

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Tuesday, June 17, 1958.

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. B. H. Teusner) presiding.

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

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with Summons, proceeded at 12.7 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. They returned to the House of Assembly Chamber at 12.48 p.m., and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

**DEATH OF MR. J. FLETCHER.**

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr. John Fletcher (member for Mount Gambier), and places on record its appreciation of his public services; and that, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased member, the sitting of the House be suspended until 2.15 p.m.

Mr. Fletcher became a member of this House in 1938. He served with distinction on the Public Works Committee and gave faithful and distinguished service to the Parliament of this State and to his district. Every member will remember him with great affection. He was a personality, well liked and admired for his integrity. He carried out his duties with conspicuous success and was a great favourite among members. I feel that every member present greatly mourns his passing. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you will be pleased to convey our heartfelt sympathy to Mr. Fletcher's widow.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I second the motion, with regret for the occasion that requires it. All too frequently in this Chamber similar motions have to be moved and they serve to remind us how fleeting is the period of our life on this planet. We on this side agree with what the Premier has said regarding our late colleague whom we mourn. Probably I had as great a knowledge of the late gentleman as any other member because for many years I served with him on the Public Works Committee. There I learned that he was diligent in his duties and enthusiastic to give the best service to the State. As the Premier said, Mr. Fletcher was a likeable personality: to put it colloquially, he was easy to live with.

We all regret his passing and join in tendering our most sincere sympathy to his bereaved relatives.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I wish to associate myself with the motion. The untimely death of our colleague came as a great shock to all members. The late member for Mount Gambier gave great and distinguished service in this House. He had the honour to represent the southernmost part of this State. The people of Mount Gambier have lost a great representative and we, in this Chamber, a great friend. During his long term of service since 1938 we have learned to cherish his friendship. He was firm in his convictions and not afraid to express opinions contrary to one's own, although he did so in a friendly spirit.

Having known Mr. Fletcher longer than the time he represented Mount Gambier, I feel I have lost a great personal friend. I join with the Premier and Mr. O'Halloran in conveying our sincere sympathy to Mr. Fletcher's widow and the other members of his family. We trust we shall remember his great and distinguished service, not only to the district he represented, but also to his friends in this House.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I wish to associate myself with the motion and to say how much I personally regret the passing of the late Mr. Fletcher. He was a good man and I, like everybody else in this Chamber, mourn his passing. I join with the Premier and other speakers in the request that the Speaker convey the great sympathy of members to Mr. Fletcher's widow and family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*(Sitting suspended from 12.58 until 2.15 p.m.)*

**NEXT DAY OF SITTING.**

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, June 18, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

**LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.**

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

Ordered to be printed.

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1959.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer), having obtained a suspension of Standing Orders 43 and 44, moved:—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:—

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishment and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1959; a sum of £7,000,000 be granted; provided that no payment for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ending June 30, 1958, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service, or any regulation, or by any award, order, or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried. Resolution adopted in Committee of Ways and Means and agreed to by the House.

Bill introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move:—

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

The Bill authorises supply to the Government amounting to £7,000,000, and contains no provisions other than those usually found in a Supply Bill. It is expected to meet the ordinary expenses of Government until the regular sittings of the House commence, which would normally be about July 22. The Bill also provides that payments shall not exceed the rates voted for the financial year 1957-58, except that payment of any increases in salaries or wages may be made.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House to make appropriation of the sum set forth in the

accompanying Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure by the Government during the year ending June 30, 1958, for the purposes stated therein.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:—

That the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I take the opportunity that this motion presents to refer to a matter of great importance—the manner in which constitutional government in this State is conducted. Members are aware that, because of ill-health, the former Minister of Works, Sir Malcolm McIntosh, had to relinquish his portfolio. All members regret this and that his health has not improved greatly since his resignation. We trust he will soon be well.

Section 65 of the Constitution Act provides that the number of Ministers of the Crown shall not exceed eight. Subsection (2) states:—

The Ministers of the Crown shall respectively bear such titles and fill such Ministerial offices as the Governor from time to time appoints, and not more than five of the Ministers shall at one time be members of the House of Assembly.

That makes it clear that there shall be five Ministers in the House of Assembly and three in another place. The vacancy caused by Sir Malcolm McIntosh's retirement has occurred in this House, but the portfolio has been filled by the appointment of a member of the Legislative Council and no additional Minister has been appointed to this House to keep its complement of Ministers at five. I believe this is an important House which is supposed to represent the people. Because of certain matters I do not intend to introduce this afternoon it does not truly represent all the people; nevertheless it bears the form of a people's House and it is the duty of every member to protect its Constitutional rights as such.

The question of ministerial administration is involved and, whilst I do not reflect on the ability of any Minister, there has been a tendency in recent years to reduce the opportunities of members in this House to make direct approaches to Ministers in charge of certain Government departments by question or by interview, frequently while the House is sitting. Only a few years ago the portfolio of the Minister of Railways and Roads was taken from this Chamber and placed under the control of a Minister in the Legislative

Council. There are innumerable subjects connected with the administration of the road policy of this State which impinge on the rights of the ordinary citizen—people who look to their members in this House for full representation and protection. The administration of railways is also important. At present there is in our railways service considerable discontent which is well grounded but could be overcome if the Minister of Railways were in this House and immediately accessible to members representing constituencies containing important groups of railway workers.

The Minister of Works, who administers water supplies, sewerage systems, harbors and port installations and roads outside district council areas, is now located in the Legislative Council. He should be in this Chamber and approachable by members of this House. Though the holder of that portfolio is an estimable and conscientious Minister he is not as valuable in the Legislative Council as he would be in this House. I look at the galaxy of talent on the Government benches and wonder why, from such an array of knowledge and experience, the Premier has not been able to select one to take the place of Sir Malcolm McIntosh. Is it because he has not the same high opinion of those members as I have?

Mr. John Clark—He knows them better than you.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That may be so, and I have no desire to know them any better than I do now, but surely one is capable enough to be appointed the fifth Minister in this House..

Mr. Lawn—You know it is a one-man band.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Is the honourable member suggesting that the Premier will not appoint one of his lay supporters because that appointee may be a contender for his throne? I do not think that is possible. I know that in his Speech the Lieutenant-Governor indicated that a Minister of Works was to be appointed, but according to what I have read in the press the Attorney-General, the Hon. Mr. Rowe, has already been appointed Minister of Works. If that is so, why is another to be appointed? Another should be appointed and there should be a review of portfolios. At one time Sir Malcolm McIntosh was Minister of Roads, Railways, Marine and Works. Those departments are co-related and should be controlled by one Minister. The Government should take steps to ensure that this House has a full representation of Ministers and that those portfolios which are so important to the people are

held by Ministers in this Chamber with whom the people's representatives can deal directly by question and otherwise.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I join with the Leader of the Opposition in his criticism of the Government's neglect in not maintaining the standard set out in the Constitution. It appears that the Government does not desire to appoint a Minister, or at least is taking too long to make up its mind who that Minister shall be. According to the Auditor-General's report, over £50,500,000 is administered by the Highways and Railways Departments, which is no mean sum. Although I do not wish to reflect on the Minister who will be handling these portfolios in the other House, this is the popular Chamber and the one in which the affairs of those departments should be discussed. It is all very well to say we can obtain the information but it is much easier for us to obtain if the Minister is in this House. The 39 members of the House of Assembly would have more requests from the electors than the 20 members of another place, so it is essential that the Government re-allocate portfolios.

I join with the Leader in extending sympathy towards the former Minister of Works concerning his ill health, and hope that he will soon be well again. Last year the Architect-in-Chief's Department spent over £6,250,000, the Waterworks and Sewers Department £45,000,000, and the Harbors Board about £13,250,000, and these departments are all under the administration of the Minister of Works. There is no need to elaborate on the many important educational matters raised in this House. However, the building programme is the responsibility of the Architect-in-Chief, who is under the control of the Minister of Works, so it is desirable to have this Minister in the same Chamber as the Minister of Education. I do not desire to develop this line of argument, only to illustrate the seriousness of not having a Minister of Works here for the present session to hear comments on matters relating to Education Department building.

The Leader of the Opposition said that there is discontent with railway administration, and that is another reason why the portfolio of the Minister of Railways should be brought back to this Chamber. Some railway officials are very enthusiastic and are probably exceeding their duties to the Commissioner in the pin-pricking methods they have adopted. I have been informed that recently an official of the Railways Department made a tour by road and saw railway tarpaulins that were being

used to cover wheat in fields. Because the department had not taken off the brands this officer investigated, and subsequently got the Police Department on the job. The police found they had been purchased through the normal channels, but even then the officer could not reconcile himself to his own mistake. Such methods adopted by some officers of that department are not what can be expected from good Government and it is desirable, and indeed essential, to have a Minister of Railways in this Chamber so such matters can be raised here.

