

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 19, 1958.

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

QUESTIONS.**PREMIER'S VISIT TO UNITED STATES.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Last weekend the Premier visited Canberra to discuss with the Prime Minister certain matters arising from his recent American visit. As a result of those discussions has he any further information to give the House, firstly on the prospects of an industry coming to South Australia and, secondly, on what Federal assistance will be forthcoming in the establishment of such an industry here?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I had discussions with the Prime Minister on Friday and with a committee which the Prime Minister called together on Monday. I felt that the Prime Minister gave the propositions being considered by South Australia a sympathetic hearing, but concerning any large project, the Leader will realize there are many complications and I believe it will be some time before they can possibly be sorted out. Therefore, I am not yet in a position to make any further comment except that the Prime Minister was sufficiently interested not only to hear my representations but also to enable me to discuss these projects with a number of departments called into conference.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Seeing that the veil of secrecy has now been lifted on the proposals discussed on the Premier's visit overseas, to include the Prime Minister and various Federal departments within the select coterie, does not the Premier think it time this Parliament was taken at least partly into his confidence on the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no objection to discussing this matter with the Leader of the Opposition or with honourable members, but seeing that the matters are very confidential I think it would be to the advantage of the project to discuss it with as few persons as possible. I think the Leader of the Opposition can see the point I am making. It was necessary to discuss it with the Prime Minister because we could not get a decision on this matter unless he understood what it was all about, but I do not think that makes it feasible to discuss the project generally because then it would soon become public knowledge, perhaps to the detriment of the project. That is what

I believe to be the position, and that is the position as far as my own Party is concerned. I am certain the Prime Minister will not divulge, publicly or privately, what was discussed.

BUS SERVICES.

Mr. COUMBE—On August 5 I asked the Minister of Works whether he would make representations to the Metropolitan Tramways Trust to improve the bus services in the southern parts of Prospect, Enfield and North Adelaide in view of the many complaints I had received from constituents who were unable to board buses and the flourishing trade taxis are doing as a result. Has he a reply from the trust?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I directed the honourable member's comments to the General Manager of the trust but have not received his report. The chairman of the trust has been away for a few days: I do not know whether that is the reason why the information has not come forward. As soon as I get it I will make it available.

HOUSING TRUST COTTAGE FLAT RENTS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 7 relating to the rents of Housing Trust cottage flats?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member asked me whether the trust was taking any action to increase such rents because of the proposed Commonwealth rent allowance to pensioners. The trust has replied as follows:—

The South Australian Housing Trust has not even contemplated increasing the rents of its cottage flats because of the Commonwealth budget proposal to make a rent allowance of 10s. per week to some pensioners. It is not the practice of the trust to alter its standard rents because of increases in the incomes of the tenants.

FERRY APPROACHES.

Mr. JENKINS—I have a letter from a constituent on Hindmarsh Island relating to the approaches to the Hindmarsh-Goolwa ferry. I know that tenders were called to repair this causeway some months ago, but on the 12th of this month when a constituent was bringing 19 prime steers across to the mainland, five became bogged down and another fell into the river and, through overheating in travelling, died. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads take up the question of expediting the repairs to this

causeway because there are no fences guarding the ferry approaches and the gates on the ferry are not in good order?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes.

Mr. BYWATERS—Last week I asked whether the raising of the approaches to the Walkers Flat and Purnong Landing ferries would be proceeded with as quickly as possible. Since then I have learned that work on the Walkers Flat approaches is nearing completion but that the Purnong Landing approaches have not received attention. Last evening, by telephone, a constituent expressed concern because the river was rising and the flow of water coming down the river would affect this ferry and its approaches. Most of the people in this area are vegetable growers who rely on the ferry. Has the Minister a reply to my question. If not, will he emphasize to his colleague the extreme urgency of raising this ferry approach above flood level?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have not yet received a reply from the Minister of Roads, but I will now address the honourable member's remarks about the particular urgency of the matter to him and ask that it be expedited.

CHAPLAIN FOR MAGILL REFORMATORY.

Mr. TAPPING—Recently I had requests from two parents of boys domiciled at the Magill Reformatory that the Government seriously consider appointing a resident chaplain there. Many youths abscond from this institution, and a resident chaplain who could give spiritual advice and create a better understanding could do much good. Will the Premier consider such an appointment?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The honourable member's suggestion is constructive and might do some good. I will see that it receives consideration by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board.

SOUTH-EAST FLOODING.

Mr. HARDING—Considerable publicity has been given to the serious flooding of large areas of pasture, particularly in soldier settlement holdings, in the South-East. Will the Minister of Lands have these areas inspected from the air or charter a plane and have aerial photographs taken of the inundated areas?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have not yet received any complaints from that particular locality. We have an officer stationed in the district and I will ask him to visit the areas and report.

LAKE BONNEY DRAINAGE CHANNEL.

Mr. CORCORAN—In the *Advertiser* of August 18 the following report appeared:—

Within 24 hours of a 10ft. wide, half-mile long channel being cut from Lake Bonney to the sea, a former member of the Millicent District Council, Mr. D. Brooks has claimed that the project and the soldier settler plan associated with it, is a "fatal error." Mr. Brooks said today he viewed with alarm the site chosen for the outlet north of Cape Banks Lighthouse. He said such an outlet would be subject to storms and tidal erosion. During a period of high tides and high seas, tidal waves would be forced into the lake where they would have the effect of raising the level of the lake, instead of lowering it by three feet—as was the purpose of the channel.

I am not quoting Mr. Brooks as an authority, but did the Minister of Works see this article, and has he any comment to make?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I saw the article, and this morning I asked Mr. Anderson, chairman of the South-East Drainage Board, and an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, to prepare comments, which I have not yet received. This matter was carefully considered by competent people, and although they could not say categorically that it would succeed in all respects, they expressed the opinion that it was well worthy of a trial, the amount of money involved was not very great, and the expenditure was justified in order to test the feasibility of the scheme. On that the Government decided to try it out. I emphasize that it was an experiment and if it succeeds even partially, I think everyone will agree that it was worth while. I think it will succeed, and if it does, the benefits to all parties concerned will be very material.

