giving at present.

I thank the Minister of Education for his efforts last year on behalf of the Workers' Educational Association. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran), the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) and I, asked last year that the grant to the Association be increased, but the Minister said that it was impossible to do so because the Budget had been prepared. He said, however, that he would do his best to have the grant increased this year, and, true to his word, he has been instrumental in increasing the amount and also provided £500 in this year's Estimates for additional commitments from the previous year. I believe the Association is grateful for that action.

I noticed in the press recently that the Tourist Bureau is setting aside additional areas in the metropolitan area for recreation. This is a good move because the future development of Adelaide will make reserves and other recreation grounds increasingly necessary.

Much has been said in this debate about water supplies. The Budget provides for increased water rates this year. Personally, my water rates bill of about £10 is not high, for it means that I pay only 2s. per thousand gallons or 10,000 lb. of water, but I feel that the increased rate has been brought about mainly because of the supply of water to the metropolitan area by the Mannum-Adelaide main. Therefore the increase in the rate will assist the people in the metropolitan area rather than in my district, although I admit that city and suburban dwellers require the water through that pipeline, particularly in dry years. On behalf of my constituents, I urge the Minister of Works to press on with more reticulation schemes in the district of Murray, which is so close to the river.

I have previously referred to the position at Hungry Hill. It has been said that the gherkin growers in that area have caused a shortage of water in the summer months but, although so far this year no gherkins have been planted, last week I received a phone call from a man who got only a slight trickle when he turned on his taps. The pipes are already along the road ready for the work to commence, but I urge that the work be expedited, otherwise people there

will be in dire straits this summer. The Minister has promised that this work will proceed, but next week we shall be into October and the hot weather will adversely affect these people if they have no water.

Much has been said in this House recently about the diversion of water under the Snowy Mountains Hydro-electric Scheme, and I support my Leader (Mr. O'Halloran) when he says that Labor members will support any genuine fight to preserve State rights in this matter. This issue is one on which it is imperative that we cross swords with the Federal Government, for it is important to the future of South Australia. Although it is estimated that we are at present using only one-third of our quota of the water permitted under the River Murray Waters Agreement, we must guard the position for future generations so that they will not hold up their hands in justifiable horror at our failure to fight for our rights. Any move made for the protection of South Australia's rights under the River Murray Waters Agreement will be wholeheartedly supported by Opposition members.

Some time ago I raised the matter of the printing of scientific books, particularly concerning flora and fauna, by the Government Printer. In the past the Government has subsidized this activity by £800 a year, although some people thought this sum insufficient. The purpose of the publication was to allow students and teachers to avail themselves of a lower purchase price for the books. The standard of the books was good, and although full advantage may not have been taken of them by students, I believe that their publication could well have been carried on. From correspondence with the Treasurer, I learned that the special line on the Estimates would be discontinued and that the books would be produced and sold by the Government Printer on a commercial basis, the cost of printing to be met from the Government Printing Department's vote. This may or may not increase the cost of the books to students and teachers alike, but I hope the Government Printer's vote will be sufficient to enable the books to be produced as cheaply as in the past. Printed by a commercial firm they would probably cost 10 times their present price, but as the purpose of the books is to promote research and scientific discovery, I hope the price will not be raised.

I was recently approached by the people of Long Flat, a small irrigated area near Murray

Bridge, concerning the bridge across the railway line which divides certain properties and which was extensively used during last year's disastrous Murray River flood when the lower road was impassable. It is now suggested that this bridge be closed to vehicular traffic. Although the bridge was originally built for stock and light traffic, this latest move has seriously inconvenienced the people of the area, some of whom have property on one side of the line and houses on the other. One man has his dairy on one side and his grazing land on the other, and every time he wishes to transfer stock he lets the cows go over the bridge while he has to drive several miles around in his car to get to the milking shed. I raised this matter with the Minister in the hope that the bridge might remain open to light traffic. I felt that that was just, because cows would probably damage the bridge more than would motor cars. Unfortunately this request was not granted and these people are inconvenienced because two steel rails have been placed on the bridge, one at each end, to stop traffic. This bridge is about one mile from the Rabila railway siding, a few miles out of Murray Bridge. I hope that this request has not been forgotten and that the Government will reconsider it so that eventually it will be re-opened to light traffic. I support the first line.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) is under some misapprehension about the Government's views on decentralization. He said that committees were being formed in country areas to promote industrial progress, and referred to Balhannah and Murray Bridge. He said that the Government's attitude on decentralization would spell the death-knell of the Government, but he is under an extraordinary misapprehension because nothing could be further from the Government's wishes than to discourage local people from trying to foster new industries. One of the best possible things would be the establishment of local committees to assist industries, and it is fantastic to imagine that the Government would oppose this. I am sure the Government would take a generous view of any proposals that such a committee could put forward. It stretches its resources as far as possible to encourage industries. I now wish to refer to the speech delivered by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), which incidentally was one of the best maiden speeches I have heard. He spoke well, and I believe that both sides of the House will listen to his future speeches with interest.

Mr. Davis—And benefit from his knowledge.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I think we will, and I congratulate him on his speech. However, I do not agree with everything he said, especially his remarks about his own electorate. A perusal of his speech shows that the Government has done much for his electorate, and he acknowledged that. He praised the comfortable coaches that the railways are running between Adelaide and Moonta. I have not travelled on that train, but I have no reason to doubt what he said. He said he gives credit where credit is due and expressed appreciation for what the railways have done in his electorate. He said later:—

With a deep sea port such as we have at Wallaroo, my district should be a hive of industrial activity. It has railways, a bitumen road, water, facilities for airfields, a good hospital and facilities for one of the finest shopping centres outside of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Davis—The Government is not responsible for the shopping centre, is it?

Mr. BROOKMAN—From reading that list of things done for his district, I wonder what the member for Wallaroo wants the Government to do now short of actually ordering an industry to go there. Does he want Parliament to force an industry to go there by passing some law? The Government has already done its part in providing these facilities for his district and it only remains for industries to go there. If we try to force industries to do so those industries will probably go to some other State. We have many industries in this State because they have been encouraged by the sympathetic attitude of this Government compared with the unsympathetic attitude of Governments of other States governed by Labor Governments. I do not know the Wallaroo district well, but it seems to me that there are only two things wrong with it. One is that the jetty at Port Hughes is a white elephant, and it was constructed by a Labor Government.

Mr. O'Halloran—When?

Mr. BROOKMAN—By the Verran Government. The other thing wrong with Wallaroo is the grain distillery which was erected for the purpose of distilling power alcohol. It was put up by the Chifley Government, but it never distilled any power alcohol. When it was sold the Commonwealth Government prudently removed one of the boilers, which greatly reduced the value of the property. Therefore, the two principal white elephants of the district resulted from the activities of Labor Governments. I doubt whether the

hopes of the electors of Wallaroo will be realized by electing Mr. Hughes, but I would like to know exactly what the electors want. After having heard from the honourable member what the district already has, I do not know what else they could ask for.

During this debate I have been impressed by the many demands on the Government for additional expenditure on all sorts of items. It seems that an argument could be put forward for additional expenditure on every line. We have heard demands for greater expenditure on public health, hospitals, roads, education, the University, schools, the recruitment of teachers, and the provision of additional school buses. I agree that increased expenditure on these items is desirable, but those demands show that this country is developing so rapidly that we are trying to progress in every direction at once. Members should realize that we cannot do everything at once. I should say that our demands for capital could be easily multiplied by three or four if we accumulated the suggestions of each member.