The affairs of the Harbors Board, which were previously the responsibility of the Minister of Works in this House, are now administered by the Attorney-General. There can be serious repercussions. Although we have members in that Chamber who could deal with waterfront labor, that subject is better suited to the House of Assembly. Has the Government sent this portfolio to another place to avoid criticism? I am concerned at the overall position of waterfront work because I have been told that it is declining seriously. There is much wharf construction at Port Adelaide that should come under the administration of a Minister of this Chamber, and, although it is really a matter for members representing the area, I am perturbed about the position there. I understand that the honourable member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) is in a better position to give information on that matter, but on the major issue before this House, I protest at the Government's neglect in not having met this House today with a full representation of Ministers as provided for under the Constitution. If the Government desired my private opinion who is worthy of appointment I could soon tell them because there are some members with very long experience in this House. I can only guess why an appointment has not been made. Labor members believe that Parliament should function in the interests of the people and that the Government has had sufficient time to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Sir Malcolm McIntosh. It is time a Minister was appointed in this House to answer the questions raised by members on behalf of their constituents. Further, the portfolios of Railways and Roads should be carried by a Minister in this Chamber.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—The matter raised by previous speakers calls for comment. The Leader of the Opposition has taken the opportunity—and rightly so—of raising the matter of the appointment of a fifth Minister

in this House. His statement was based on press statements that Sir Malcolm McIntosh, the previous Minister of Works, had resigned on account of ill-health. I agree with Mr. O'Halloran that every member sincerely regrets Sir Malcolm's inability to carry on, but I cannot agree with him that the Constitution Act has not been observed in its entirety merely because a fifth Minister has not been appointed in this place. Although the Attorney-General, a Minister in another place, has been appointed also Minister of Works, I point out that section 65 (2) of the Act states:—

... not more than five of the Ministers shall at one time be members of the House of Assembly.

I believe that the Government has acted within the provisions of the Constitution. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, however, that the new Minister of Works should be a member of this place and that the interests of members here should not become subservient to those of members of another place. Although the Government has acted in good faith it should consider seriously the appointment of another Minister here and the taking away from the other House of the Works portfolio. It has always been accepted that the House of Assembly, being the popular House with 39 members compared with 20 in another place, should have the greater number of Ministers.

Mr. Quirke—How about putting the Attorney-General in this House?

Mr. STOTT—That is not a bad idea, but we would lose the venerable Minister of Education, who has done a remarkable job. Whether he could carry the two portfolios of Attorney-General and Education we do not know, but if he could I would not object, for I have confidence in his ability as a Minister. Although I cannot support the argument that the Constitution has been abrogated, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that as soon as convenient the Government should appoint a Minister of Works from among its members in this House. Indeed, when it was learned that Sir Malcolm McIntosh was unable to carry on as Minister of Works because of ill-health, the proper procedure was for the Government to appoint an Acting Minister of Works and allow him to carry on until Parliament met.

Mr. O'Halloran—Under the Constitution it could not do that.

Mr. STOTT—I am not prepared to argue that, but it probably would have been better to do that.

Mr. O'Halloran—Why wait until Parliament meets?

Mr. STOTT—Previously an Acting Minister of Works was appointed without the office being vacated, but I agree with the Leader that as Sir Malcolm McIntosh had resigned his portfolio the Government could not appoint an Acting Minister. The Government should seriously consider the entitlement of the popular House to five Ministers. The Minister of Works is needed in this place because members representing smaller districts often come into contact with local councils in whose districts works are being carried out. Members of another place, who represent far bigger districts, do not hear the complaints and requests which come to the ear of members in this House and which must be brought to the notice of the Minister of Works. I submit that this Chamber is entitled to the appointment of the Minister of Works. All members have the greatest sympathy with Sir Malcolm and hope that his release from Ministerial responsibility will help restore him to health and that this session we shall have the pleasure of his beaming presence.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—While Sir Malcolm McIntosh occupied the position of Minister of Works I received prompt attention to any matter I took up with him. He sympathetically considered all matters and wherever possible gave a favourable reply. He was a good Minister to deal with from the point of view of a member taking up matters administered by him. It was no trouble to him to have matters investigated and prompt replies made. On the other hand I sent a letter to the Minister of Works on May 2 and had to ring his secretary only this morning to ask whether something might be done to give me a reply. That is indicative of the present position.

Mr. Jennings—I can corroborate that.

Mr. LAWN—The member for Enfield has had a similar experience: he wrote to the Minister of Works and is still awaiting a reply. I support the statements of the Leader of the Opposition and other speakers and would like to see this portfolio filled by a member of this House soon. I do not know why that has not been done already. Is it because the Premier believes that nobody among his followers in this House is competent to fill it? Alternatively, is he afraid the appointee would be a contender for the job of Premier? I have in

mind particularly a recent lecture on efficiency delivered by the Minister of Roads. According to the Minister, efficiency meant that he could do the job of anyone absent from his office, including the typiste. According to him that was efficiency. I do not know whether the Minister of Roads is a contender for the throne, but if he is, he will have to change his House.

Mr. Shannon—What price would you give on him?

Mr. LAWN—I should like to give the member for Onkaparinga an example of Government inefficiency because of which thousands of pounds and hundreds of man-hours are being wasted. The Government defines efficiency as sweating the worker, but during the last few months I have had considerable experience regarding the preparation of Legislative Council rolls by the Electoral Office and I can quote the following example of inefficiency. The Government Printer has to print hundreds of thousands of Legislative Council electoral cards, which are different from those used for the House of Assembly, and these cards must be posted to all new owners of property. The postage runs into thousands of pounds each year. Whether they are posted back or whether I or someone else enrolls voters they must still be checked by the staff of the Electoral Office. Sometimes police officers are sent out to check the statements of persons making a claim, yet the Government talks about efficiency. If the Minister of Roads was really concerned he would see that the Government set its own house in order and South Australians would be saved thousands of pounds which is now being wasted in having superfluous cards printed by an already overworked Government Printing Office.

Mr. Jennings—The Government is only trying to save its seats.

Mr. LAWN—Of course. If the same people voted for both Houses there would be a big change in representation in Parliament, and that is why the Government is concerned only with retaining the present system. I draw the attention of Government supporters, who subscribe to separate enrolment cards and separate qualifications for voting for the two Chambers, to the fact that there are thousands of South Australians unemployed. If any member opposite is prepared to come with me to the Commonwealth Employment Bureau in Currie Street, he will see that they are not all old people. Figures released recently showed that the number of unemployed in this State has

increased substantially. Many people attend the Employment Bureau day after day, and they are losing hope, but they are not hopeless. They are a good type of Australian men and women, and they are not unemployable. Perhaps most of the women have come from overseas fairly recently, but at least 50 per cent of the men were born in this country or have been here for many years. The money that is being wasted on the Legislative Council rolls could be put to better use.

Recently the Tramways Trust has substituted buses for trams on the Colonel Light Gardens-Walkerville service, but the route has been altered. Instead of continuing south along King William Street, the bus turns off at Grote Street and runs along Goodwood Road. The trust also stopped the Wayville West service. People at Wayville West and in the west end of the city find that in the peak morning hours they cannot get into town because the bus from Colonel Light Gardens is full by the time it gets to Park Terrace. Many pensioners in the west end have to go to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. They often have to wait a long time before they can board a bus, which now travels down King William Street and continues north down King William Road. Therefore, they have to get off at the Gresham corner and walk, or struggle as best they can, to the hospital. Those coming to town by train have to struggle from the railway station to get to the hospital.

Since the re-routing of the bus service six shops in the south end of King William Street have become empty. This should be of concern to Government supporters because they claim to represent vested interests and business people. One business man who had six people coming to him daily from Colonel Light Gardens finds now that only two are coming to him, the others doing their business in the northern part of the city. At least 20 business men have told me they have lost substantial business. We all know of parking difficulties in the city. Many motorists used to park their cars in Peacock Road and catch a tram to the city, but there is now only one tram service from the southern districts and those motorists often have to wait a long time to catch a tram from Hyde Park because so many trams from that district are full by the time they reach Peacock Road. Many motorists are therefore driving their cars into the city to be parked. By exercising a little commonsense the Tramways Trust could overcome the difficulties I have mentioned.

The trust should take the Colonel Light Gardens bus down King William Street as previously, and the Firlie bus which terminates at Victoria Square could run down Grote Street, Brown Street, Sturt Street, West Terrace and Park Terrace to Wayville West. That would cater for those in the west end of Adelaide and at Wayville West. The re-routing of the Colonel Light Gardens-Walkerville bus service through the southern part of the city would greatly help business men in King William Street south and also serve motorists who desire to park their cars in Peacock Road.