ABATTOIRS YARD FEES.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I have discussed with the Minister of Agriculture a comparison of South Australian abattoirs yard fees with those of other States. Has the Minister any information on this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The honourable member questioned me about yard fees at the abattoirs because they appeared to be higher than in other States, so I obtained the following reply from the General Manager of the Abattoirs Board:—

In reply to your inquiry of 14th inst. addressed to the chairman of the board, wherein you seek comments concerning the reason for lower yard fees applying in other States as compared with those ruling at this establishment, I desire to advise that:—

1. The charges for cattle and sheep ruling in Melbourne are now 2s. 6d. per head for oxen, cows, yearlings (bulls 3s. 6d. per head) and 3d.

per head for sheep as compared with 1s. 9d. per head and 2d. per head detailed in your letter.

2. The following services operated by the board are not provided in similar types of abattoirs in most other States, but are the responsibility of the stock salesmen:—

- (1) Pick up of dead and crippled stock.
- (2) Provision of gatekeepers to check the accuracy of stock purchased.

3. In addition, the undermentioned factors also affect charges applied:—

- (1) The market facilities of some works are freehold which excludes the necessity to recoup interest and sinking fund charges in the fees applied.
- (2) The majority of works do not include in their yard fee cost structure, certain administrative costs applied by the board, but charge same to other operations.
- (3) As compared with over 450 active buyers at the board's markets, the highest number in other States is less than 200.

4. It is also known that certain other States are running their saleyard operations at a loss, therefore the yard fees charged do not necessarily infer that costs are being recouped.

WITHDRAWAL OF MANSLAUGHTER CHARGE.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Minister of Education received from the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on August 13 relating to the withdrawal of a manslaughter charge?

The Hon. B. PATTISON—The matter has been examined by the Attorney-General and the Crown Solicitor, and I am now in a position to give the following reply:—

The honourable member is not correctly informed as to the facts. In the case in question the defendant was committed for trial and originally charged with manslaughter. Before the trial the honourable the Attorney-General on the recommendation of the Crown Prosecutor, substituted a charge of causing death by driving in a manner dangerous to the public, to which the defendant pleaded guilty. This is an indictable offence punishable with imprisonment up to seven years, which was introduced in 1927 in effect to replace the charge of manslaughter in fatal accident cases. In practice this charge has almost invariably been used in running down cases since it was first introduced, and the maximum penalty is quite adequate to cover any set of facts. As the matter is still *sub judice* I do not propose to discuss the facts in the present case.

REMOVAL OF ABATTOIRS.

Mr. KING—Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question concerning the Metropolitan Abattoirs, and my statement regarding odours emanating from the abattoirs, which I described as unsavoury, was smartly

challenged in the press. Beauty is largely a matter in the eye of the beholder, so smell depends on the sensitivity and discrimination of the nostril in each individual. I must compliment the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board on making use of everything of value processed in the abattoirs, and the odour that results will perhaps not be as offensive to some as to others. Has the Minister considered the suggestion to move the abattoirs to country areas and to sell portion of the land now occupied by it to meet the cost of removal and perhaps establish a new abattoirs?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have received the following report from the chairman of the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board:—

1. From an economic point of view it is considered that the board's works are well situated having regard to:—

- (a) Availability of skilled labour.
- (b) Adequate supply of water (both reservoir and bore), power and light.
- (c) Established rail facilities and close proximity to a main shipping port.
- (d) Fulfilment of urgent demands made by the board for its production stores and materials particularly to meet export requirements.

2. From the standpoint of the producer it is considered that the board's stock markets are ideally situated in order to provide active competition from local butchers, exporters and graziers.

3. It is conservatively estimated that to provide facilities comparable with the abattoirs, based upon present day costs, an expenditure of £8,000,000 would have to be incurred. As the provision of finance would in all probability have to be made upon a loan or debenture basis slaughtering charges would be required to be increased considerably to meet the repayment commitments. It is pointed out that the realization from the sale of the board's land would fall far short of the cost of re-establishment.

4. The establishment of the slaughtering sections of the works away from the distribution centre must necessarily increase handling charges and in any case the suggestion to use portion of the works as a distributing centre using the present layout would be both unsuitable and uneconomic.

With regard to odours, the statement made by Mr. King is exaggerated and it is considered that a great deal of the unsavoury odours attributed to this establishment emanate from the noxious trades area located in close proximity to the board's works, which includes the meat works of ———, felmongeries, fertilizer and boiling down establishments.

In conclusion I desire to inform the honourable the Minister that should Mr. King or any other member of Parliament desire to inspect the board's establishment the general manager (Mr. K. D. Wharton) would be happy to make the necessary arrangements.

OFFICIAL OPENING OF SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR.

Mr. SHANNON—Following on the recent good rains, the filling of most metropolitan reservoirs, including the Warren, and the intake in the South Para reservoir, has the Minister of Works considered arranging a ceremony to open the new South Para reservoir, and if so, will he give members adequate notice so that they may have plenty of time to arrange to attend?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think all members would be glad to participate in the official opening of such an important public work. The matter has been considered from time to time, but until recently the intake into the reservoir was restricted and the prospects of having a decent intake to provide something worthy of an opening ceremony were somewhat remote. However, the situation has changed in the last four or five weeks and, although I have not seen this week's intake figures, I expect that they will be material; therefore, I suppose the time has arrived when an opening date can be considered. So far, however, the matter has not been discussed and I am unable to give the member any information, but ample notice of any such arrangement will be given.

KADINA-WALLAROO SCHOOL RAILCAR.

Mr. HUGHES—For some time now serious overcrowding has occurred on the railcar service conveying school children between Kadina and Wallaroo. The railcar service has a total seating capacity of 56. It is required to transport 99 high school students to Wallaroo, about 20 primary and convent school students to Wallaroo Mines, as well as any members of the public requiring transport. The diesel railcar used for the service arrives at Kadina at 4.10 p.m. and remains idle until it departs at 4.50 p.m. There is no train movement on the Kadina-Wallaroo line between 4.10 and 4.50 p.m. An additional service could be run departing Kadina approximately 4.10 p.m. for the conveyance of school children. The car could then return to Kadina for the usual departure at 4.50 p.m. The only extra cost involved would be the fuel for travelling 11½ miles; the personnel in charge of the train are idle at Kadina at present. A teacher remains on duty at the school until 4.35 p.m. in order to supervise the Wallaroo students. The young primary school scholars have no supervision; many of them hang around the station for an hour. Overcrowding, whether for short duration or

otherwise, could lead to serious injury in the event of an accident. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Railways ask his colleague to provide an additional railcar service to convey school children between Kadina and Wallaroo, stopping *en route* at Wallaroo Mines?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will take up the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Railways.