As far as I can see three courses of action are open to us in the Budget discussions. Where some item in the Budget falls obviously below the accepted standard it is up to us as members to put it to the Government that it is not doing the job it should be doing. That is the first thing. Secondly, if we have any particular line on which we think more money should be spent we can press for that standard to be exceeded. There is no obligation on us to say where the money will come from, but we can suggest how the Government can spend more money, and that is what I am going to do in a moment. Thirdly, we can press for more money to be spent and we can also be generous enough to suggest to the Government how to finance our particular suggestion. I will adopt the second course and not try to find the money for the Government, but simply point out where I feel there is a need for greater expenditure. I must admit that the Government has so many offerings on its plate that I cannot complain very bitterly.

The particular subject I have in mind is the extension of agricultural information to primary producers. Honourable members will have heard me mention this subject more than once over the last few years, and, indeed, for some years I have been asking the Government to provide a service in South Australia House, in London whereby a quarterly or monthly letter could be sent to South Australia on the latest agricultural developments in the United

Kingdom. The letter I have in mind could be given to the press and perhaps to our own department's journal and disseminated through that media. This would reduce the danger of new and useful developments remaining in England when they could be of advantage to us, instead of the information coming to us through some tourist coming back and gradually spreading the knowledge through his own activities. We would save ourselves a lot of time if we had such a service. I have been pressing the Government to do that for some years, but so far I have been unsuccessful.

We must remember the importance of getting proper information to the farmer. The oft quoted example comes to my mind of the research activity of an Austrian monk called Mendel, who conducted experiments in breeding plants which were of such a far-reaching nature that they founded the science of genetics. The most peculiar thing about it is that the foundation of this science did not really take place for several decades after Mendel had done his work, simply because nobody took any notice of what he did, and it was nobody's business to take any notice of it. When it was finally found it became of great importance, but the world had lost several decades of the benefit of his useful research work.

Our farms in South Australia may be efficient and the average farm may be of a higher standard than those in other States. I do not know, but I should say that we have nothing to be ashamed of when it comes to a comparison with other States. However, that is rather beside the point. I just cannot imagine a farm that is so efficient that it cannot be improved in some way, and of course we are very far from that standard here. I know that our standard is fairly good, and that there are districts in other parts of Australia which are obviously very inferior. On the other hand, developments are taking place in the other States, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria, which would teach us a tremendous lot if we followed them closely. We are a community which throughout its history has been developing land and establishing farms. With the exception of wheat lands, which have been farmed in much the same way for a long while, we are actually just coming out of the process of establishing our farms. Even the wheat country has changed its methods considerably, and the spread of pastures into the cereal growing country, which went hand in hand largely with the increase in wool prices, has had a very

beneficial effect on the soils of the cereal growing land. The fact is that to date we are not traditionally farmers so much as developers, whereas older countries such as the United Kingdom have been farming for centuries. The forests there were cleared over a thousand years ago, whereas some of our forests are still being cleared and we have to learn to maintain and manage our farms and generally settle down to the continuous process of farming during which we can look ahead to a period where agriculturally speaking there may not be any great changes for several generations. That is the reason why we need this information on management and soil maintenance, and why we must have the extension of agricultural information as soon as it comes to hand.

We have a good record in research. I do not know how our expenditure compares with other countries and I am not sure of the standard by which we should judge it, but I know that our standard of research is high. However, that does not mean that there is not a very great need for more research. It would not take me more than a minute to compile a list of quite sensible projects for agricultural research which would involve the expenditure of £100,000, and it would not take very much imagination to do that. I think we have plenty of scope for research, but the fact is that we have not done too badly. Our scientists in some respects are world famous, and the C.S.I.R.O. has had many brilliant successes. The Waite Agricultural Institute, which is a South Australian organization, has also had several brilliant successes, and the research branch of our own Department of Agriculture has also done very well, its latest contribution being research in the establishment of clover with the use of lime in certain types of soil.

After the research has been carried out, the next thing is to make use of it, because until it goes to the farmer it is useless. Until the farmer can use it it is like having a ton of superphosphate in his shed; he has paid for it and it is there, but it is of no use to him until he has actually spread it on his pasture. A Mr. Willoughby, a scientist with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, has done some research work on a phalaris and subterranean clover pasture in the Canberra district that was capable of carrying three sheep to the acre. While the pasture was good and well managed, each year it converted to meat only one-tenth of the

total nutrients. On that good proposition one-tenth was being used, so the quantity used on a bad farm would not be much.

South Australia has a number of good advisory officers. Not long ago a man went to the department for information as to how to grow potatoes on his land. A very efficient and knowledgeable officer told him that he could suggest so and so, but would first suggest that the man test his land in order to ascertain the soil requirements. Here is an instance where an expert has insufficient information because of insufficient research having been done to enable him to cope with every type of soil. I do not attack the department: as a matter of fact, I think it has done a remarkable job in extension work over the last few years. Its net expenditure, excluding the cost of fruit fly control, has increased by 51 per cent in four years. At its head is Dr. Callaghan, and if he has one ability greater than another it is in connection with extension work. For years now the department has had sympathetic Ministers. We cannot complain about the way it has spent its money, but more should be spent on extension work. The *Advertiser* of September 20 contained a letter to the editor from Professor C. M. Donald, who for several decades has been a leading pasture research man in South Australia, and he has rendered great service. In the letter he said:—

In this sphere Australia has perhaps an even greater problem than in its research programme. The simple fact is that the Australian Departments of Agriculture have inadequate funds and staff for the task of interpreting research findings for farmers and for instructional visits to individual farms.

It is noteworthy that New Zealand has as many agricultural instructors on the few thousand square miles of the Canterbury Plains as S.A. has in the whole State. Though the standard of our extension service is high the numerical strength is quite inadequate for the task that lies before them.

He acknowledged the efficiency of our advisory service so far as it goes, but pointed out the need for a greater extension. We have agricultural officers of high standard but they are spread thinly over the State. The value of personal contact is so great that we should not ignore the need to appoint more officers. There is no better way of spreading information than by personal contact. The grant made by the Commonwealth Government to the dairy industry in New South Wales was spent by a committee in providing continuous technical assistance to five farms over a period of five

years. By this means the butterfat production per cow was increased from 181 to 247 lb., and the herd numbers by 12 per cent. The committee pointed out that at the time the Commonwealth Government was paying £6,500,000 in subsidies to various primary industries and that there was a great lag in efficiency which could be met by giving greater technical assistance. The value of personal contact is great. The United States extension service—which is widespread and gives up-to-date information on almost every subject—conducted an experiment on the value of personal contact. It chose a simple subject—trying to convince farmers of the value of ordering fertilizers early. Where personal contact was used the result revealed 75 per cent success, but in areas where only press and radio publicity was used it was only 30 per cent successful. There are about 30,000 holdings in South Australia and if our district advisers set out to make personal contact with each it would take between five and ten years. It is not realistic to approach each farm only once, but the fact is that the number of farms is so great it would take years to establish personal contact with each. If a person asks help from the department he gets it willingly. The district advisor goes and gives advice on the spot. I cannot speak too highly of the helpful attitude of the department, but I wonder what would happen if every farmer asked for help at the same time. Our services would have to be extended considerably.