I have previously drawn attention to the shortage of Government office accommodation and to the haphazard way the Government has tried to overcome this problem. I have had much to say about the purchase of Foy & Gibson's building, and I shall now read from the *South Australian Public Service Review* of December 1957. One article headed "Fire danger in Government offices" states:—

The Association is not satisfied that there are sufficient safety and escape provisions in the event of fire in a number of Government offices. This opinion was expressed at the November meeting of the Council. It was reported to Council that members of the Association Executive had inspected Foy's building in company with the Public Service Commissioner and other officers, and as a result of the inspection, Executive had some doubt as to whether there were sufficient escape provisions in the event of fire. Representations had been made to the Government pointing out that the Association was concerned in view of the number of members who would be permanently housed in the building. The Association does not look lightly upon the fact that about 800 members will be in the one building, in which the ways of escape in the event of fire do not appear to be adequate. The only reply so far received from the Government is that it is making inquiries into the matter. Council also was informed that there was a fire hazard on the third floor of the Victoria Square building, where a number of officers were quartered, and the only means of both entry and exit are by way of a very narrow winding staircase. The Association is following these matters up, and is seeking expert opinion and advice and, if necessary, intends to make very strong representations to ensure the safety of life of its members.

I condemned the purchase of Foy's building on a number of grounds. I am not an expert on fire escapes, but that article stresses a real danger. It must be very real if the Executive of the Public Service Association takes up the matter with the Government, for it is a responsible body. If the danger is anywhere near as real as the article mentions it is time the Government provided adequate fire escapes. I do not know whether the Government is greatly concerned about the safety of its employees.

Some months ago there was a disastrous fire in the South East, when some Government employees lost their lives. The Leader of the Opposition asked the Treasurer to subsidize an appeal for funds on a pound for pound basis, but the reply stated that the Government merely intended to pay ordinary workmen's compensation of about £2,350 to the widows. I hope that the Government will provide adequate fire escapes at Foy's building, and at other Government offices, and not wait for a fire to occur. I have read all issues of the *Public Service Review* since last December, but have not seen any intimation that the Government has rectified these matters.

As a member of the Labor Party I often have to travel around the country, and I have met people, some of them supporting the Liberal and Country League in South Australia. Many of them have noticed that twice in the last five years the Governor has had six months' long service leave to go home to England. At one time long service leave could be taken as 12 months on half pay or six months on full pay after 10 years' service, but His Excellency has not completed 10 years' service. He has had two breaks of six months. Long service leave legislation was before this House in 1954 and in 1957, but this Government refused to grant workers 13 weeks' leave after 10 years' service and these people believe they have a real grievance. I can quite understand the Governor wanting to go home as often as he can, but I suggest that at the completion of his term the Government seriously consider appointing a worthy South Australian to the position of Governor. No-one could suggest that our Chief Justice has performed the opening ceremony with less dignity than Sir Robert George. As the Parliamentary session has now commenced and there will be frequent meetings of Executive Council, the Deputy Governor will be called upon to perform many duties. I believe the Government could appoint a worthy South Australian Governor.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla).—We have heard much about the negotiations the Government has been conducting with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company concerning the proposed steelworks at Whyalla. We have been told that the Mines Department, in its exploratory work in the Middleback Ranges, has made estimates of the amount of high grade ore that has been found. At one site it is estimated that 30,000,000 tons of high grade ore has been discovered. However, it has not yet been made clear whether during the

negotiations any further assurances have been given the company concerning these leases. Before any firm agreement is signed this Parliament should have the opportunity of debating whether or not the company should be granted further leases.

I remind the House that in 1948 it was made quite clear that the company was prepared to erect a fully integrated steelworks at Whyalla on the leases it then held. In other words, at that time the company considered that it had sufficient leases of high grade iron ore to justify the erection of a fully integrated steelworks. There was no suggestion that it needed further leases to conduct this operation. The present suggestion is to erect steelworks to the value of about £30,000,000. I think it was generally understood in 1948 that a fully integrated steelworks would cost about £100,000,000 and that reinforces the view that the company was quite satisfied then that it could conduct its operations on the existing leases. The company holds a number of leases of high grade ore which have not yet been developed. Explorations have been carried out but apart from the company no-one knows what tonnages of ore those leases contain.

We should have far more information on this matter because the question of the quantity of high grade ore available is most important to the State's future and we should not be placed in the position of having to say "Yea" or "Nay" to some negotiated agreement already arrived at when the whole future of the steel industry is involved. If the company is granted complete control of the iron ore in the Middleback Ranges it will have a monopoly of iron ore in Australia. No matter how much we may recognize the efficiency of the company and the work it has done, we cannot say that it is a good thing for the company to have complete and sole monopoly forever of the steel industry in this country. In view of what I have said I hope that the company will not be granted complete access to all these leases without Parliament having an opportunity of debating the matter and satisfying itself that such a proposal is in the best interests of Australia as a whole.

An enormous amount of wealth has been drawn from Iron Monarch over the past years. As a rule, when natural resources are exploited, the area receives a considerable benefit, but Iron Knob has virtually no civic amenities although it is and has been the basis of the steel industry of Australia. Today about 3,000,000 tons of iron ore are exported

annually from Whyalla. It is conservatively estimated that it is valued at £5 a ton f.o.b., so the company is obtaining from Iron Monarch ore worth at least £15,000,000 a year. Notwithstanding this, at Iron Knob there is a collection of houses—many of them sub-standard—and only one short length of sealed road. The inhabitants suffer considerably through dust and have a minimum of civic amenities. The company is now developing a site at Iron Baron and fresh plant is being put in. This will relieve the drain on Iron Monarch. This area presents a better picture than Iron Knob, but I believe before the company is granted any further concessions from iron ore leases Parliament should be assured that the areas exploited will receive better treatment regarding civic amenities. The inhabitants should receive some benefit from the exploitation of their areas to enable them to enjoy better conditions than at present. Whyalla has applied more than once to the Government for a portion of the royalties to be applied for local government purposes, but the Premier's rejoinder has always been that if that were done the Commonwealth Grants Commission would take that into consideration when making amounts available for this State's finances. I think some means could be devised of overcoming that problem whereby the areas exploited could benefit.

The company has never paid the royalties it should have paid under the Mining Act. It has been granted special concessions and the State has lost considerably as a result. I am not quibbling so much about that because the State has gained other benefits, but I point out that the company is now paying 1s. 6d. a ton whereas under the Mining Act it would pay 2s. 6d. a ton. Surely the places that are being exploited should receive more benefit?

I desire to refer to the policy of the Housing Trust regarding the provision of homes at Whyalla to migrants who have been recruited by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company in Great Britain and Europe. I do not criticize the trust as such. I have the greatest respect for it as a Government instrumentality and for the work it is doing. It is most important that I mention this because the Premier has frequently stated that if we criticize the trust's policy we are, doing something not in the best interests of the people of this State. However, the point I make is that frequently people who have been waiting for at least 18 months for a home come to me complaining. Some have received notices to quit and others

are sharing accommodation and they are disgusted to see migrants being housed within two or three weeks of their arrival. They ask, "Where is the justice of a priority system in such a situation?" We all realize that the migrants recruited by the company in Great Britain and Europe require housing immediately on arrival and it is quite obvious that in order to foster the development of Whyalla it is necessary to get skilled tradesmen, but surely this is not the right approach. I find it very difficult to get accurate information on this policy, who lays it down, or how long it is to be continued. I also find that skilled tradesmen who have been employed in Whyalla for a considerable time are giving up hope of getting a home, and as a consequence some have left the town. This does not appear to me to be a particularly good policy, because these people know the place, like it, and wish to stay there, and there is no doubt about their desirability as residents, whereas others have left within two or three weeks of their arrival because they have not liked the place.

The policy that is being pursued has produced ill effects. When a company such as the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited guarantees a house to a recruited migrant it should provide the accommodation. Some might ask "Can the company do it?" I suggest in this case it can. Some of the directors of the company are also directors of the National Bank, which can find any amount of money to promote the Custom Credit Corporation, a hire purchase concern, so we have the position of these people who are leaning on the State Government for assistance from a State instrumentality to house migrants being the people who are providing finance at a much higher rate of interest for hire purchase. In other words, they are making it possible for people to fill their houses with any amount of furniture and equipment at high interest rates, yet are not prepared to help them purchase homes at low interest rates. It is no use saying they are two totally different institutions, as the people concerned have directive powers in both companies. This matter should be looked into by the Government, and the policy of upsetting proper priorities abandoned at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Quirke—What about our own State financial organization? Why should the Savings Bank of South Australia be compelled to invest 60 per cent of its holdings in Commonwealth stock?

Mr. LOVEDAY—That is a pertinent interjection. I quite agree that there is no reason at all. There is not the slightest doubt that if

we went about it in an intelligent way we could find finance for more homes. However, even if we cannot do that, this company by various methods of financing could provide homes for these migrants, which would overcome the difficulties I have mentioned. I would like a clear declaration on this matter of housing: I am not placing the blame on the Housing Trust, because I have found in my dealings with that body that it scrupulously gives proper priorities in allocating homes.