RIVER MURRAY LEVELS.

Mr. BYWATERS—In view of the amount of water coming down the Murray River, as reported in the *Advertiser* in the last day or two, can the Minister of Works say when that water is likely to reach the lower reaches of the river, and the approximate rise expected in the lower reaches?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I cannot supply the information now, and I doubt whether it has yet been compiled because, although there have been big rains in the catchment areas of the Murray system, particularly in Victoria and the Riverina, it may not be possible yet to collate with any degree of accuracy the information the honourable member wants. However, I will refer the question to the Engineer-in-Chief.

OAKLANDS ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently on whether the bridge on Oaklands Road over the Sturt Creek will be widened or renewed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have received the following report from the Minister of Roads:—

The Commissioner of Highways reports that the plans for the bridge over Sturt Creek on Oaklands Road are almost completed, and it is expected that tenders for the construction of the bridge will be called in the near future. The bridge should be completed during this financial year.

PORT MACDONNELL SLIPWAY.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked recently about the possibility of a slipway being established at Port MacDonnell?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have received the following report from the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game:—

In March I notified the then Minister that the Harbors Board rough plan of a slipway was not satisfactory—the desired facility was a marine railway from the shore not a slipway and staging out in the sea such as they had roughly designed. The Harbors Board indicated that this would mean the taking of

soundings at Port MacDonnell. Because a full programme of works was in hand the Minister ruled that action be deferred. Since that date South End jetty near Beachport has been completed, the Beachport slipway has been commenced and the Port Lincoln slipway has been approved. I recommend that, if moneys are now available, the preliminary work in obtaining soundings could be commenced. From the information gained the best site for the marine railway will be able to be assessed. I understand that there is some opposition to putting the marine railway near the jetty because the fishermen leave their boats up on the beach there. It is thought desirable by some that the boats be beached well to the east of the jetty if sufficient depth of water exists there. The Harbors Board might be asked to indicate the best site after the completion of soundings. The fishermen and the council should then be advised. In view of the above I recommend that Mr. Corcoran be notified in terms of the letter of November 13, 1957.

That letter was sent by the then Minister to the Fishermen's Association, and he said he would ask for plans and estimates to be prepared as soon as possible, subject to other work in hand. I will now ask the Harbors Board to go ahead with the soundings that will be essential before we can get a detailed plan for the slipway.

POLICE ACTION ON THEFT.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I have received a report that a member of the Amalgamated Engineering Union living in Adelaide was visited by plain clothes police, who entered the premises where he was living without a search warrant and said that a firm with which he had been employed had reported a theft and that a complaint had been made against this man. After inquiries had been made of the security officer of the company concerned, information was received that the firm had made no request for assistance in recovering stolen property and that no complaint had been made against any employees, or ex-employees, for the past 12 months. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General ask his colleague to investigate this matter with a view to preventing a repetition of such an occurrence?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes.

SUBSIDIES FOR LIBRARIES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently on how many libraries are receiving subsidies under the Libraries Subsidies Act?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—At present the Elizabeth Public Library (Salisbury District

Council) is the only library receiving subsidy under the Libraries Subsidies Act. It was opened by the Premier on December 11, 1957. The response from the citizens of Elizabeth has been beyond all expectations. The library has 3,490 borrowers enrolled and is lending books at the average rate of 8,025 a month. This library has been set up as a model, and has been inspected by officials from a number of local government bodies. It is expected that other free public libraries, set up under the Libraries Subsidies Act, will be opened during the financial year 1958-59. A library at the corner of Sturt and Morphett Roads, Seacombe Gardens (corporation of the city of Marion), is being built and should be ready for occupation within a couple of months. A number of other local government bodies are investigating the possibility of setting up libraries under the Act.

FISHING IN METROPOLITAN RESERVOIRS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—My attention has been drawn to letters in the *Advertiser* on the question of fishing in metropolitan reservoirs. One was from a man known to me who resides in my district. The reservoirs were closed for fishing during the war years, for good security reasons, but the prohibition has continued. As one who many years ago enjoyed hours of quiet relaxation in fishing in reservoirs I can appreciate the attitude of people who desire to do so. It has been suggested that the ban remains because of the danger of polluting the water. I point out that there are many unsewered areas in the watersheds of these reservoirs—I need only mention the Premier's district, which has been approved for sewerage by the Public Works Committee. Many organizations engage in this sport, one in the metropolitan area comprised entirely of ex-servicemen. Will the Minister further consider the suggestion of the South Australian Piscatorial Council with a view to permitting controlled fishing in reservoirs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—This matter has been the subject of much consideration. Last Thursday the member for Norwood asked me whether it would be reconsidered and I said I had asked for a report from an advisory committee which had been set up to consider the quality of our water. As soon as the report is forthcoming the matter will be further considered.

PRESERVATION OF NATIVE TREE.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last Wednesday concerning the preservation of an area of pink cored stringy bark at Clare?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I referred the question to the Conservator of Forests, who reports:—

Mr. Quirke's question obviously refers to a small area in Clare which supports a forest stand of *eucalyptus macrorrhyncha*, commonly known as red stringy bark. To my knowledge this is the only occurrence of this species in South Australia, although of course it cannot be referred to as a unique tree any more than any other eucalypt can. It occurs throughout much of the foothill country of Victoria, and is also common in the southern highlands of New South Wales.

The land on which it occurs in South Australia is mostly under private ownership with a small area under the control of the district council of Clare. Following an inspection by an officer of this department, I referred the matter to the Commissioners of the National Park and Wild Life Reserves, with the idea of asking whether any action could be taken to obtain some of this country for a permanent reserve. As a result of this, an inspection will be made in the very near future with the Chairman of the Commissioners with the idea of investigating any possibility of securing a small area permanently as Crown land.

The honourable member will see that the Conservator has taken an interest in this matter. He could not explain how this stand came about.

BUS SERVICES: MOIETIES TO COUNCILS.

Mr. LAWN—I understand that the Municipal Tramways Trust, in addition to registering its buses with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, pays a moiety of a penny a mile to various municipal councils. Can the Premier indicate what moiety, if any, private bus owners pay to councils?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The trust pays a penny a mile into a fund in lieu of registration and this fund is paid to the councils concerned. Private bus owners do not make such a payment, but pay the normal registration, which works out at about the same figure.