The road between Meadows and Willunga is senselessly neglected. A few years ago it was one of the best gravel roads in the State and was regularly graded. Although for some years it was anticipated that it would be bituminized, there was not much cause for complaint because it was well maintained. The road carries heavy traffic—milk lorries, school buses and through transport to Victor Harbour. For many years I have urged the Highways Department to use private contractors in maintaining and constructing roads, but in respect of this particular road until just over a year ago a private grader was used to maintain it in reasonable order. However, since then the road, which was to be maintained by a Highways Department grader, has received little attention and is now a mass of potholes. The situation has been saved somewhat by a dry winter, but the road is in worse condition now than it has been for 20 years. I urge the Highways Department to do something about it.

I fully agree with the member for Stirling's remarks about Nettle's Hill. That is an alternative route to Victor Harbour. Had Nettle's Hill been bituminized we would now have two roads to Victor Harbour and the widening of the present road would not be so urgent. The road over Nettle's Hill commences as a good bitumen road, but peters out into four or five miles of absolute hell.

The export trade from Kangaroo Island has rapidly increased and recently a forecast was published in the press concerning the Island's future development. In the last financial year Kangaroo Island exported 9,825 bales of wool—an increase of over 2,000 over the previous year—50,000 sheep and over 2,000 boxes of fish. When the War Service Land Settlement Scheme reaches fruition the increases therefrom will be great. However, freight rates have been a continual source of worry to farmers and business people on the island. At the moment freight costs on superphosphate are 54s. 3d. a ton; on wheat 55s. 6d. a ton; barley, peas and oats 60s. 6d.; fuel 20s. 10d. a drum; fish and perishables 78s. 6d. a ton and general cargo 71s. a ton. It costs about 9s. 6d. to transport a sheep from Kangaroo Island to the Abattoirs and £7 5s. a head for cattle. They must be good quality stock to justify incurring that expense. They are the freight rates imposed by the Coast Steamship Company.

Mr. Stephens—That has a monopoly. It has killed all the opposition.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Ketches run to and from the Island, but I do not know their charges. They carry a number of sheep from the Island. I mention these things to draw attention to the fact that this is a problem that is increasing, and with the increasing production of Kangaroo Island the disabilities of the people there will be forced more and more on the attention of the people of this State. I support the first line.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—We have had many interesting speeches during this debate, and the member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) gave us quite a number of points well worth our attention. I was only sorry that the opening part of his speech, in which he attempted to take one or two Opposition members to task, was not omitted, because he was not very successful in this. He made some criticism of the speech of the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) in regard to decentralization, saying that apparently he was under some misapprehension on the Government's policy in this respect. Very briefly,

I can assure him that Mr. Bywaters was under no misapprehension about the Government's policy on decentralization, because it has no such policy—its policy is plain centralization. As a matter of fact, that is what the member for Murray was saying. I was pleased to hear Mr. Brookman compliment our newest recruit on his maiden speech, but I could not follow the point he attempted to make with regard to all the assets that exist in Wallaroo already. Some of these are natural assets, and practically none were put there by the Government.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—The railways, hospital and waterworks were put there by the Government.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is the very thing the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) was complaining about. Even though the Minister seems to think that quite a number of assets were put there by the Government in the past—

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—The hospital was put there by the Government, and so was a good water supply.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Before the Minister rudely interrupted me, I was trying to make the point that although Mr. Brookman apparently thinks the district of Wallaroo is well off and has been treated very well by the Government, the presence of the member for Wallaroo in this House is evidence that the people of Wallaroo do not share that opinion. In fact, after hearing what Mr. Brookman had to say about the work done at Wallaroo, I rather regretted that he did not accompany the honourable lady Senator when she spoke in that area. If he had, instead of the 250 votes that she swung our way, he might have swung 500 votes. Incidentally, the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said this afternoon that he wished the Premier had run in Wallaroo. He thought that the Premier would have been beaten there, and I believe he would have been beaten by a bigger majority than Mr. Dowling, because Mr. Dowling is very well known, whereas the Premier is barely known there.

Mr. Millhouse—What conclusion do you draw from that?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I will talk to the honourable member privately if he allows me to continue. I congratulate Mr. Hughes on his maiden speech, although this has been done already more ably than I could do. I heartily agree with Mr. Brookman that it was an excellent maiden speech, and I believe Mr. Hughes will continue the tradition of excellent Labor

members in this House representing the district of Wallaroo. He has already made that very manifest indeed. I now wish to say something in a general way on certain matters in my own area. I begin by reminding members of last year's Budget, when we were told by the Premier in his Budget Speech that the Commonwealth returned to this State in tax reimbursements about 27 per cent of income tax raised from here and, with the special grants from the Grants Commission, this equalled about 33 per cent of the total. From my rough and ready calculations, I understand that about the same percentage is being returned this year. However we look at it, this is a very small percentage, and it gives positive proof, if proof were needed—and it is not needed by most of us—of how an unsympathetic Federal Government treats this State. It is surprising in a way, because I suppose one would expect that with Governments of similar complexion, such as our State Government and the Federal Government, our treatment would be better.

Mr. O'Halloran—Very fortunately the Commonwealth Government cannot show preference under the Constitution.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—It is very fortunate indeed that it is bound by the Constitution not to show preference. Even if that were not so, it is obvious that this Federal Government does not give the State Government very much chance to show real progress. The result is that all sorts of expedients are being thrust on State Treasurers to raise money and their States must suffer. I am sorry for some of them, but I cannot, as an individual, be sorry for our Treasurer because, despite some mock fights, this Government has supported the Menzies Government through thick and thin. Some members may remember the speech Sir Thomas Playford made at Glenelg in the last Federal election campaign when he said, in effect, "Put these fellows back in Canberra and leave the rest to me." In other words, he said, "I am South Australia."

Mr. O'Halloran—That is a fair summing up of his statement.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes, that would be the substance of it for I would hate to give an untrue picture of the remarks he made not jocularly, but in all seriousness. If one speaks to Ministers of this Government, one hears a sad story of the difficulties facing them of how much to allot to certain departments and of the increasing difficulty in making the money spin out. When one hears these stories one cannot but feel a deep sympathy for the

Ministers, but our real sympathy should go out to the people of this State who have suffered, and will continue to suffer, for the Treasurer's misguided loyalty to his Federal colleagues. I remind members of some of the Treasurer's proud words when, in introducing his 1956-57 Budget, he said:—

Despite the adjustments made in other States, the Government is most reluctant to authorize increases in passenger fares of either railways or the Tramways Trust, and I am pleased to inform members that no such increases are contemplated.

Later in the same speech he said:—

I have endeavoured to avoid those increases which would raise costs and prices. Particularly have I avoided those which would affect the ordinary living costs of persons of modest means.

That sounded very well 12 months ago, and indeed, to those people who read *Hansard* it must have read very well; but in the light of subsequent happenings it does not read particularly well today. Indeed, when the recent increases in fares were announced, some in this year's Budget, but others by way of press reports in previous weeks, one would have expected a heartfelt apology by the Treasurer for his complete reversal of direction in a brief 12 months, but one would have to look very hard in the Budget speech to find any apology. Again, this goes to show that the Treasurer believes he can get away with anything. We now find a host of increases, every one of which will affect the ordinary living cost that the Treasurer was so proud to say last year he would avoid affecting.