Mr. Quirke—It will build houses wherever they are wanted.

Mr. LOVEDAY—It will do its best in any situation, and I feel that what it had to do was very much against the grain. It is highly probable that the Government stepped in and stated that these houses must be provided. I hope that the method of allocating houses will be altered in the near future, because it is creating ill feeling without producing good results, and there is no reason why a company with methods of obtaining finance should lean on a State instrumentality when there is a terrific shortage of homes for people who have been waiting for very long periods.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—In the speech with which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to open Parliament today, he referred to a decision to establish another power station on the Port River. This is a matter of considerable importance to the northern part of South Australia. Decentralization of power supplies was referred to a Royal Commission and, as I understand the report of that Commission, it was very definitely in favour of establishing regional power stations. The terms of reference were specific: the Commission was asked to report to Parliament whether it was in the interests of the State that a regional power station should be erected at Port Augusta. Speaking from memory, the finding was that it was desirable to establish a regional power station, but the Commission did not specifically nominate Port Augusta, and for quite a long time it was a matter of contention whether Port Augusta or Port Pirie would be the logical site. It was only after an examination by experts of freight costs and handling charges as against transmission costs and the availability of deep water that Port Augusta was decided on as the site for a power station to burn Leigh Creek coal. During those investigations it was shown that a site was available at Port Pirie.

The Commission found that it was desirable that the sources of power of this State should be decentralized, and at this stage, before any further work is done, I urge that full consideration be given to the establishment of a power plant at Port Pirie. When this matter was under consideration before, the member for Port Pirie (Mr. Davis) vigorously advocated the claims of Port Pirie and established that that town had a case. That case obtains still. Port Pirie is an adequate shipping port. It would be just as easy to off-load Newcastle coal there as it would be at Port Adelaide. With the broadening of the rail gauge from Port Augusta to Leigh Creek, coal from Leigh Creek would be available just as easily at Port Pirie as in the metropolitan area, and it seems to me that all the advantages of establishing a station north of Port Pirie, which were stated before the Royal Commission and found by it to be valid, obtain today. As a matter of fact, according to the press at the time, Port Pirie was promised the power station on that occasion.

I am referring to this matter because there will be no inquiry by the Public Works Committee, because this work is not entirely a Government undertaking. Any public works involving an expenditure of over £100,000 has to be referred to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report and, according to the Chief Secretary of this State, it is competent for any interested parties or districts to approach that committee and give evidence, but under the terms of the Electricity Trust Act no such inquiry is held, and no opportunity is afforded to people of a district to appear before any inquiry such as is held if the work is a normal Government undertaking. I am not criticizing the Electricity Trust's decision, because I believe it might well be that from the angle of producing electricity, if that is the only question to be considered, it could probably show that there are advantages in the site selected. However, I suggest that other factors should be considered, such as decentralizing an industry, and the benefit that a power station in the country would have on country settlement and on relieving the further overcrowding of an industrial area.

I believe that taking industries to the country is one of the most vital matters this Parliament will have to discuss, as it is something that is uppermost in the minds of all citizens occupying public office from Port Lincoln to Mount Gambier. I do not think

there is a single country centre that is not concerned about the difficulty experienced in taking industries to the country, and we know that by and large it is impossible to encourage industries into the country unless there are some advantages in relation to accessibility of raw materials, or some market advantages. It is not possible to establish industries artificially. All the attempts to take industries to Wallaroo and Quorn have shown the great difficulty of taking industries into the country, so much so that I believe that in the interests of the country every opportunity should be taken in governmental or semi-governmental undertakings to bring about decentralization. I do not believe that we can expect the trust engineers to consider that when they determine the policy for the construction of power stations. I did not criticize the Adelaide Electric Supply Company for wanting to build power stations in a central position so as to assist administration and control. There are advantages, of course, in centralized control but other factors must be considered in the interests of the State. Where the economics of the position are so finely balanced there is a weight to be thrown into the other side of the scale by taking industries into the country. It should be the task of some body to consider these other matters. They are not subject to review by the Public Works Committee. There is an urgency in this matter and before much more time passes the Port Pirie people should be given the opportunity to state a case for a regional station there. Naturally I would like the third power station to be established at Port Augusta and the only thing that prevents me from advocating it is that I am not sure of the quantity of Leigh Creek coal that will be available. Interstate coal could be off-loaded at Port Pirie just as easily as at Port Adelaide. There is a need for an industry at Port Pirie to take up the employment lag. This is not a new matter and I am only reiterating the excellent case presented many times by Mr. Davis, the member for Port Pirie. With the alteration to the electoral boundaries the part of Port Pirie concerned has been included in my electorate and I ask that an opportunity be given to Port Pirie people to speak in support of a power station there.

I want now to refer to the delay that has occurred in the erection of Education Department buildings at the Port Augusta high school. I refer to the buildings where primary

school children are taught domestic arts, woodwork and sheet metal work. There has been an inexcusable delay and extreme muddling. Many promises have been broken repeatedly. The Minister of Education said that the buildings would be ready by the end of December 1957, then for the first term this year, then before March 31, and then by the commencement of the second term. We do not know now when they will be ready. In all this time there has been confusion in the teaching of the subjects at Port Augusta. Last year they were not taught at all. There is no reason why the buildings should not have been completed before the end of December last. We have not been able to get a satisfactory reason for the confusion that exists. Before the next Parliament meets I hope the situation will be resolved. I cannot afford to let the matter rest any longer and I ask the Minister to take early steps to see that this work, which he knows is urgent, is put in hand forthwith.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I would not have risen but for the fact that remarks by the Leader of the Opposition earlier brought to light a subject that is most important for both Parliament and the people. I refer to the non-appointment of a new Minister of Works. Members on the Opposition side have been waiting anxiously for an appointment and I have no doubt that Government supporters are also waiting anxiously for it. If we remember happenings in the past when appointments have been made to the Ministry it can be said that no member on the Government side has no hope of appointment. In view of what has happened in some recent appointments there are no no-hopers on the Government side. I have much sympathy for the Premier in his dilemma. It is a difficult and colossal job that has to be filled, but in fairness to members generally an appointment should be made quickly. Let us look at the difficulties faced by the Premier. Today two Government members were privileged to have their pictures printed in the press. Apparently these two members are regarded as likely contenders for the position of Minister of Works. There is a good picture of Mr. Dunnage, the Chairman of Committees, and apparently he is regarded as a likely contender. That could well be the position, for Mr. Dunnage has had much Parliamentary experience and has held a high office in the Government Party. However, there is one grave difficulty because it must be realized that after the next elections the honourable member will not be in this place.

Mr. O'Halloran—The present Government will not be in office.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—There is a happy possibility of that happening. The Premier would not think of appointing a new Minister to carry on only for a few months and then leave this Chamber. Regretfully I think we must discard the possibilities of the member for Unley. When we think of other possibilities we come to Mr. Coumbe, member for Torrens. He has plenty of promise, which is an acquisition for any Government member, but it is almost a certainty that he too will not be here after the next elections, and again the Premier must be forced into the position of discarding him. Then we come to Mr. King, the member for Chaffey. He also shows much promise, but his fate, I am reliably informed, is likely to be the same as that of the other two honourable members at the next elections. I could mention Mr. Hambour, the member for Light, who many of us believe would make an ideal Minister, but once more there is a grave doubt whether he will be returned at the next elections. In his case, however, I do not think it is so much a certainty as it is in the other cases. We could think of Mr. Harding, the member for Victoria, but despite his being the type of member we know he is there is a virtual certainty that he also will be defeated at the next elections. Someone has suggested the member for Gouger, Mr. Goldney, but here I am on a certainty for on his own choice he will not be a member of the next Parliament.

I could go on speaking about other members, but that would only be wearisome. I have shown the dilemma in which the Premier finds himself. His list of possibilities has decreased greatly. Honourable members can themselves think about the chances of other members. It is useless to appoint a man unless he will be in this House for some time. It is a difficult task in the light of past events. Not long ago a member of another place was appointed Minister. At the time members generally would have thought the odds against his appointment would have been the same as those against Wotan when he won the Melbourne Cup—200 to 1. No-one on the Government side can say that he has not a chance of appointment to the Ministry. We may rise in the morning to read the newspaper—because that is certainly where we will get the information first—and be astounded by the appointment of a Minister. I have heard rumours in the past that when the Minister to whom I was referring a few moments ago was appointed, the Premier put a number of names in the hat

and drew one out. I do not believe that, because I do not think the Premier would descend to that level, particularly in the light of his known aversion to lotteries and the like. However, I have heard that rumour, and I am quite confident that when I go down to the South-East, which I hope to do in the next few weeks, that rumour will be trotted up to me again. It can be done that way, but I hope it will not, and I am sure it will not.