MARREE RAIL CROSSING.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—A constituent at Marree advises that the Commonwealth Railways Department has closed the main road crossing leading in and out of the town, which has been the main crossing for 50 years

or more. He states that the Commonwealth has suggested that a crossing under a bridge should be used, but that such crossing is inaccessible in wet weather. The Commonwealth also suggested using another crossing half a mile south of the town, but this, too, is inaccessible in wet weather because the creek which runs under the bridge is between the town and that crossing. The main road crossing is not dangerous because everyone using it has a clear view of trains approaching from either direction. The writer mentions that the Birdsville mail used this crossing until the Commonwealth erected a barricade across it. This represents a serious inconvenience to the people of the town and the district, and I can see no valid reason for the closure. Will the Minister of Works have the Minister of Roads investigate the position to ascertain whether the Commonwealth is within its rights in closing this crossing, for I believe it is an established road under the Roads Act, even though it is not within a local government area. Will a thorough investigation be made to see whether steps can be taken either to induce the Commonwealth to remove the barricade or, if we have the legal power, to make it do so?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am most surprised to hear of the closure of this crossing if it is the main crossing at the end of the railway yard between the town site and the new railway yards which have been established for the transhipment of cattle.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Speaking off hand, I would have the same opinion as the Leader that this is a main road. No doubt the Commonwealth has some reason for closing the crossing, but I will ask my colleague to ascertain the reason and whether the matter can be reconsidered.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION METHODS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on August 6 relating to a new type of building material being used, particularly in the construction of schools?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The honourable member's question referred to construction methods being adopted in respect of new schools, and he named one or two in the area he represents. I have obtained a report from the Architect-in-Chief to the effect that some

18 months ago it was decided, because of the much faster construction, to design a number of new schools to provide for steel framework with precast concrete slabs as external cladding. One short-coming of this type of construction is the drab appearance of the concrete slabs. To obviate this trouble, it was decided to use exposed aggregate on the face of the concrete to give texture to the product. Various coloured marble chippings were selected so that a variation of colours and a considered use of white as well as grey cement would provide different appearances from school to school.

The Architect-in-Chief states that the whole question is one of appearance and not of quality of workmanship. The workmanship at Marion High School, Forbes School and Ascot Park School is of high standard. In the case of Marion High School, the back of the building was faced with small red and white marble with grey cement while the two sides and front of the main structure were faced with green and white marble with white cement. In the small samples which were prepared, this combination provided a very good appearance but in the large slabs the white marble chippings merge too closely into the white cement and the appearance is not quite as pleasing as the section carried out with red and white marble and grey cement which was also used at the Ascot Park School. This again is a matter of individual taste. With the experience gained, it has been possible to choose colour groupings that will give a more pleasing appearance for the later schools.

FISHING IN UPPER SPENCER GULF.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. Have regulations been gazetted controlling fishing in upper Spencer Gulf waters?
2. If so, what procedure is adopted to police these regulations?
3. Is the Minister aware that fish in these waters are reported to be scarce?
4. Can any reason be offered for this scarcity?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The replies are:—

1. Yes, by proclamation under the Fisheries Acts published in *Government Gazette*, March 11, 1937, at page 532. It is an offence to use a net in waters greater than 6ft. deep in upper Spencer Gulf north of the 33rd degree

of latitude, which extends from a point just north of Port Germein to a point just north of Whyalla.

2. There are no full-time officers of the Fisheries Department stationed in upper Spencer Gulf, but police officers are inspectors of fisheries by virtue of their office.

3. There is not much data available on the scarcity or otherwise of fish in these waters. Fishermen in South Australia are under no obligation to give information on their catches.

4. The Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game gives the following information which may have some bearing upon the reported scarcity:—

It has been noticed over the past 20 years that in the years of, and immediately following droughts, whiting in particular become scarce in most fishing centres of South Australia. It is probable that, with no run-off from the land, the phosphate content of sea water falls so low, plant growth fails and desert conditions prevail. Whiting in particular then shun the area.

RAILWAY GOODS TRAFFIC TO BROKEN HILL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—What tonnage of freight was carried by rail from Adelaide via Terowie and Peterborough to Broken Hill and other points in New South Wales beyond Broken Hill, including Sydney, during the year ended June 30, 1958?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

To Broken Hill, 31,279 tons; to New South Wales, 5,969 tons. An additional quantity of 138 tons was forwarded to Queensland via Broken Hill. The term "Adelaide" has been read to include also environs as Mile End, Port Adelaide, Dry Creek, and Salisbury.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPER-ANNUATION FUND.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—What was the balance of the accumulated fund account held on behalf of members by the South Australian Superannuation Fund Board as at June 30, 1958?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The amount was £9,708,095 ls. 1d.

COOLTONG DRAINAGE.

The SPEAKER laid on the table an interim report by the Public Works Standing Committee on Drainage of Cooltong Division of Chaffey Irrigation Area.

Ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 14. Page 396.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I join with other members in supporting the motion. I agree particularly with paragraph 2, which expresses regret at the resignation of Sir Malcolm McIntosh from the Ministry. It is pleasing to see that his health is improving almost daily, and I hope that at the end of the year, if offered the position, he will be well enough to carry out the duties of Minister of Works again. I join with other members in expressing regret at the death of Mr. Fletcher. I also congratulate the Honourable D. N. Brookman on his elevation to Cabinet rank, and the Honourable G. G. Pearson on his promotion in the Cabinet. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said during this debate:—

We have heard no grand policy enunciated by the Opposition during this debate which at least affords an opportunity for members to declare their policy.

In the Party to which I belong we at least acknowledge our Leader, and an opportunity will be presented early next year for our Leader to enunciate a general policy for the Party he will be leading. Even if we were to take up the time of this House enunciating our policy, we would not prevail on the Government to bring down the desirable reforms we advocate. If we take the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech as representing Government policy, we must be forced to the conclusion that many things are lacking.

Like the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), I am concerned about the Government's attitude towards rural workers in refusing to permit them the right of entry to an industrial tribunal for determination of wages and conditions. This matter should receive the attention of Parliament. Consider, for example, the staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Because it is a Government instrumentality, many of its staff are members of the Australian Government Workers' Association, which is an industrial organization within the meaning of the Industrial Code and able to appear before various industrial tribunals in an effort to improve the wages and conditions of employment of its members. Two girl friends aged 17 may desire to train as nursing sisters. One enters the Royal Adelaide Hospital and enjoys industrial conditions determined under the Industrial Code. The other girl enters the Children's Hospital for

training but she, together with many other members of the staff at that hospital, is denied the legal right to enjoy the industrial conditions determined by the court. Indeed, it is only by the good grace of the management that workers in such an institution enjoy award wages and conditions.