Let me deal with the increase in fares. I do not believe increased fares can produce increased revenue, but we are told that they will do so. Past experience, however, does not confirm that opinion: in fact, it decidedly refutes it. Let us briefly examine the position of the Tramways Trust. Over the past few years we have heard much about the trust. A few years ago we were told that an effort was to be made to rehabilitate it and we were given figures to show how much that would cost. It is well, therefore, to remind ourselves of the difference between what we were told and reality, for there is a great difference indeed. We were told that increased revenue caused by increased fares would reduce the necessary grant to the trust from general revenue, but what is the past history of the trust? A few years ago the management of the trust was changed and a new board was constituted. Apparently the aim was to run the affairs of the trust more efficiently, although that may be hard to believe today.

This move followed an inquiry into the trust's affairs which showed the trust was in a bad way financially.

What has happened since? The new board was given a completely free hand and it acted accordingly. It scrapped the general implications of the Government's development of electricity supplies; it dumped electric trams and introduced more diesel buses. This meant scrapping much equipment and ripping up permanent tramlines. Many roads had to be remade and disputes naturally followed with councils over the maintenance of roads used by the buses. These and other things were costly. Surely the bulk of these costs should have been foreseen by the experts, but what is the financial position of the trust today? Is it any more satisfactory? The answer to that is practically unknown, but it is extremely doubtful.

Mr. Hambour—This year's grant is £90,000 less than last year's.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Possibly, but the Auditor-General's report states that whereas for the year ended June 30, 1956, 5.9 passengers were carried for each traffic mile run, for the last financial year the corresponding figure was only 5.7.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—Don't you think that every motor car put on the roads takes someone off the trams?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Of course it does, and there are many reasons apart from those I have already mentioned for the decline in the number of passengers carried. It is doubtful whether the position of the Tramways Trust is any better, but the board is certainly responsible for its financial affairs because it has been given a free hand. This has cost the State a lot of money, probably more than the member for Light realizes.

Mr. Hambour—Under a Labor Government it would cost the State much more.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I do not think so, because under our administration it would become a real State undertaking, not one of these semi-Government instrumentalities. In 1952 the Treasurer told us that the Tramways Trust would require considerable financial assistance for rehabilitation. We expected that, and I will quote the Treasurer's estimate of its requirements. He said that for 1952-53 the trust would need £450,000, but that in succeeding years it would not need as much. He said that for 1953-54 it would need £350,000; for 1954-55, £250,000; for 1955-56, £100,000; and for 1956-57, £30,000.

Thus, under the five-year rehabilitation plan, the total assistance would amount to £1,180,000.

Mr. O'Halloran—And from then on the trust would pay its way!

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes, but the actual position is quite different.

Mr. Hambour—Under a Labor Government things would be so bad that people would have to ride in tramcars instead of motor cars.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I'm afraid that the honourable member has an obsession. Whenever I speak he interjects constantly, and it is difficult enough for me to deal with logical arguments. When the Treasurer gave his estimates of the financial assistance that the trust would require they seemed high enough. Some of us were not happy at the thought of having to vote such large sums for the trust, but we were prepared to agree to those grants if they would put the trust on its feet. However, I shall now state what amounts have been voted. In 1952-53 we provided £700,000, compared with the estimate of £450,000; for 1953-54 we again provided £700,000, instead of £350,000; in 1954-55, £600,000, instead of £250,000; in 1955-56, £570,000; and in 1956-57, £510,000. What we shall have to provide in the future no one knows. Over £3,000,000 has already been granted to the trust in five years, which is very different from the forecast of £1,180,000. Obviously, those responsible for estimating the trust's requirements must have overlooked many factors. Some people say that to help pay the piper we must increase fares, and thereby close the gap between revenue and expenditure, but experience shows that this does not always achieve the desired result. The total number of passengers carried by the trust in 1944-45 was 95,000,000, when the population of the metropolitan area was 365,000. The population has increased to 515,000, but the passengers carried annually now is only 63,500,000.

I realize that there are many more motor cars and motor cycles on the road, and if economic conditions do not improve there will be many more push cycles too. Higher fares are not the only factor influencing the number of passengers carried, but surely if the population has increased by about 150,000 there should be some increase in the number of passengers. It is a fact that each time fares have been increased the number of passengers carried has decreased. I think this will happen again, and it will be a pleasant surprise to me if the law of diminishing returns does not operate as a result of the recent increase in fares. Unfortunately, those who can least

afford to pay these fares will suffer, that is those people who have no other way of travelling. They must use the trams.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Do you think the law of diminishing returns would operate if you imposed a capital tax?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I do not want to be drawn into an argument on that. During this debate we have heard many theories on how to raise money, and I do not wish to speak on those matters. I now wish to touch on another disturbing aspect of tramway finances. The Auditor-General's report reveals that the Government has had to write off a considerable amount of the trust's accumulated indebtedness. For instance, the total loan funds expended by the trust at 30th June, 1956 amounted to £6,386,000, but of that amount £3,200,000 must be regarded as being entirely lost—gone with the wind. That means that although £6,386,000 has been "invested"—and I point out that that is the word used—over a period of years in capital assets, the assets actually in existence at 30th June, 1956 were worth only £3,200,000.

We must note that during the same year the Government had to remit £350,000 of the lost capital by crediting the trust loan account with that amount, and this amount was taken from reserves created through the National Sinking Fund. It is understood that the Government will have to repeat this process indefinitely until the lost capital is written off altogether, that is, assuming that sufficient reserves from the sinking fund are available for this purpose from time to time. We must remember that these contributions are in addition to the annual subsidy which Parliament is making towards the revenue of the trust. In the final analysis it is not only those people who pay increased fares who suffer in an attempt to bolster up the trust's revenue. We all suffer, because we all help to provide the money, but of course those who use the trust's services pay twice. I would very much like to see the revenue increased, but I am afraid these new increases in fares will only kill the goose that lays the golden egg. In this particular instance the goose never laid very much at all, and indeed when it did its eggs were obviously infertile.

There is also an increase in railway fares, another one of those things which it was hoped would be avoided so as not to increase the cost of living of the average person. I do not seek to put the railways in the same category as the tramways, because I believe that the railways are a real State undertaking

in the true sense of the word with a responsible Minister in charge. I am not suggesting for one moment that the management of the railways is inefficient. It is obvious to anyone with any commonsense at all that Government railways in the main serve the whole community, whether they pay or not, for the good of State development, and we cannot possibly estimate their value in pounds, shillings and pence. I do not believe for one moment that railway losses should be regarded as a true indication of the prosperity of the railways system. Over the last few years I have at times had to castigate the railways, but during the last few months in particular I have had nothing but praise for the improved service that has been given in my particular area, and that of course is what I know most about.

There are a few anomalies in that particular service, but I know they will be ironed out in time. I have not seen the figures and actually I cannot prove that there has been an increase in the number of passengers since the service was improved, but I am quite certain from my own personal experience and observation that very many more people are using the service. I do not know how increased fares will affect the number of passengers carried. It will not make any difference to those who have no other means of travelling, and there is a great number of such people. Over 1,000 men and women travel from Gawler each day and many others travel from Salisbury and Elizabeth, and those people, in the main, must travel by train. Many of them will club together and use a motor vehicle. That has happened before, but a great deal of that has been discontinued since the railway service has been improved. I suggest that the increased fares in this particular case will not improve the railway revenue one little bit, because it is almost certain that the number of passengers carried will be less. The return fare from Gawler has been increased from 6s. to 7s., and with that extra shilling the railways can perhaps afford to lose a few passengers, but we should not do anything that will lose passengers for our State railways, nor should we do anything that will lose even more passengers from the tramways.