Some of the things I have brought forward today possibly give some idea why this appointment is taking such a long time. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it is vital to members, particularly in this House, that the appointment of the Minister be made quickly. Let me place on record my sympathy for Sir Malcolm McIntosh in his ill-health. I have always received from him the greatest of courtesy, and what is more, something that is very nice to get, I have usually received very quick replies. I am not suggesting for a moment that the replies have always been satisfactory to me, but many of them have and at least I have always received an answer that I could convey to my constituents so that they would know where they were.

We want the Minister of Works in this House where he is easy of access, and where that long waiting period of time is saved. As members know, I have a certain amount of interest in the sewerage of various districts, and naturally I was jubilant when I read the references to sewerage in the Lieutenant-Governor's speech, although I am afraid that in the light of past events I do not feel like pinning a great deal of faith to them. However, I do desire to have the Minister in this House so that I can obtain the fullest information, and I hope we will not have to continue getting secondhand information on this matter for much longer. I am certainly not reflecting on the gentleman who is carrying on in that capacity at the moment, who I must say has always treated me particularly well when I have brought requirements to him. I believe that the Minister should as soon as possible be given his chance of training for the Ministry. It is all very well for people to say that a Minister has a permanent department, and that the department does all the work. I cannot believe that. I believe that it takes a certain amount of time for a Minister to be trained in the job and if we wish to give this Minister an opportunity of knowing something about his job before he is forced to retire from it next March, then we should appoint him soon.

In common with the Leader of the Opposition I deplore the fact that we do not have at the moment the Minister of Railways and Roads in this House. Some of my colleagues might facetiously say, "What a jolly good thing we do not," but I am referring to the Minister and not to any particular individual. I am very fortunate as far as railway matters are concerned, because, unlike quite a number of members, I travel on the railways frequently. I have not been here long enough to be able to afford a motor car on a Parliamentary's salary; I realize it can be done if one is prepared to run oneself into debt, but when one has a wife and a reasonably young family to look after one is not very happy about doing that. I am forced to travel on the railways, and I am quite happy to do it, because it gives me the opportunity which some members, particularly on the other side, are denied, of getting to know something about the railways. People know me as a regular traveller and I am afraid they come to me with a certain amount of their troubles.

During the last two or three months not one day has passed when I have been travelling on the trains that a porter or a guard or a rail-car driver or such person has not come up to me and told me about a certain amount of discontent which apparently is growing worse and worse in the railways. One particular thing I have heard a great deal about in the last few months is that apparently some young fellow—I do not know his age, but I should say he is not old enough to vote from what I have heard—has apparently been employed as what a good many people would class as a pimp on the railways. Apparently this young fellow, who is not much more than a boy, has been entrusted with the job of catching railway employees in slight breaches and infringements of railway regulations. I do not know whether it is correct or not, but I am informed that this practice has been discontinued during the last week. I hope it has, because I think members realize that the railway regulations that are issued to employees would fill a book as big as the Encyclopaedia Britannica, and if railway men decided to adhere strictly to every one of those regulations there would be chaos in the railways. That is typical of some of the complaints made to me, I think with justice. Other members have heard these things and naturally they desire to have the Minister in this House so that they can verify them if possible. At the moment it takes a certain amount of time to do that. I have a query at present that I would like to address directly to the Minister

of Railways and get an immediate reply because it is urgent and important, but that is not quite as easy as it should be.

Quite frankly, I do not know why the Minister has not been appointed. In common with the Leader of the Opposition, I believe that this is virtually a violation of a very important principle as far as members of this House are concerned. After all, we represent the people in this Chamber, and we are the people, because we are here in their stead. Every person who voted for us or who did not vote for us was over the age of 21 and had the right to vote, and that, unhappily, cannot be said for all Houses of Parliament in Australia and indeed it cannot be said for both Houses in this State. I simply add my few remarks of protest and hope that the heading which we read in the newspapers will soon be brought to fruition. I would have preferred to have seen "Government will fill post now," but the word "now" is not there. I support the Leader of the Opposition's contention and plead with the Government to appoint the Minister as soon as possible.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I rise to draw the attention of the House to a matter which is really of grave urgency to this State. It is a matter to which I drew the attention of the House in May, 1956. Various other people have been good enough to draw the Government's attention to it since then, and various vague promises have come forth from the Government without anything really satisfactory being done to meet the situation. I refer to the administration of institutions by the Children's Welfare Department, and particularly the Magill Training School. In the Address in Reply debate in May, 1956, I pointed out the urgent necessity for the Government to institute at Magill and in other institutions generally, where boys who had been sentenced were to be reformed, the general principles of the Borstal training institutions in Great Britain. That principle is that when boys are taken to institutions they are to be examined by psychologists and vocational guidance officers after a thorough consideration of their background, aptitude, desires and abilities, and then sent to an institution suited to their particular class of offender and segregated from other classes of offenders. I understood that something was to be done soon after I raised this matter in 1956. An announcement was made in the press at that time that £90,000 was to be spent on Magill, and later the Chief Secretary

went overseas, one of the reasons he went being to study prison and Borstal institutions in Great Britain. After he had been overseas for about 10 months at our expense he returned to South Australia, and the one thing he had to say about the situation at Magill was that under the Children's Welfare Department the principles of the Borstal institutions were being put into effect. That was a completely fantastic statement. I cannot conceive what the Minister was doing overseas if that were the conclusion he came to.

I shall outline to honourable members in a moment just what the situation is at Magill. Although the number of boys there varies, there are about 90 boys there from time to time who are housed in an extremely old building which is quite unsuitable for the purpose of the Magill training institution. The department two years ago called for plans to be made for a new main building, but there are no plans yet. This matter has been discussed for the last two years, but discussions have not yet reached the stage of a decision whether the present building is to be demolished and a new one put on that site or whether a new building, the plans of which have not yet been finalized, is to be erected somewhere else. They do not know that even yet. Nobody quite knows as yet when they are going to come to some decision in the matter. It is true that tenders have been called and work is to commence very shortly for a security block at Magill, but this will not house those already at Magill. The security block is to cater for the incorrigible escapees who at present are being sent to Yatala because Magill cannot accommodate them. The security block will not do anything effective to alter the present situation at Magill.

Let us have a look at the present building at Magill and see what it is that the Government has failed to do something about since considerable public outcry about this business commenced years ago. The boys are in two dormitories. There is one main dormitory, and there is a dormitory for the very small boys of school-going age, of whom there are about 13. The other 80 odd boys are in one long series of dormitories on the other floor. There is no attempt at segregation. Boys who have venereal disease are not segregated from other boys. The 84 boys in the top dormitory have one bathroom adjoining a few shower cubicles which are ancient and dreadful looking, and two lavatories opening on to the dormitory.

One can imagine what it is like. Warders described to me in rather graphic terms just what happens when there is a run of gastro-enteritis in the place, and just what the atmosphere is. There is no bay for sick boys. The old recreation room was burnt down some time ago and no new one has been erected. For a group of 84 senior boys there is one room measuring 52ft. by 22ft. 6in. There is no segregation amongst these 84 boys. They are all in there during the evening for their small amount of recreation. Although it is true that boys are sent to do jobs in the training school and in consequence there is some difference in the work that they do during the day, apart from the segregation of boys of school-going age there is no segregation during recreation hours or during the hours of sleeping.

There is only one warder in the main dormitory who is required to be there at night. He has to look after them all. The general atmosphere of this institution is most unsatisfactory, and many of the facilities are unsatisfactory for any sort of Government institution. Looking at the recreation yard at Magill or the toilets that open off it, I am surprised that the Department of Public Health does not do something about it. Perhaps they do not know about it. The conditions are dreadful. Plans go on and on and there is much talk about the modern ideas of Borstal institutions being put into effect, but nothing seems to get done. We are still where we were two years ago, and even yet there are no adequate plans for doing something about it. The Government should get on with this job, because while there is no effective segregation of boys sent from the juvenile courts for training, it is not a reform school but a school for crime. The Magill graduates, as they are called at Yatala, are well known. These boys have had considerable training in crime, and it is difficult to reform them under the present basis of the institution.

However, it does not end just there. The warders of this institution who have the over-seeing of these boys, apart from the Superintendent, are not required, or even allowed, to do anything in the way of reform work. They are warders simply, or people who do certain manual or vocational training work. General reform work according to the nature of the boys is not the business of the warders, but apparently of the Superintendent alone. This is strange enough from the point of view of trying to put into effect the plans of a Borstal institution, but further amongst the staff at the Reformatory is the most bitter

discontent owing to their conditions and the feeling between them and the department, or their immediate superiors, is so bad that I prophesy that unless the Government does something about this situation quickly there will be a very serious industrial upheaval.