Some patients, after treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, are transferred to the Northfield block because they have become chronic patients. The nurses and other staff who look after such patients are legally entitled to wages and conditions of employment awarded by the court, whereas persons doing the same type of nursing at the Home for Incurables at Fullarton have no right of approach to the Industrial Court for determination of wages and conditions. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) should bear in mind these and many other such instances and remember that, when the will of the electors is implemented and a Labor Government returned, these reforms will be effected.

Surely these people have a right to go to the court so that their interests may be safeguarded, but what is the position? This Government has denied them that right and it is only by the good grace of the boards of management of these institutions that they receive wages and enjoy conditions comparable with those awarded to workers in Government hospitals. There is no guarantee, however, that these conditions will continue to operate, for they are legally unenforceable. The Playford Government has failed to realize the importance of industrial conditions to the workers and has denied many of them the right to have their claims heard by the Industrial Court. On reflection, Mr. Coumbe may realize that this applies not only to rural workers but also to many members of the nursing profession and other large sections of wage earners.

I am particularly concerned about the establishment of the South-Western districts hospital at Oaklands. Now that the Premier is back from overseas I hope he will ask his colleague, the Minister of Health, when this hospital will be commenced. I have already asked a question on this matter, and I hope I shall get a reply before long. The treatment of tuberculosis does not now take nearly as long as it once did, so the Bedford Park Sanatorium may not be required in the future for tuberculosis patients. This sanatorium occupies a valuable site. It has a number of buildings that may not be suitable for a general hospital, but I think

they could be utilized as an institution for the care of the aged. Some people are awaiting admission to Northfield hospital for nursing in their old age, and Bedford Park Sanatorium could be used to take some of them, or people now accommodated in mental institutions. This could relieve overcrowding in some mental homes, particularly Parkside. It is most urgent that a start be made on the South-Western districts hospital at Oaklands Road, Oaklands Estate. The Brighton subdivision of the Minister of Education's district shows an increase in enrolments of 5,000 since the last State election. Further, many industries have been established in my district of Edwardstown, and the population of that district has increased greatly. If we have an oil refinery established near Christies Beach, instead of at Wallaroo, that in itself will necessitate the establishment of another hospital. I hope I shall not have to wait long for further information on this project.

Mr. O'Halloran—You will have to wait until after next March.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—If the Labor Party occupies the Treasury benches next year—and I am sure it will—there will be no delay in establishing this hospital. Paragraph 4 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech stated:—
My Ministers regret that their efforts to safeguard South Australia's right to a share of the Snowy Mountains water have not yet been successful.

We have been informed that many things could happen relating to the Snowy Mountains Agreement, but according to reports given by the Premier to Parliament since the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech was delivered, it seems that this State's rights have been safeguarded. However, I remind members of what took place in another Parliament, and if I am in order I shall quote my authority. It is a report I received dated May 8, 1958, quoting the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator McKenna) when he moved that a clause be inserted as follows:—

The Act shall not be proclaimed until after each House of the Parliament shall resolve that in its opinion all rights of the State of South Australia to waters of the River Murray are not adversely affected by the operation of the Act.

That, in my opinion, was a vital matter, and in respect of it Senator McKenna said:—

When the Tooma is diverted, 330,000 acre feet of water will be taken out of the Murray. Under the clause that I am pinpointing, there is a legal obligation on New South Wales to put back 165,000 acre feet. That obviously

means, as a provision of the agreement, that the rights exist to subtract 165,000 acre feet per annum from the River Murray . . . The supply of 40,000 acre feet per month is limited to a term of seven months, because the limit of 280,000 acre feet is provided . . . We are faced with a subtraction from a river upon which we are told 750,000 people in South Australia are dependent. Why is the water to be subtracted?

I will leave it at that for the time being, but I am not prepared to overlook the voting that took place on that occasion. It is obvious that the South Australian Liberal Party Senators must have been prevailed upon by someone representing a similar Party elsewhere.

Mr. O'Halloran—Surely they supported our case!

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Let us examine what they did. Senator Nancy Buttfield voted against South Australia's recognition, as did Senators Hannaford, Laught, Mattner and Pearson—the latter having been trained in this House to support South Australia's interests. Mr. Speaker, you will undoubtedly recall that the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council met together in this Chamber to discuss filling the vacancy that occurred as a result of the death of Senator McLeay. We were informed that under the Constitution we had to make the appointment and we selected Senator Nancy Buttfield. Apparently, she had been runner-up in a pre-selection ballot and was the logical selection. Many people doubted whether the electors would sustain her endorsement at the ensuing elections, but they did. We appointed her to look after and safeguard South Australia's interests in the Senate. The Liberal Senators from South Australia must have been aware of our Premier's beliefs in connection with the preservation of South Australia's rights to water, but they voted solidly against our interests. That is a responsibility they must bear. I am not a member of the Liberal Party and I do not know whether in its pre-selections some heads will be chopped off. I emphasize that the amendment proposed by Senator McKenna was vital to our securing water under the agreement. Surely we should be able to depend on people selected by the Treasurer's own political party to represent our interests in the Senate. We would have expected it if we had been occupying Treasury benches. I commend the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) for his interest in this subject and his explanations. Members on this side were

vitaly interested from the outset in the effect the agreement would have on this State.

Earlier this session I asked a question relating to the Electricity Trust's requiring a person whose account was overdue to pay a £20 security deposit. I said that usually people do not get in arrears without good cause, and the Minister said:—

On the other hand, however, some people procrastinate in these things and the trust has provided in its regulations that people who do so should pay for the pleasure or privilege of procrastination.

I do not agree with those sentiments. This man is the father of six children and receives a low wage, and it is a hardship on him to be required to pay hire charges for electrical equipment and £20 deposit added to the current account of £12 17s. 6d. Although I do not know this, he could be an ex-serviceman, and possibly he has fallen into arrears because his health has suffered from war service. It is not reasonable to assume that he is procrastinating, yet the trust has asked for this security deposit because he has been a naughty boy. We are not in the days like 1930 to 1933 when it was a positive hardship for people to find even the minimum charge of 10s. a quarter.