I mentioned these instances as proof that the cost of living has been increased despite the Government's assurances last year that it was avoiding those increases which would affect the ordinary living costs of people of modest means. I have quoted the increased tram and train fares and the increases in water charges coming. The latter will not be

an increased rate, but a re-assessment has been almost completed which will have the same effect. I think it is almost certain that the time will not be long delayed—and this seems an intelligent inference from the Auditor-General's report—when we will have increased charges for electricity as well. In addition to those direct things, there has been an increase in the price of bread and other such commodities. I suppose that the Treasurer, in the light of what he was good enough to tell us last year, made those increases most reluctantly. I suggest it is not much good blaming the Federal Government alone for this because after all the Premier, apparently until recently anyhow, has given his blind support to that Government.

I appreciate the excellent service that the railways are giving in my area, but I do not always appreciate the type of Ministerial replies that are given to questions which I ask in this Chamber. I asked a question with regard to the provision of toilet facilities on the new 300 class diesel cars. I pointed out that these are excellent cars, and I said also that the lack of toilet facilities is very embarrassing for passengers and for the porters on the cars. If the House considers it necessary I can give one or two rather unedifying examples to prove my point. I asked the Minister if it would be possible to have some sort of lavatory accommodation on these cars, and he replied that these cars were designed solely for suburban use which includes the run to Gawler, that it was not the practice to provide toilet accommodation on suburban cars, and that there was no real justification for them. I assure the Minister that if he would take the trouble to travel on that particular line for two or three days he would see real justification for such amenities. The peculiar thing is that the old-time rail cars which are to an extent being superseded by the modern cars, had lavatories. Apparently such is progress. I was intrigued by the conclusion of the Minister's reply. I felt sorry for the Minister in this Chamber who represents the Minister of Railways because he looked embarrassed when he gave the reply. It concluded in these words:—

I might add that it should not be overlooked that toilet facilities are provided at various stations in between Gawler and Adelaide.

That brings to mind three alternatives. Do the guards or porters stop the cars whilst the passengers make use of the toilets at the intermediate stations? This has happened on

occasions. Who takes the blame for the subsequent lateness of the train, and if such necessity occurs do the passengers alight for the purpose and then catch a later train? I suggest that if they had to catch a later train those travelling on the last train from Adelaide to Gawler would be in an awkward position. The reply from the Minister was completely absurd.

Last week I spoke about the warning signals at the Hilda railway crossing following on the fatality that had occurred there. If members inspected the crossing they would say that it looks safe, but it is a very busy crossing because of the growth of the town of Elizabeth and the great number of men who work at the long range weapons establishment. We should always make some allowance for human error. Over the last year or so efforts have been made by the Salisbury Council, the Salisbury North Progress Association and the member for the district to have warning lights installed at the crossing, but without success. Recently a conference was called to discuss the matter, and those represented were the police, the council, the Royal Automobile Association and the Railways Department. The latter said it was not prepared to install lights at the crossing as it was not considered as dangerous as many in the metropolitan area, and that it would cost £2,500 to install them. Even after the last fatality at the crossing the same old stereotyped reply was sent out. It was a reply that did not answer my question, but a reply to a question I did not ask. Another dangerous crossing near Elizabeth North is at Womma. The Railways have told me that they do not regard it as dangerous and cannot afford to install warning devices there. The population around Elizabeth North is growing and when the permanent station is built—and I think it will be some distance farther north—trains will travel over the crossing at an increased speed. I ask the Government to treat as urgent the matter of warning devices at these crossings. A sub-leader in the *News* of September 16 said:—

The pattern of death before remedy has happened again at the Hilda rail crossing, Salisbury North. A man and his son were killed and the boy's mother badly hurt at the crossing on Saturday night. Another man was killed there a year ago. No warning lights or safety devices of any kind, other than Stop signs, are installed at the crossing. The railways have rejected advice that warning lights should be installed, on the ground that the cost is £2,500 and that there are other, more dangerous, crossings in the metropolitan area. Today, £2,500 is a small expenditure if it

saves one human life. Failure to make this outlay in this instance has already cost three lives in 12 months. Is it not perhaps high time that the responsible Minister intervened and instructed that work should begin at the earliest opportunity for warning lights at the most dangerous crossings in the metropolitan area? Even if 20, 30, or 40 are needed, is our community so poor today as to deny £50,000 or even £100,000 to end the sickening toll of South Australian level crossing fatalities?

Surely everyone whose heart is not in his pocket must agree with this statement. It is an urgent matter because we cannot afford to throw away valuable lives so heartlessly. Normally I have quite a lot to say on education when I discuss the Budget, but I do not intend to say much tonight except that over the last few weeks some important announcements have been made on education. I commend the Minister's recent announcement about increased promotion opportunities for teachers. This has been sought for a long time. Possibly if they had been available earlier I might still be in the Education Department instead of here. There has been a bottleneck that has meant that many members of the department with the necessary qualifications have had to wait for someone to die before reaching a higher position. I know that it was most stultifying to ambition and effective work. I am happy now that the position has been altered, and many hundreds of teachers will also be happy. The greater chances of promotion will do a great deal to assist in the recruitment of teachers. I commend the Minister and the department for the opportunity that will be given in future to women teachers to rise higher in the department. There has been no reason why women should not reach a higher position, provided they had the qualifications and were good enough. I hope these reforms are forerunners of others, for there are some that would help the department. Many of them must wait because funds are not available now.

The Gawler Adult Education Centre is an excellent organization. The principal has done a magnificent job in the area he covers, and I fancy that it even takes in Kangaroo Island. If anyone wants visible evidence of the success of this school he need only examine the large number of prize entries in the recent Royal Show. During Education Week I was struck by the work being done by the principal. One of the chief functions arranged during that week was a public meeting at which various choirs sang and other items were presented. The important part of the evening was a

speech by Bishop Gleeson. I do not think I have had the opportunity of hearing a better speech on the subject of the relationship between parents and children and the school. It was worth travelling a long way to hear. That function was arranged by the principal of the Adult Education Centre. As the Minister knows, this school has no real home at the moment. It is housed partly in the high school and partly in the old Electoral Building in Murray Street, Gawler. Land has been purchased for the building of the new school and I sincerely hope that, if possible, this building will be commenced soon. The present accommodation is grossly overcrowded. Although good furniture is made at the wood work centre the trainees are forced to suspend articles high in the air and crouch beneath them while working with their tools. That is not good enough.

As usual during this debate we have heard weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth concerning the wickedness and injustice of uniform taxation. That, with the 40-hour week, has become a pet subject of some members. The only thing wrong with uniform taxation is that the wrong Government is administering it. In the past we have heard much from the Treasurer about this subject, but he did not strike nearly so high a note this year. Most members will recall his outburst last year when he complained so tearfully that I expected to hear sobs all around the Chamber. He referred to the faults and failings of the Federal Government and the Grants Commission. Most of us thought then—and some of us still do—that the Treasurer was not genuine. It is obvious we cannot get as much money as we desire from Federal resources, but we never will while the present Federal Government's miserliness is equalled only by its financial ineptitude. We have one small consolation and that is that if it does nothing else, the lack of money does curb the expenditure of the Treasurer which, in the past, has often been extravagant and devoted to grandiose and ambitious schemes. Most members realize that many of these schemes are for publicity and propaganda purposes to enhance the Treasurer's waning reputation and many of them never get beyond the blue print stage. In any event, they would be of doubtful benefit to the State.