Let me outline why. A roster system has been instituted by the Superintendent which is hopelessly unsatisfactory from any working man's point of view. The hours worked are extremely long. Men may be as long as six hours straight on a shift, during which they are not even allowed to sit down. On occasions, because of alterations in the roster, men have been made to work for as long as five and a half months without a single week-end off. When they are called back they work long hours on their rosters and have no penalty rates for overtime paid. When they are technically off duty they are still on call for the whole time.

The provisions for amenities for them are shockingly bad. Indeed, the lockers are rat infested and the position has to be seen to be believed. Propositions have been put forward for reasonable alterations, but the men are continuously met with the statement, "If you don't like it you know what you can do." I have a pretty shrewd suspicion what they will do unless something reasonable is done. How can we have satisfactory work in an institution like this which has no organizational basis for doing its job when in addition, there is bitter discontent among the staff? The Children's Welfare Department should be prepared to do something about this, and quickly. It is just not good enough for the Government to muck about for two years discussing general plans for the institution without coming to a final solution. The reconviction rate, which at Magill is already high, may even be increased, unless the Government does something. As the actual reconviction rate has not been published, we do not know, but anybody with knowledge of the treatment of juvenile offenders and of the activities of the juvenile courts knows very well that the reconviction rate of boys from Magill is much higher than from the Borstal institutions. Unless we do something about this we will continuously increase the delinquency problem with which we in this community are faced. What has happened in the State of New York will eventually happen here if we are prepared to accept from the Government statements that something is to be done, when in fact nothing is done. I want to hear something satisfactory from the Government, because those in contact with this

particular problem are sick and tired of being fobbed off with vague statements from the Minister which in fact are not borne out by the facts of the case. I hope that we shall hear something from the Premier as to what is going to be done about the situation. I want to hear that something more than that a security block is to be built in order to satisfy the community, who are getting concerned about this particular issue.

In 1955 there was a slight contretemps between the Minister and myself on the subject of some additional land for the Marryatville school. Then he said in reply to a question by me that the department had land for the erection of a new infants' school at Kensington without encroaching upon neighbouring properties. I was very concerned about the effect on neighbouring properties because an official of the department had stated that that was under review. I was glad to hear the Minister's statement that there would be no encroachment upon neighbouring properties and that that would not be necessary. The Minister said that he was then considering placing on the Estimates an amount for a new infants' school at Kensington, but so far it has not come to light. The parents have become most concerned; many of them live in my district and the new school will be built in my district. The parents have prepared a petition containing 590 signatures stating that they desire urgently the building of this new infants' school. I am sure the Minister will appreciate their urgent desire for this new school, which will provide much needed facilities in this particular area, and thus increase the playing area available at the Marryatville school. The petition is courteously worded, and I have great hope that the Minister will give it due consideration in the preparation of his Estimates for the coming year.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I desire to sympathize with Sir Malcolm McIntosh in his illness. He is a man for whom I have much respect. As a Minister he always did his best for members on this side of the House when approached. I strongly protest against the non-appointment of a Minister to take his place, all the more so because the matters that I am going to deal with this afternoon concern the Minister of Marine. At present the Harbors Board is dredging certain sections of the Port Pirie harbour. I am pleased that most of the silt dredged has been pumped to the eastern side of the harbour. I should like to know from the Premier if it is the Government's intention to reclaim the whole of the eastern

side of the harbour, which is long overdue. If it were reclaimed it would be an ideal place for an industry. I should also like to know how the Government intends to utilize the eastern side of the harbour when reclaimed. At present a wall runs across the Solomontown beach. I am not an engineer, but in my opinion it would provide a good foundation for a causeway.

Recently the Premier and the Chief Secretary (Sir Lyell McEwin) visited Port Pirie on the invitation of the Mayor (Mr. Walsh) to see whether an industry could be established there because all Port Pirie people realize the necessity of further industries as many young people, on leaving school, can find no employment in the town. I do not know whether to blame the Electricity Trust or the Government, but I am disappointed at the decision to build an additional power house on the Port River. If the Government is sincere in its alleged desire to establish industries in the country, surely it has the chance to establish a power house away from the city. True, the Government has established a power house at Port Augusta. I thought the first country power house would be situated at Port Pirie because the Premier called me over in this House one day and told me that I had the power house, but three weeks later he said that the Government had changed its mind and that power house would be built at Port Augusta. Although I do not object to the erection of a power house at Port Augusta, because Port Augusta needs an industry just as much as Port Pirie, I submit that no valid reason can be advanced why the second power house should not be built at Port Pirie where the site is already available.

It is time the Government realized its responsibilities to country towns. We in Port Pirie claim that our town is one of the greatest in this State; indeed it is a great money spinner for this Government. It has every requirement and facility for a new industry and we need a power house there.

Wallaroo is another town that deserves greater consideration when the Government is deciding on the situation of an additional power house. According to the press and the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), young people are leaving that town in large numbers.

Mr. Loveday—That is happening in every country town.

Mr. DAVIS—Yes. Wallaroo, Moonta and Kadina performed good service in the early

days of this State. That district was prosperous then, but since the mines were closed the Government has allowed the towns to become almost ghost towns. As Wallaroo is only 90 miles from the metropolitan area it is an ideal place for a power house.

When the Premier visited Port Pirie he promised His Worship the Mayor to give the council £1,500 in June and an additional £1,500 in July. Unfortunately, His Worship had not the experience that some other people have had in public life and probably had never dealt with the Premier or any other Minister of this Government, so he did not think to ask Sir Thomas whether any stricks were attached to the promise. The result is that the money has not yet been received and the Port Pirie Council does not look like getting it because the Premier has now to inquire of the Harbors Board what is involved in the removal of, or repairs to, the Solomontown wharf. Some years ago the Minister of Marine informed the Port Pirie council that the wall at the Solomontown wharf would have to be removed or sheet-piled. Either job would cost more than £30,000, according to the Minister at that time, but now it seems that the Premier has made a promise without investigating the position. He does not know what is required. Indeed, if the intentions of some years ago are carried out the sum of £3,000 promised to the Mayor will be only a drop in the ocean. I agree that to make the wall suitable to meet current demands it would have to be sheet-piled. Although there is a difference of opinion among Port Pirie people on where a swimming pool should be constructed, most people there desire better bathing facilities at Solomontown and the closing or repair of the wall will give sufficient water for bathing.

I am disappointed that this Government has not given the country the consideration it deserves. From time to time members on this side have tried to bring to its notice the way the country has been neglected. As one travels throughout the north one sees towns, once prosperous, now ghost towns. In some places even the hotel is closed and no effort has been made by this Government to rectify the position. Although there may be difficulties in the way, something should be done to relieve the unfortunate position of such towns.

Mr. John Clark—Where have the people gone from them?

Mr. DAVIS—Instead of trying to establish industries in the country to keep people there,

the Government is enticing people to the metropolitan area and the metropolitan area is being choked and the country starved. If it desires to develop South Australia it is the duty of the Government to see that people are kept in the country to develop it.

I now turn to the subject of sewerage. Recently the Government did what I considered to be a ridiculous thing when it sent to Port Pirie the advisory committee on country sewerage to investigate the position there so that the priority of Port Pirie in country sewerage schemes might be determined. The Government knew full well that the Port Pirie council, realizing that the Government did not intend to sewer Port Pirie, had decided to make it a septic tank area. Indeed, a large area of Port Pirie has septic tanks today and eventually all the town will be serviced by septic tanks.

I give the Government credit for its concurrence in the recommendation by the municipal association, for which recommendation I was responsible, to amend the Local Government Act so that a council would be allowed to adopt a sewerage system other than the septic tank system, but when the Port Pirie council decided to exercise its powers under that amendment, the Central Board of Health refused to approve the suggested system and sent what I considered a ridiculous reply to the council. Since then, however, I am pleased to say that the Minister has taken up the matter to see whether the Port Pirie council may act under the terms of the amended legislation.

I am sorry to say that the mayor of Port Pirie spoke with no authority, as I would be speaking if I said Port Pirie was not going to have sewerage. The mayor told the advisory committee that Port Pirie did not desire an early priority. Although I do not say he was wrong, I suggest that, before he said that, he should have sought the opinion of Port Pirie ratepayers. When he said that Port Pirie wanted no early priority he also made another statement that I thought was not wise, namely, that eventually the town would have to be sewered. He knows as well as every other person in Port Pirie that there will be no sewers in Port Pirie while this Government is in power. Furthermore, the people there would not accept sewerage today because they could not afford it. The latest figures given to me by the Minister of Works showed that it would cost £1,000,000 to sewer Port Pirie, but the figures given by the advisory committee show it would cost £1,500,000. I think it would cost every ratepayer over £20 a year for sewerage.