I have had a great deal of correspondence from people living in flats who state that before they are granted a supply of electricity they must find a security deposit of about £8 for the minimum type of flat, which is not up to the Housing Trust standard. The trust was formed to render a service to the community, and members on this side of the House have not complained about services being extended into country areas, because they look upon them as developing the State, but surely people living in flats in the metropolitan area should not be investigated and asked to pay a deposit before they are granted a supply. That is making fish of one and flesh of another. The purchaser of a home does not have to pay it, yet the tenant of a flat does. Everyone is innocent until found guilty, so why should a tenant be suspected of intending to defraud by leaving premises without paying his account? That policy is wrong and the sooner the people realize that the Government administration is so unsympathetic and turn it out of office the better it will be for this State.

The importance of education cannot be over-emphasized, but it must be remembered that it is the parent's duty and right to educate his child. I believe that the parent

is entitled to decide where the child shall be educated. Indeed, the parent had that right before there was a State. After all, the first education the child receives is in the home. On July 26, the press reported that a new college, costing £63,000, was to be erected at Strathmore and that another new college, to be known as Westminster, was to occupy 25 acres adjacent to the Marion railway station. Parents are to have the right to decide whether their children shall attend these schools, the same as parents today have the right to decide whether their children shall attend private or public schools.

Many public schools have been built in my district. The Mitchell Park Boys Technical High School occupies at least 20 acres; the Vermont Girls Technical High School, 12 acres; Ascot Park Primary, 12 acres; and Forbes Primary, 10 acres. There are others I will not mention now. From a reply to my question last session on the Education Department's policy on payment of road moieties, I gathered that the Minister had agreed to pay an amount to the Marion Council, but whether he has done the same in respect of other councils I do not know. It must be realized, however, that the Education Department does not have to pay council rates or road moieties, but if the Minister decides to pay a road moiety, that is to the advantage of ratepayers in the district concerned.

My point is that private schools have had to pay road moieties and rates, although some have paid only a greatly reduced rate. I believe, however, that the Government should be responsible to pay to the local council an amount in respect of the rate revenue which is payable on land occupied by private schools and which is not payable on land occupied by public schools. This would relieve ratepayers in the council area of an imposition they must at present bear. After all, in the Marion council area existing and projected schools will occupy land sufficient for about 1,000 homes, which means that, under my proposal, rate revenue would be increased by about £15,000 per annum. It must be remembered that all schools, whether private or public, must prepare their scholars for the Intermediate, Leaving and Leaving Honours examinations; therefore all scholars must obtain the same standard to obtain a certificate. During this debate some members have discussed technical high schools and one member said:—

If members visit technical schools they will see groups of young girls with pieces of cloth in front of them learning to iron with electric

irons. In another room they will see girls rolling bits of pastry around a sticky mess and calling the result a pasty.

The mover of the motion (Mr. Hambour) said:—

I criticize the Education Department, too. It is responsible for teaching subjects like cooking and domestic arts which, from time immemorial, have been the parent's responsibility. After all is said and done are the girls of today better cooks than our mothers?

I shall now quote from the *Education Gazette* of July 15, 1958. The following is an extract from an article by Miss N. J. Miller, who holds the Diploma of Home Science:—

Emphasis in education today is placed on equipping the student for life as a citizen and not merely as a wage earner. Thus we must keep as a primary aim, in the education of girls, the fostering of an awareness of home life. Most of them will ultimately find themselves responsible for the welfare of a family unit, or, as single women, pursuing a career which includes the task of creating a congenial home atmosphere. In our secondary schools this aim is met by home science, which can be a theme running as a background to all the other subjects. The knowledge gained through it for many students will be a major learning carried over into adult life. An essential is the scientific understanding of home-making by our girls and in its practical application within the specially equipped modern centres of the department each student derives a sense of great satisfaction. The training covers the theory and practice of general teaching, as well as special methods required for home science as described above. Although the young teacher should keep in mind that her popularity at her first country appointment is largely engendered by "cupboard love," she will find that many facets of her full course of training are a source of constant interest to pupils and teacher alike.

Many girls anticipating a nursing career complete their work in invalid cookery whilst studying home science, and thus feel that their career is already under way. The new centres now being completed consist of a large kitchen planned as bays or compact kitchen units so that groups of four or five girls pursue their practical work in conditions closely identical with those of the home. An attractive, well-equipped laundry removes any dreariness from laundry chores and the centre has a complete unit for use in teaching home management to the pupils. They are equipped with the latest developments in home-making devices. Seldom does parental opposition towards homework arise in home science and one of the real joys to the teacher is the shyly expressed gratitude from the mother of the student who experiments earnestly at home. Even sceptical fathers are generally won over during their daughters' early days of Home Science, although their practical attitude may best be expressed as:—

We may live without poetry, music and art;

We may live without conscience and live without heart;

We may live without friends, we may live without books;

But civilized man cannot live without cooks.

Mr. Millhouse—Are they your sentiments?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I consider, firstly, that I am civilized, and secondly, that my requirements regarding cooking are not great. I believe I am a reasonably good judge of properly-cooked food, and a person gets much enjoyment from a well-cooked meal.

Mr. Quirke—Your grandmother must have been a good cook or you would not be here.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I do not know about that. I never saw her.

Mr. Hambour—I never saw my grandmother either, but I do not think I was an angel from Heaven.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I did not come from Hell, either. Miss Miller's article continues:—

Although Home Science is a specialized subject, it is in no way narrow in outlook as it presents to the imaginative teacher a variety of warm, personal contacts with her students. By participating in the coaching of a sports team and hobby clubs, in cake decorating, floral arrangement, or deportment, a teacher of Home Science feels the pulse of the school and she is rewarded by the knowledge that she has guided her girls through the uncertain years of adolescence towards graceful womanhood.

That article was written by a highly qualified teacher in home science, and I have had the pleasure of meeting her.