The obvious answer to the unsatisfactory financial relationship between the Federal Government and the State—and I do not set myself up as a financial wizard with new proposals—is for the Treasurer to throw his

weight behind those who seek amendments to the Federal Constitution. He has never seemed anxious to do this. We should remember that section 96, under which grants are made to the so-called weaker States, was an original provision of the Federal Constitution. It is not new, and even the member for Burnside would have difficulty in blaming that on Mr. Chifley. There is no doubt that the Constitution needs amending to secure even a semblance of justice from the Federal Treasurer. If our Treasurer wants financial justice he should work to remove the present Federal Government from office. Perhaps this fight over the Snowy River Waters Agreement is a sign of the shape of things to come. Perhaps the Treasurer has at long last realized that the Federal Government is of no use to him or anyone else, but although I am a confirmed optimist I find it difficult to believe that. I support the first line.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support the first line and join in the chorus of congratulations to the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) on his maiden speech. I am sure he will be an asset to the House and lift the standard of debate from the opposite side. I will listen to his future remarks with interest. I am hopeful that the Government will do something to provide uniform regulations relating to labels in the food industry. In the past it has happened that labels in one State have not been satisfactory for another State and consequently manufacturers have been put to great expense to qualify to sell their fruit and products in other States. They have got together and framed a uniform set of regulations. When the opportunity presents itself to this State I trust the Government will prove helpful because I can assure the House that much thought has gone into the promulgation of these regulations.

I hope this will be the last time I have to congratulate the Government on the way it has helped all River Murray settlers during the flood. I am pleased to see that the grant to the Marriage Guidance Council has been increased. I asked that this be done last year because I realize that the work of this council is often unsung and people do not know what it is doing in saving broken homes, keeping couples together, and helping children who might otherwise have become delinquents. I was interested in the remarks of the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) concerning decentralization because he proved my contention that a Royal Commission is not necessary. As

I pointed out, people know the requirements of their districts and are actively working to bring industries to them.

Mr. Bywaters—Where will they go to get assistance for those industries?

Mr. KING—They can go to the Industries Development Committee.

Mr. Bywaters—They have not had much success yet.

Mr. KING—Perhaps they have not tried. This matter has been alive for many years.

Mr. Bywaters—And it is still alive in your district?

Mr. KING—My word it is! The member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) said that the cannery was thought of before I was born, but nothing was mentioned about canneries before the war. If he would like to go along the river and learn a little about how people help themselves in these areas he would not make these comments. I was extremely interested to hear the remarks of the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) about housing, because I have been interested in this matter for a number of years and have a great deal of interest in co-operative societies and other housing organizations. I was very interested in the information he produced. Taking 1938 as a base year for building costs on an index figure of 100, the corresponding index for a comparable house in 1957 is 450, which is a considerable increase. When I say it is a comparable house, it must be remembered that today's house usually has a hot water service, stainless steel sink, cupboards and a gas or electric stove, and despite what the member for Whyalla said, I think that the standards have improved.

Mr. Davis—I think you are the only one who does.

Mr. KING—There may be a few others who live with their heads above the clouds. Mr. Loveday said that 50 per cent of the cost of a house is for labour. I am informed that it is considered that 2,000 hours on site is sufficient to build a house. If that is the case, on today's costs and at today's rate of pay, the amount would be about £840, which is about 25 per cent rather than 50 per cent. In 1938 the percentage would be approximately the same. As far as the housing position is concerned, and the difficulty of obtaining finance for houses for sale, it seems to me that we have been able to find finance for all the houses offered for sale.

There is one important aspect of this matter. The member for Whyalla mentioned these percentages, and made a comparison between the

rates of pay out of which rents have to be paid. I do not want members opposite to think I am mentioning these things in a deprecating way, because I am anxious to find any solution to this problem, and it would be foolish not to keep our eyes open to everything that has raised house building costs. I will compare 1938 with 1957, and give the rates that applied in the building industries in those years. The State living wage in 1938 was £3 14s., and today it is £12 11s. The bricklayers' margin in 1938 was £1 4s., and now it is £3 15s. The bricklayer now gets a disability allowance of 5s. 6d., and a tool allowance of 4s. 6d., so the total effective wages respectively are £4 18s. and £16 15s. 6d. The bricklayer did not get a smoko in 1938, but he now gets 10 minutes. He now gets 10 public holidays a year whereas he got only eight public holidays in 1938. The standard working week in 1938 was 44 hours, but today it is 40 hours. Workmen's compensation was then £5 a week but it is now £12 16s., which is not relatively as high as it was then, but the additional cost of workmen's compensation premiums is higher. The span of working hours in 1938 was from Monday to midday Saturday, and is now from Monday to Friday. Since 1941 payroll tax has been payable in varying degrees; sick leave has since become payable, and has affected all costs. Without going into a great deal of detail, members will find that the actual days worked in 1938 were 279 compared with 236 in 1957. In other words, there are 43 days difference between the number of days worked then and now. He used to work 2,232 hours, and now works only 1,888. The cost of these improved conditions translated at today's rate of pay on a house costing £3,648 is £475. That is the price we have to pay, and I am quite happy about it, except that when we are saying that the worker has not enough money to pay for a house we should remember that he has become the victim of the circumstances that now benefit him.

Mr. O'Halloran—You are not allowing for any savings from mechanization.

Mr. KING—I will deal with that right now. If we could make house building thoroughly automatic, I dare say we could pay far better wages and work fewer hours, but unfortunately house building is mainly a job that must be done by a man using his own two hands; it does not lend itself to mechanization. Only in mass building and in the construction of prefabricated homes is any form of automation applied. Where there is little mechanization,

I am afraid there is no alternative to what we have now. House building has retained a greater labour content than most industries, therefore improved working conditions directly affect the cost of houses in many ways; firstly, on site labour, and secondly, on cost of materials that go into a house.

Interest rates and sales tax have gone up, while freights and other costs have all been inflated by improved conditions enjoyed by the people who build houses and who now, according to the member for Whyalla, cannot buy them. The member for Whyalla said that the real basic question is the increased cost of the home in relation to the wages earned. However, there are two sides to this—not only the wages earned from which you have to buy a house, but the wages which build up the cost of the house. We must consider that when considering the other matters that go towards building up the cost of a house.

Mr. Loveday referred to housing loans, but we must consider this subject in proper perspective. Considering money values, housing loans follow very much the same terms proportionately that they followed in 1938. Some people are having a good time in paying from today's wages for yesterday's liability incurred when a pound was worth a pound and not 6s. 8d., and they do not complain. We should also consider whether any arbitrary steps taken to protect new home buyers might be objected to by an older generation who like paying yesterday's liabilities from today's wages. In other words, we are living in a state of transition. Indeed, money values have been changing since 1900, and under these conditions people with fixed interest investments and fixed money incomes will inevitably suffer because of inflation.

Mr. Quirke—Is it inevitable?

Mr. KING—Up to the present it has been. Mr. Loveday is not alone in his dislike of the practice of the Commonwealth Government of charging interest on taxation surpluses loaned to State Governments, but even if we won the concession of interest-free loans, should it not be shared by all services in which loan moneys are involved, including the Department of Lands and the Department of Works? Even if we got the interest-free money, would we be right in applying it all to housing, although I believe housing should have its fair share.