I join with other members on this side of the House in protesting against the delay in filling the vacancy caused by the resignation of Sir Malcolm McIntosh as Minister of Works. I was interested to hear what the member for Gawler had to say about it, and I was disappointed that he did not mention the possibility of the appointment of the member for Mitcham. I have much pleasure in making my plea to the Government for more assistance for the country districts.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I endorse the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition about the necessity to have another Minister in this Chamber in place of the former Minister of Works and Marine, Sir Malcolm McIntosh. It is imperative to have a fifth Minister in this place because many questions are levelled at Ministers during a session. During last session only 53 questions were asked in the Legislative Council, but 846 in this House. That shows that we must have at least five Ministers here. Records show that last year 250 questions were directed to the Minister of Works, and when we realize that many members represent sea ports it can be seen that the Minister of Marine, too, must be in this House. I hope the Government will make an early appointment.

The harbour facilities at Port Adelaide, Birkenhead and Outer Harbour are in the districts of Semaphore and Port Adelaide. For some time I have been concerned, like most other people in my district, at the easing off in shipping, which is affecting the livelihood of people in Port Adelaide and Semaphore. The blame for this cannot be placed on the waterside worker, for records show that over the last two or three years the time lost through stoppages has been very small. Therefore, there must be other factors which have caused trade through our sea ports to diminish. If this trend continues the revenue of the State will suffer. The Harbors Board is spending millions of pounds a year to make Port Adelaide one of the best ports in Australia, and we must find ways to maintain the board's revenue. The board's annual report for the year ended June, 1957, showed that cargo which passed through all our ports increased by 746,528 tons, which was rather encouraging, but that was the result of heavy shipments of grain and concentrates from Port Pirie, and at Whyalla there were heavy exports of iron stone and pig iron. I hope that trend continues, but the figures for Port Adelaide last year showed that export and import cargoes decreased by 101,148 tons.

More recent figures that I have seen show that this trend will worsen, firstly because of import restrictions (which are controlled by the Commonwealth Government), and secondly, and more important, is the loss of cargo which is not now going over the Port Adelaide wharves but is being handled by road hauliers. Of course, section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution allows those hauliers to transport that cargo, and this has had wide repercussions on shipping in South Australia. One of the leading shipping companies announced a fortnight ago that when two of the vessels trading on the Australian Coast from Fremantle to Brisbane reach the stage in a few years that it will be uneconomic to run them they will not be replaced. That will have a bad effect on our ports' revenue and on employment in Port Adelaide in particular. Therefore, we should take steps to compete with road hauliers. The railways are also affected by competition from hauliers, and I believe the Government should purchase its own trucks and lorries and transport merchandise to other States in competition with road hauliers. That would compensate for loss of revenue on our wharves and railways.

The position regarding coastal shipping is most alarming. In the last two years the Adelaide Steamship Company has sold two of its vessels—the *Moonta* and the *Moriatta*. If shipping companies continue to lose money further vessels will be removed from the coastal services. There are only two bright spots in coast shipping, the Kangaroo Island and Far West Coast trade, on which the *Yandra* is operating well and bringing revenue to the company controlling it. The deterioration in coastal services has been brought about by competition from interstate hauliers. Our railways and harbors are losing revenue because of interstate hauliers and we must compete with them. Business people find it more expeditious and cheaper to consign goods interstate by road. If they ship their goods five handlings are required, whereas goods can be taken from an Adelaide warehouse to a Sydney warehouse with only two handlings. Considerable capital is invested in our railways at a high interest rate and we must do something to compete with hauliers to safeguard that investment. I hope the Government will consider the points I have raised.

In the last seven or eight weeks there have been occasions when more than 1,000 waterside workers have received appearance money. It is true that the London dock

strike has to some extent brought about this situation, but the waterside workers who receive only 24s. a day appearance money want to perform work that ensures a return to the State. Our harbors are equipped with modern plant and our wharves can compare with the best in the world and the Government should do its utmost to ensure that a reasonable return is gained from their use.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I do not propose to speak at length because I realize that with other business to come before the House there is not sufficient time. I point out that the Leader of the Opposition's criticism this afternoon was a criticism of the Constitution rather than of the Government, because the Constitution provides that Cabinet shall consist of not more than eight Ministers with not more than five in this House. There is nothing providing that the number of Ministers shall be not less than a given number. The provision is that there shall be not more than a given number. When we analyse the Leader's objections it appears that he is concerned with there being any Ministers in the Legislative Council.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not suggest that. If I had my way there would not be a Legislative Council.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Leader would not have any Ministers in the Legislative Council because he would not have a Legislative Council, so obviously his objections are against the Constitution rather than the administration.

Mr. O'Halloran—You amended the Constitution in 1953, increasing the number of Ministers.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Parliament amended the Constitution and I believe the Leader supported the provisions he now refers to. It is claimed that the Minister of Works should be in this Chamber. It is also claimed that the Ministers of Harbors, Railways and Education should be here. I presume members require the Treasurer to be here. Previously, when the Minister of Agriculture was situated in the Legislative Council, a request was made that he should be here. Members know that a Minister in the Legislative Council is just as courteous and looks after members' requests with as much zeal as a Minister in this Chamber. He is also just as conscientious. Members know that frequently, by waiting to ask questions in

Parliament, it takes longer to get a reply. However, they desire the publicity they get from a matter being raised in Parliament. I have no objection to that, but if they want a matter dealt with expeditiously it is frequently better to approach the Minister outside of Parliament.

In the Lieutenant-Governor's speech it was made clear that it was not the Government's intention to fill the vacancy of the Minister of Works with an appointee in the Legislative Council. Sir Malcolm McIntosh was advised by his doctor that he should retire immediately and that happened just prior to a Loan Council meeting when I was negotiating several weighty matters that had to come before Parliament. Under those circumstances the vacancy was filled temporarily by the Attorney-General. It was not possible to appoint him as an Acting Minister because he was not acting on behalf of anybody. He had to be appointed and that is all there was to it. There has never been any suggestion that this House would carry on with four Ministers.

Mr. O'Halloran—Then this afternoon's *News* is completely wrong?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not seen its contribution to this matter. I can only speak of what I know. Many of the prophecies made by members opposite—particularly those made by the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark)—should not have been made. After all, who will be here in the next Parliament is a matter that nobody here can determine. A short time ago I went to Victoria and was told on the highest authority that half of the Liberal members were going to be kicked out, but members all know that by the introduction of a third splinter group the whole position was changed overnight. Instead of the Liberals being decimated, the official Labor Party was decimated, so I suggest to the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) that in the event of active Democratic Labor Party opposition he might not be here after the next elections, and we would miss his contributions, because they give an air of novelty to the proceedings.

This afternoon the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) said that the establishment of the iron ore industry at Whyalla is directly contingent upon the Broken Hill Proprietary Company having additional leases. If we want an industry, we will have to give them additional leases, because there is no attraction to that company to take an industry to Whyalla except the leases. Also, if we want an extension

of industry at Whyalla and want tankers to be built there, we will have to provide additional houses to enable skilled workers to go there. We cannot escape those facts. We cannot make cake without breaking some eggs, and we have to decide whether we want the industry at Whyalla. The Government set out to look for iron ore because it felt that that was the one way it could attract an industry to Whyalla, and having found iron ore, it entered into negotiations. It tried negotiating overseas, but there is no attraction for an overseas company to come to Australia today. We could not interest any substantial group to find £5,000,000, let alone £30,000,000 and all the additional money that would be necessary for steel production. We should get this matter in its right perspective now, because it will be for Parliament to decide whether it wants the industry or not, but the agreement could never get here for consideration unless it had the feature that the member for Whyalla saw fit to raise this afternoon. In regard to the oil refinery, we had a different sort of proposition, and we did not have to break many eggs in relation to that industry, because nature had been rather kind to us.

I thank members for their consideration. The matters raised can, and I have no doubt will be debated at great length later. With regard to the constitutional position mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, firstly he had no constitutional point whatever, and secondly, his objections are objections to the Constitution itself and to the existence of a Legislative Council. The fact that a post was not filled for a short period would not normally have enabled him to rise in his place to raise an objection.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The Supplementary Estimates that I will place before members are very brief, and deal with a number of matters it is necessary to finalize this financial year. It is necessary for the Government to seek the approval of the House to expenditures unprovided for in the Budget for the year ending June 30, 1958, amounting to £627,339. In some cases the amount provided in the Budget is insufficient to meet the requirements for the year and in other cases the particular line for which appropriation is requested was unknown at the time the Budget was delivered.

The requirements under the Supplementary Estimates are as follows:—

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, £72,000.—In the Estimates for the year £138,000 was provided for relief in the city and suburbs. It has been found, due to circumstances over which the people concerned have had no control, that a further £72,000 is required so that those persons who through no fault of their own find themselves temporarily out of employment and in need of assistance can be helped by the Government. Although the Commonwealth Government provides assistance for persons unemployed its policy is that cash relief is not available until the applicant has been registered for employment for two weeks. My Government has found that in many cases persons require some assistance during that two weeks and our policy is to assist them. Earlier in the year there was an influx of transient labour from interstate, especially Western Australia, to this State, attracted by the favourable conditions applying here, and these people needed some relief during the period which elapsed between their arrival and when they could find employment.