Mr. Lawn—Are the girls taught to make jam?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am not sure about that, but they are taught all kinds of cooking. I am not an authority on jam making, but the member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) said that fruit taken from proclaimed fruit fly areas could be used for making into jam. I believe when he asked his question he had not given any thought as to the maturity of the fruit for jam making. Students of home science in departmental schools are made conversant with the suitability of certain fruits for jam making and are taught to appreciate the nutritional value of certain meat cuts. I do not believe that we should criticize teachers in respect of matters we know nothing about. It was suggested that today girls are not as good at cooking as were the girls 50 years ago, but today's world is very different from the world of 50 years ago. Let me quote again:—

For the South Australian secondary school girl "domestic arts" of 50 years ago has become "home science" in 1958. No longer does the teacher of this subject place her whole emphasis on pupils' acquiring practical

skill in cooking, washing, and cleaning. Today's home science teacher is vitally concerned with training her girls to be home-makers of the future. Today's home is tomorrow's world! She therefore wants them to understand the scientific reasons underlying good home-making. This cannot, of course, be achieved without some practical knowledge and ability. She wants her pupils to be self-reliant and independent through experience and experiment but she is certain that the development of these qualities is more important than immediate practical results.

School practice is closely related to everyday family experience. Girls are taught not only to be progressive in outlook but also to be discerning so that, eager to use the most modern equipment, they are not blinded by the salesman's claims but can choose the best for their needs. They know that washing machines and similar appliances eliminate the drudgery of housework but they are fully aware that these machines cannot think—as yet—and the efficient housewife must understand the reasons for the different treatment of wool, cotton, linen, nylon, and modern synthetics. A knowledge of sound nutrition is basic. The home science student is taught how best to feed her family from the toddler to her grandparents but she thoroughly appreciates the fact that the most perfectly balanced meal is useless unless eaten with enjoyment, and this can be achieved only by artistic service and harmonious environment, etc.

In addition to learning the arts of cookery, needlework, and other crafts, the home economics pupil takes the full course in invalid cookery (as taken by nurses for their certificate), is alive to safety precautions necessary in the home, especially in the use of electricity, can administer simple first-aid to the injured, home nurse a sick member of her family as well as discuss the relative merits, or otherwise, of lay-by, time payment, and hire-purchase schemes. Not only has she learned to use her own energy and time economically in carrying out the manifold household tasks but she has studied economy as applied to every phase of home-making. To sum up, present-day home science teaching stresses the influence for good of enlightened home-making upon the welfare of the individual, the family group, the community, the nation.

I have taken exception to the reflections made on teachers during this debate. I am not Minister of Education—and I doubt whether I would ever want to be—and I know that it is easy to criticize, but I deprecate unfounded criticism. I often visit the schools in my district and I have a particular interest in them, the teachers and particularly the children. The students of today will be the citizens and leaders of tomorrow. When I refer to our future leaders I am not referring to those students who caused all the havoc last Friday.

Mr. Lawn—Are you talking about the future intellectuals from the University?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I shall have more to say about them during the debate on the Loan Estimates. Some of them could be well engaged during the fruit season in making jam in the manner suggested by Mr. Dunnage.

I do not desire to roast the Architect-in-Chief or his senior officers but I commend to the Minister the reply to a question I asked about the construction of certain school buildings in my area. As defined in the report, the framework is of steel with pre-cast concrete slabs as external cladding. The concrete cladding was objected to, so they went a step further and said that they would treat the slabs with an exposed aggregate. The Architect-in-Chief states that it is all a question of appearance and not of quality of workmanship. The workmanship at Marion high school, Forbes school and Ascot Park school is of a high standard, and I have never complained about the workmanship. I voiced complaints in this House—and again I make no secret of it—about the incompetent type of erection by the firm that was given the contract for the foundations of the Marion high school. About 1½ in. had to be cut off the height of the foundations that had already been poured and the building finished by another contractor. I have finished with that; that was last session.

Today, I make this complaint. The building that was erected at Ascot Park primary school, known as the woodworking centre, I use as an example to compare the finished work there with what obtained at the Marion high school, in some sections of the Mitchell Park technical high school and in the infants school at Forbes. I said before that the school building erected at Ascot Park known as the woodworking centre had a very pleasant outlook, was well finished (I make no apology for repeating that) and the exposed aggregate had been graded. When I used those terms, I commended the Architect-in-Chief's department for adopting that type of thing, but I am not prepared at this stage, now that the matter has been raised, to accept the Architect-in-Chief's use of material that has not been graded. I defy the Architect-in-Chief, after inspecting the Forbes infants school building, to deny that in certain sections of that particular exposed aggregate there is not more cement than exposed aggregate showing. I make no apology for saying that either. If the Architect-in-Chief wants to

enter into this debate through the Minister, let them give me the correct answers.

I have never opposed standards but, when the Government or its departments set a standard, I like that standard maintained. That is all I am concerned with now. I do not want standards lowered. I maintain that I am right when I say that a standard once established should never be reduced. If the Architect-in-Chief had carried out his obligations to the Education Department, he would have specified that the exposed aggregate should be screened. The Minister can take that to his Architect-in-Chief with my compliments and say deliberately that, when a standard is established, it should at least be maintained.

Another matter that has caused me a deal of concern I raised on the opening day of this session, when I drew the Government's attention to the Durham Court flats. I use this only to illustrate my point. The Minister of Education represents the Attorney-General, and my remarks are addressed to the Attorney-General and his department because it is from them that we expect some recognition in these matters. Whether they be multi-purpose flats or single-storeyed flats, all erected on a normal building block fulfilling the requirements of the Building Act—that they are of a solid construction and conform generally with the requirements of that Act—I was under the impression that they could be erected under the one title; but, the moment it is desired to erect a series of flats—or, for that matter, some maisonnettes—on a particular title, then two Acts are involved: first, the Building Act and, secondly, the Town Planning Act. However, when it is desired to erect flats, we come up against our champion of champions that we are pleased to broadcast throughout the Commonwealth and the rest of the world—the Torrens title. We are so proud of these things. However, because we erect flats and try to protect ourselves in ownership because they are erected on the normal blocks of 50ft. by 150ft. or 60ft. by 150ft., the Town Planning Act is complied with. There being over 7,000 sq. ft. on the allotment, a title is issued for it. You build a home and it has a title. You build flats for the purposes I have mentioned and, as long as you leave them under the one title, you can still let the flats. I will not quote the reply I got to my question because there is not much in it, but I understand the matter went before a recent conference held to celebrate the centenary of the Torrens system of land titles. I received a letter dated July 28 from the

Attorney-General on this matter. Because of his legal training Mr. Millhouse may be able to suggest a way of solving this difficult question. The letter stated:—

I refer to your question of June 18 last in reference to the Government's intention with regard to the title to flats and have to advise that it is not intended to amend the law with regard to this matter at the present time. The Town Planning Act General Regulations give no minimum area for allotments in plans of resubdivision. At present, approval is not granted for a residential allotment less than 3,960 square feet and, in the case of maisonnettes, where the frontage is less than 30 feet. If the Town Planner approves a resubdivision, then there is no ground upon which the Registrar-General of Deeds can decline to issue a certificate of title. If, therefore, people erect flats on land and obtain the approval of the Town Planner, they know that certificates of title can be issued for such land.