Much has been said about the interest rates charged on loan moneys, but I believe that the interest rate is not so much out of proportion. For instance, in 1930 the interest rates

were 5½ per cent and 6½ per cent. In 1938 it was 4½ per cent and today it is 5½ per cent. Why has the rate risen over the past few years? Bank rates have been controlled, but other interest rates have been free. We have seen what has happened because of that freedom over the past few years, particularly because of the demand by companies that have taken advantage of the raising of money on unsecured notes that the public accepted in the same confident spirit as they have accepted the future of this country. These funds are being used by hire-purchase companies, various types of industries and retailers, including the retailer who buys wholesale and retails his goods on a terms basis, thus making a welter of it while the going is good.

The effect of this practice on savings banks, co-operative building societies, Star Bowkett societies, and private investment generally is that the people who formerly put their money into the type of institution that financed housing are tending not to do so today. Such people are being attracted by the extremely high rates being paid by other companies, so that money previously available for housing is now invested in a less secure form that bears a rate of interest of nine per cent or more. It is therefore easy to understand why most banks have joined the undignified rush to avoid banking controls by taking out shares in certain credit companies, but I believe that the banks have lost some of the respect of the community by joining this undignified scramble.

There follows this anomaly: Whereas one cannot borrow money from the banks, private investors, and other sources with which to build a house, one can get almost unlimited credit from hire-purchase companies and other companies up to the ability of income to pay the instalments.

Mr. Bywaters—You can have a house full of stuff on hire purchase and no house to put it in.

Mr. KING—Yes, we might just as well complete the circle and sell houses on hire purchase, which has been done in America. Nobody seems to inquire about the rate of interest on hire-purchase. The overall effect of the colossal growth of disclosed hire-purchase business has been to raise interest rates, not only on housing, but on everything else. There is also a certain undisclosed effect on the cost of living, which causes inflation and seriously depreciates the real value of the basic wage. In May 1957, trading bank overdrafts, totalled £868,000,000 and hire purchase balances

£232,000,000, whereas three years previously the latter figure had been only £132,000,000. It will therefore be seen that the hire purchase figure is fast catching up the trading banks figure. These figures show how far this type of business is taking over the finances of the country and taking the business away from the banks. This must be a tremendous problem to those who wish to regulate the credit and finances of this country. The effect of this trend has been to vitiate the control of credit by the banks and to take the initiative from the banks.

The effect on Government loans and Government finance generally is out of all proportion. When a loan is floated it must be at the back of the Treasurer's mind what rates are being paid for money that would normally be put into the loan. Much money is going into other investments at higher rates. Two facts emerge: firstly, money is being taken away from the normal channels of investment; secondly, at the same time turnover and business generally is being increased, particularly in those businesses financed by hire-purchase investments. In this State that is a good thing, for we depend to a large extent on the quantity of business done by manufacturers who are serving retailers who do much hire-purchase business, and this business is here to stay. Although I do not say that hire-purchase is intrinsically bad, I believe it is getting a little out of hand.

We are in a state of transition and the final destination is hard to see. No doubt the prosperity of this State is based on the confidence of so many people in the future of Australia and their ability to meet their hire-purchase commitments. This is a world-wide phenomena. There is a young spending generation today that has suffered no set-back and does not count the cost so long as it can cover the down payment and instalments and feels there is no reason why this cannot be done. This generation did not come through the thirties as so many of us did. These younger folk readily argue, "The goods are there; we should be able to use them; we need them."

The *Saturday Evening Post* recently reported that after the war Russia expected the capitalist economy to collapse because it could not carry on, but it is still carrying on although all capitalist countries are exporting their real wealth overseas. Their internal economies are getting stronger because these people are confident they can carry not only themselves, but the rest of the world at the same time. So long as we have more money than

goods prices will continue to rise. I am afraid that the pressure will continue while people are prepared to put money into this class of investment. Except for a few steady periods, money values have fallen since 1900, and this has depreciated many investments, where values are fixed, such as with insurance policies or superannuation schemes. Insurance companies have been financing much of our housing programme. A solution of this problem is awaited by all countries, and I wish I were intelligent enough to produce it.

I consider that the Budget is a sound and prudent one, and discloses an expenditure framed within our income sources. After all that is about all that any Treasurer can do. With our revenues governed largely by the present Federal-State financial arrangements, the best use is being made of the money available. I am particularly interested in the activities of the Lands Department, for they affect my district particularly. I think that the income of that department could be increased by certain savings and bringing additional land into production. If we could gain an additional revenue of about £58,000 a year by these means it would go a long way towards reducing the deficit of that department, and we could do that by maintaining the present water rates. I am pleased that the Minister will be visiting my area in November and I shall have great pleasure in accompanying him. I support the first line.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent)—I join with previous speakers in congratulating the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) on his maiden speech. I know he impressed members on both sides of the House because some members opposite have referred to his speech. I admire him for being so impartial and I am sure he will be an acquisition to the debating strength of the House. I am proud that he sits on this side of the House, though after next year he may be on the righthand of the Speaker.

I may be the last to speak on the first line, but I hope I am not the least. One of the most important industries in my district is fishing, which is carried on from about 30 miles north of Kingston right around the coast to the Victorian border. Many fishing boats operate from Robe, Cape Jaffa, Beachport, Southend, Carpenter's Rocks, Cape Banks, and Port MacDonnell. The importance of the fishing industry to the State was stressed by the member for Stirling.

Mr. Millhouse—Does your district include Reedy Creek?

Mr. CORCORAN—That is near the boundary of the district of Millicent, but there is no fishing there. These fishing centres have been provided with certain facilities, but they need more. This is acknowledged by the Minister of Agriculture, who now has the responsibility of allocating the funds voted by Parliament. I do not envy him his job because I notice that on this year's Loan Estimates £40,000 was provided for this purpose, but last year £75,000 was provided. Unfortunately, through circumstances perhaps beyond the control of the Harbors Board, only £1,520 was spent, and that was at Southend. However, I commend the Minister for visiting the various ports so as to become acquainted with the needs of the fishermen. I had the pleasure of accompanying him and I am sure he is now in a better position to assess what places should receive assistance first. I think it was taken for granted that, although certain facilities existed at Kingston, the fishermen there would go to Robe to carry out repairs to their boats. Some time ago I suggested the excavation of a channel from the sea into Lake Butler, at Robe, to provide a haven for fishing craft operating from Robe, Beachport and Kingston, and recently the district council of Robe supported that suggestion.

Plans were prepared and it was estimated that the project would cost about £80,000. I do not know the Minister's opinions on this scheme, but there are already certain facilities at Robe. For instance, it has a slipway, but it can be used only in calm weather. It has been suggested by the Harbors Board that a breakwater be built so that the facilities at Robe can be used even under adverse weather conditions and it was the cost involved which was more or less responsible for this other suggestion. However, the Minister recently received a deputation from Robe and pointed out the position in that regard.

The Minister met all the fishermen at Beachport, including those from Kingston and Robe, and discussed their problems with them for more than two hours. They were asked whether, in the event of these facilities being provided at Robe, their requirements would be met, and their reply was an emphatic "No." They wanted a slipway at Beachport and in due course a haven. The same position applies at Port MacDonnell. The Cape Jaffa fishermen use the facilities at Robe. A jetty is in the course of erection at Southend. I suppose that it was not the fault of the Government that that jetty was not established

last year, but owing to other circumstances it was not done. As far as I know everything is going according to plan at the moment; the Minister expects that this work will be completed within a reasonable time, and I hope that he will not be disappointed.