TREASURER.

Miscellaneous, £368,019.—At the Loan Council Meeting held at Canberra in February last the Commonwealth Government made a special grant of £5,000,000 to the States for the following purposes:—

- (a) To assist the States' Budgets where necessary in order to preserve as much as possible of the loan programmes for capital works and relief of unemployment.
- (b) To stimulate employment and, wherever possible, to assist the housing shortage.

My Government decided that the total of this grant would be made available to the Housing Trust for construction of houses in country areas; the houses to be let at a rental not exceeding one-sixth of the family income to the tenant, with a minimum weekly rental of £1. To carry out this scheme the Government decided to grant the amount of £368,019 to the Housing Trust for the aforementioned purpose.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are they carrying on as an agent for the Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, and as I will explain later, a special Bill will be brought down this session to deal with this

matter on a permanent basis. The Housing Trust has undertaken the administration of this scheme, which is a social housing scheme, without charge to the Government. It is prepared to do the supervision without raising a debit to the Government. The rentals will be called upon to meet the maintenance charges, but no administration charges will be made, and the trust in many instances has been able to get a tremendous amount of help from the local governing bodies concerned. I believe that those bodies are also making no charge for their services. The trust has let tenders for the construction of 101 houses in the following country towns: Murray Bridge 5, Mount Barker 3, Penola 3, Millicent 3, Naracoorte 3, Strathalbyn 3, Mount Gambier 6, Port Augusta 10, Port Pirie 10, Peterborough 3, Renmark 3, Berri 3, Barmera 3, Loxton 3, Lobethal 3, Kapunda 3, Tanunda 3, Angaston 3, Gawler 3, Clare 3, Snowtown 2, Balaklava 3, Burra 2, Wallaroo 2, Riverton 3, Jamestown 3, Crystal Brook 3, Gladstone 1, and Port Lincoln 3. In addition, construction of houses in the following towns is under consideration: Pinnaroo, Tailem Bend, Bordertown, Nuriootpa, Kadina, Whyalla, Minlaton, Maitland, Cummins and Streaky Bay. Later in the session a Bill to authorise the construction of these houses will be brought down for consideration by members. The people who it is envisaged will be assisted by this scheme include war widows, deserted wives and families, servicemen's widows, pensioners, and incapacitated ex-servicemen's families. Two designs have been chosen for the houses, each of four rooms. With one of the designs it would be possible to provide a sleepout which would be detached and movable to meet the needs of a large family. The scheme will enable war widows and others in needy circumstances to remain in the communities where they are known and assist in stopping the drift to the city in search of cheap rental houses.

The trust will administer the scheme on behalf of the Government and collect all rents which will be paid into a fund from which more houses will be built. Although no interest is payable on the money provided, and the trust has undertaken to bear from its own funds the cost of administering the houses, certain charges, including maintenance and insurance, must be met from the rents received. The average overall cost of each house is expected to be in the vicinity of £2,422. For these houses the trust is now holding 67 applications from widows, including war widows.

At present only 25 applications are held for rental accommodation in the metropolitan area from war widows.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is not restricted to war widows.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. I gave a list of those who would be qualified to apply. It concerns people who are at present in most adverse circumstances because they cannot afford to pay an economic rent for a house.

Mr. Hambour—What is the position if they pay one-sixth of the income as rent?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The people to whom the houses are to be let are in the groups I have stated. They will not be let to people who can pay more rent. In any case one-sixth of the income would be a deterrent. Priority will be given to people in the classes I have mentioned. The Leader of the Opposition may ask why the Government proceeded with this matter before it came to the House. It was done because it was necessary to get the matter out of our books before June 30. If it were there after that date it would come within the review of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. At the Canberra conference the Prime Minister said that if the matter were dealt with in this way he had no desire for the Grants Commission to consider it.

Mr. O'Halloran—Does all the money have to be spent by June 30?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It has been handed over to the trust. It is not now in our books. The rents will be used as a perpetual fund for the building of more houses of this type. I think all members will approve the decision.

Mr. Bywaters—Is there any priority of war widows over pensioners?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. A war widow might be well off financially whereas another applicant might not be so affluent. Each case must be considered on its merits.

#### MINISTER OF WORKS.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, £77,000.—This amount is required to pay for additional costs incurred in connection with pumping water from the River Murray through the Morgan-Whyalla water main. The sum of £147,800 was provided on the Estimates but, due to the very dry period between the beginning of the summer and May of this year, it was necessary to pump considerable quantities of water from the Murray through this line

in order to supply the Lower North, Middle North, and areas on Yorke Peninsula.

#### MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Education Department, £320.—This amount is provided as an *ex gratia* payment to a widow as monetary equivalent of long service leave which the Government decided should be paid on the death of her husband, which did not technically come within the scope of the Act.

#### MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Miscellaneous, £110,000.—This sum is for the purpose of providing for an additional grant to the University of up to this amount. An amount of £800,000 was provided on the Estimates for grants to the University, and the additional amount now becomes available as the result of larger amounts being granted by the Commonwealth Government following the approval given to what has now become known as the Murray Report. I move the adoption of the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### REPORTS OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid on the table reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the following projects:—Relaying of sewers in Port Adelaide drainage area (Carlisle and Hart Streets) and Royal Adelaide Hospital (Northfield Wards)—Additional nurses' homes.

Ordered that reports be printed.

#### LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The Speaker laid on the table the following reports of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement:—Acquisition of land in the Hundreds of Pendleton and Wirrega (South-East); Land Development in the Hundred of McDonald (Kangaroo Island); Land Development in the Hundreds of Woolumbool and Lochaber.

Ordered that reports be printed.

#### QUESTIONS.

##### MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN.

Mr. FRED WALSH—As a result of an approach about 18 months ago by the Association for mentally retarded children to the Minister of Health, an inquiry was promised

into the question of establishing an occupational centre for children over the age of 16 years. I understand that those between the age of 6 years and 16 years are well catered for at the centres at Woodville and Kent Town, but that trouble arises when the children are too old to attend those centres. I read in the press last week a statement by the Minister for Health (Sir Lyell McEwin) that a home for backward youth requiring special care had been opened by the Children's Welfare Department at Lochiel Park, Campbelltown. The Chief Secretary said:

A housemaster and housemother had been appointed. The home, on a 50-acre site, would accommodate 12 youths who would be trained in gardening, fruit-growing, and later dairying and manual training. It was hoped later to take more boys, including some of school age. Land for a similar home for girls had been acquired in the Campbelltown district.

Is the home referred to in the press report the result of an inquiry by the Department of Health that arose from the deputation to the Minister, and if so can the Premier say whether the scheme envisages the establishment of an occupational centre on a daily attendance basis for mentally retarded children over the age of 16 years?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will obtain a full report on the subject from the Chief Secretary and make it available to the honourable member tomorrow.

#### SUNDOWN MURDER.

Mr. STOTT—I ask leave to make a statement with a view to asking a question. My question is one of urgency and of great importance to the general public. I refer to the Sundown murder case. Can the Premier say what prompted Cabinet to reprieve the condemned man for one week? Was it because of new evidence not produced during the trial relating to a fourth body, and because of that fact did Executive Council or Cabinet give the opportunity to the Crown Law authorities and others to seek evidence—

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member cannot debate the matter.

Mr. STOTT—I asked leave of the House to make a statement with a view to asking a question.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member cannot debate the question in any event. He may explain his question.

Mr. STOTT—The question I desire to ask is whether the intimation of the existence of another body was made through the accused's legal representative and was it fantasy on the

part of the accused, in the opinion of Executive Council? According to the press, no body has been found. Will this fact alter the decision of the court in any way, or have any influence on Executive Council?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The facts are quite simple. The accused person made a statement to a minister of religion that he had murdered a fourth person at Sundown. Although Cabinet did not believe the statement at the time, it was considered necessary, after consultation with the judge, to prove whether it was correct or not, because the accused person could in point of fact have buried this fourth person and could have shown where the body was buried. I personally did not place any credence in the story, but it was something that was capable of being proved false or true, and, having conferred with the trial judge, it was decided that it was desirable to clear the matter up. That is all there was to it.

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:—

Standing Orders—The Speaker and Messrs. Geoffrey Clarke, O'Halloran and Quirke.

Library—The Speaker and Messrs. John Clark, Millhouse and Stephens.

Printing—Messrs. Bywaters, Coumbe, Ham-bour, Harding and Jennings.

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

#### JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:—

That it be an order of this House that, in view of the creation of a Joint House Committee under the Joint House Committee Act, 1941, a Sessional House Committee be not appointed under Standing Order 404.

Motion carried.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:—

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Ham-bour, Harding, Jenkins, Laucke and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft Address in reply to his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report on June 18.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 18, at 2 p.m.