Cape Banks has provided its own facilities and therefore no inspection was made there. However, I am not suggesting that Cape Banks may not also require attention. The fishermen at Port MacDonnell pointed out their need, and the Minister made a note of that during his inspection. I can see no remote possibility of providing anything down there at all. I understand that the Harbors Board estimate for the cost of the slipway at Beachport was about £35,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—I think that figure is a little bit high.

Mr. CORCORAN—It seemed exorbitant to me at the time, and in fact all the estimates of the Harbors Board seemed high. I do not know what the Minister has in his mind and it is not for me to say where this will go and where that will go. I suppose I am merely expected to plead with the Minister to do something in every place, but I know that cannot be done in one year. I want to know whether the Government can arrange a more substantial sum of money for such works as these. Why was it that £75,000 was allotted for this purpose last year and only £40,000 appears on the Estimates this year? What has happened to justify that reduction? The money was not spent last year and the reason given for that was that there were works of higher priority in connection with the wheat silos. I do not know whether that is a legitimate reason or excuse, but in fact the work was not done. That £35,000 which has disappeared from the Estimates this year might make a big difference, because the amount now on the Estimates is absurdly low. A few amenities have been provided during my term in this House, but although I have been constantly agitating for something to be done nothing very much has been done except at Robe. Beachport has a landing stage and a few lights on the jetty, but apart from that nothing very much has been done.

I urge the Government to make available a more substantial sum than it has done this year to enable the Minister, who has the responsibility for trying to provide for the needs of all the fishing centres in the State, to do more in my district because it plays such an important part in the economic life of the State. I consider that the amount on

the Estimates is insufficient, and I would like to know the reason for the reduction from £75,000 to £40,000.

The member for Chaffey and other members referred to the housing problem, and there is nothing I consider more vital than the housing of the people. Homes are the very basis of a nation, and we must do all we can to provide homes for our young people as well as our old people. The young people have no easy road today, and if they are on the basic wage or even just above it they have very little chance at all of saving sufficient money to establish themselves in a home or to provide for the purchase of a home. I prefer any young couple to try and purchase a home, but under the present set-up a big percentage of them have no chance whatever. The Housing Trust is not making up the leeway; it might be making every effort, but the problem is not being solved. The member for Burra referred the other day to the utilization of the credit of the nation for that purpose, and I consider that his suggestion was quite within the realm of possibility. However, he indicated that the Government of the day did not appear to support his suggestion. Thousands of people are on the waiting list for homes, and the waiting list on rental homes is nothing under 12 months.

Mr. Frank Walsh—The waiting period for rental homes is between five and seven years.

Mr. CORCORAN—How are we going to get over that? Are we facing up to this matter in the way we should? For some years it has been part of Labor's advocacy that we appoint a special Minister to deal with the housing problem. Whether that Minister would achieve anything remains to be seen, but such an appointment would indicate that we are more serious than we have been in the past and that we are trying to do something to solve the problem. According to the Premier the problem is not now a lack of material and men but money. Where can we get it? If a war broke out tomorrow we would find millions of pounds but in peace it cannot be found to build houses. I would be happy if we were making up the leeway but we are not. Mr. Loveday suggested dealing with the matter on a united front and if that were done something might be achieved. It is the ambition of every young couple to own a home, and we should endeavour to get more money for housing. A special Minister to deal with housing should be appointed. We should do all we can to solve the problem. A block of land in the suburbs costs anything from £500 to

£1,000 and it is used as security in the purchase of a house costing about £3,500, and then the house has to be furnished. How can a young couple find the necessary money? There is a responsibility on the Government, and on Opposition members to co-operate with the Government. Labor members will support any scheme that indicates a possibility of overcoming the leeway in the building of houses, and we must cater for old as well as young people.

I represent a fairly new district. Much development is taking place, and new roads, schools and other things are needed. The Minister of Education is trying to meet the education needs. About 13,000 children are being conveyed by bus to the various schools, but there are still many disadvantages to be overcome. It is better to transport the children in this way than to have small schools all over the place. The Minister has agreed to the establishment of a school at Tilleys Swamp because of the difficulty in arranging road transport. It is expected that it will be ready at the beginning of next year. Several months ago I said a new courthouse was needed at Millicent. The reply I got indicated that I was interesting myself in a matter that did not concern me. I suppose that report came from the police officer but he does not do any court work. The Government should reconsider the position. An inspection should be made of the conditions and the opinion of the police officer, who is not engaged in the work should not be accepted. I am approaching the Government on this matter at the instigation of the district council at Millicent, and not the police officer. Millicent is an important town and should have a decent courthouse. Today I asked a question about the water supply at Millicent. Evidently the matter is still before the Public Works Committee. There has been a hold up in connection with the scheme because of local interests, but if the town is to have a deep drainage there must be a good water supply. The people of Kingston have hoped that such would become an established fact there long before it actually will. I know the Government has not lost sight of these things and I hope the Public Works Committee will deal with that petition and whatever is bound up with it expeditiously. If any further information is required I shall be happy to secure it from the appropriate source.

The hospital at Millicent is subsidized on a pound for pound basis. It is a fine institution, but those responsible for it have not had an easy row to hoe. The residents of Millicent

are not exonerated from paying a share towards the cost of the new hospital at Mount Gambier by way of taxation, but at the same time they are obliged to contribute towards the cost of maintaining their own hospital. Surely that is the Government's responsibility? It is the Government's responsibility to cater for the sick and aged and those requiring medical treatment. I understand that in some other States hospitals are subsidized not on a pound for pound basis, but on the basis of £2 for every £1 collected. Millicent has been referred to as a rich and productive district, but other parts of the State are equally productive and there is no reason why the people of Millicent should be imposed on more than those living elsewhere.

Because of the Government's lack of a policy of decentralization industries have been concentrated in the metropolitan area and the provision of sewerage and other amenities in country centres has suffered as a result. We look forward to the Government extending such activities in country towns. Nothing has been done in towns like Port Pirie or Mount Gambier. We are rather ashamed to tell people from other States who naturally assume that deep drainage is provided at Mount Gambier that such is not the case. The only centres outside the metropolitan area that are seweraged are Leigh Creek and Radium Hill. It is time something was done in other districts. I am convinced that if we do not make such provisions in these prosperous days we will never do so. I hope my remarks bring a favourable response.

I pray that this State will not be stricken with the ravages of a drought and that the elements will favour us in the eleventh hour and we will avoid what could have a disastrous effect on the country. We can put our shoulders to the wheel and work hard, but unless the elements are kind and we get a fall from heaven our efforts will be worthless. The Treasurer was optimistic in introducing his Budget and said he thought we would have a reasonably good season. I hope his optimism is not misplaced. The dark hour is almost at hand. I live in a favoured spot and whilst the South-East might not be in dire need, if other parts of the State fail it will have an effect on the South-East. People from all walks of life will suffer. Let us pray that God will soon send rain and that the salvation of this State will be brought about as a result. I hope something will be done about those matters I have mentioned and if I am convinced that an honest attempt has been made I will be more reconciled to any decisions that are made. I support the first line.

THE ESTIMATES.

THE LEGISLATURE.

First line (Legislative Council, £10,630) passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 25, at 2 p.m.