The question of title to multiple flats is a difficult one because such an establishment requires the rendering of certain services, for example, maintenance of lifts and various other matters such as a garden. The ability to compel each flat owner to repair, paint and generally maintain his flat is a necessary power. Furthermore, the survey of each flat requires vertical as well as horizontal fixings. This requires very careful thought and preparation. In Victoria, there are certain implied rights which attach to every transfer of a part of a building. To legislate for these rights and services seems at first an easy way out, but opinion in New South Wales suggests that this could lead to litigation over matters for which the legislation had not completely provided.

Because of the above facts, some people are resorting to long leases of flats (which are not within the Town Planning Act), but in such cases the building itself would be subject to the terms of the Act. The information set out above illustrates the fundamental difficulties in connection with multi-storey flats and, because of these difficulties, it is easily understood why the limited company quite often offers a solution to the problem. The buyer of a flat merely obtains a share in the company and that share represents a given flat. The company itself is responsible for its services and the flat holders (who are the shareholders) control the company.

In small groups of flats where it is not possible to secure town planning approval to resubdivide, it is quite common to purchase the whole block as tenants-in-common. The individuals then agree that they will occupy a certain flat. Reciprocal caveats are lodged to protect these agreements. In view of all the above facts, and particularly because there does not appear to be any satisfactory way in which the present law can be amended, it is not proposed to institute legislation on these matters at the present time.

We should at least be consistent in regard to titles. If I build flats on a piece of land 60ft. by 150ft. I can let them, but if I want

to sell them I need a separate title for each flat, but the Town Planner will not approve of separate titles. I cannot get a clear title in respect of each flat because I cannot get a certificate from the Town Planner to take to the Registrar-General of Deeds. The Government says it believes in the Torrens system of titles and that under town planning legislation if I build a house on a certain area of land I can get a clear title. If the Town Planner agrees to the building of maisonettes on an area of 3,960 square feet I can get a clear title if I am lucky. In South Australia we have not as many flats as other States, particularly New South Wales. I do not know what the practice is in New South Wales except for what the Attorney-General told me. I anticipate that the number of flats in South Australia will increase but I cannot agree with the Attorney-General that a company should be formed when people buy a flat for about £3,500 or £4,000. The Government intends to continue this type of legislation, which is wrong. I speak only of ground flats, not the multi-storey flats they have in other States, where the people say they have a title to each flat, although I do not know how they get it. As I have said, if I build a house I can get a clear title but if I build a number of flats I must form a company. In other words, I must do something that is illegal.

Let me liken it to the position under the Lottery and Gaming Act. If I run something in the nature of a raffle where there is an element of chance I am liable to prosecution, but if I offer membership of a club I can probably get away with it. That applies to the recent controversy with regard to Sunday sport. If I were to stand in the street and sell a membership ticket I would like to know the court that could say I was breaking the law. It would be a contribution by way of membership that may entitle me to go and see, for instance, the Bob Hank Memorial Football Match, which was what the controversy was about.

We have comparatively few flats compared with other States. I am not concerned about how they are getting over the position in other States. What I am concerned about is that the legislation provides that before I can get a title to build on land in residential areas I must allow for a certain area of land or otherwise obtain the approval of the Town Planner. If I want to do something that is not of a legal standard—if I may use the term—and build a series of multi-

purpose or single flats, I am told I can go on the market and form a company. I think that is morally wrong and bad legislation, but this Government is not prepared to try to improve it.

I admit my guilt in connection with this legislation because I supported the second reading, but I did not think at the time that there would be so many implications in it. I asked a lengthy question in this House recently. Some of my colleagues accused me of attempting to make a second reading speech on the matter, and I do not want to be guilty of that again. I never imagined for one moment that under the Town Planning Act building blocks could be reaggregated and put under one or two titles. In the case in question the West Torrens Corporation was receiving £650 a year in rates from the South Australian Jockey Club, but because of the Town Planning Act and the reaggregation of that land the corporation will now receive only about £100 a year. I did not think we were going to do these things.

Mr. Lawn—Don't you know this Government looks after big business?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am concerned about it. The corporation of Marion takes in the Ascot Park subdivision and a large portion of the Edwardstown subdivision. It has a big acreage attached to the Morphettville racecourse, and if the South Australian Jockey Club gets its way under the Town Planning Act—and it seems to be well on the way to getting it—what will happen to the Marion Corporation? It will probably be informed that the Morphettville racecourse is to become open land, and it will be £5,000 down the drain. Let us examine what the South Australian Jockey Club does for the community. Any person who owns or trains a race horse pays a fee to take it on the racecourse whether it be for track work or for a race. Unless a person is given a complimentary ticket he must pay to go on the racecourse, and if he wishes to go to certain other enclosures he must pay an additional fee. In addition, people wishing to park their cars must pay a fee of 3s. to leave them on the land that has already come back as open land under the Town Planning Act. No children are allowed to play on these areas and no-one may play in the centre of the racecourse because it is the property of the South Australian Jockey Club.

I did not for one moment think that we would have a Town Planning Act that would

permit this land to be declared open land, to the advantage of the commercialized interests of the South Australian Jockey Club. If people get away with this sort of thing there must be a further amendment to the legislation, so that the moment land is declared open land the Crown could step in. I do not know what will happen in another five or 10 years with regard to land valuation. The land to which I refer consists of a frontage of approximately 1,000ft. on the Anzac Highway, and on today's valuation it is worth about £35 a foot. It could be worth double that amount in five or 10 years time, and the South Australian Jockey Club under this Act could apply for it to be subdivided. Why should it have that land at the expense of the other ratepayers merely to enable to it charge 3s. a head for parking?

Mr. Lawn—They belong to the top hat brigade.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My point is that if this is to be declared open land the Crown must step in, and if later there is an application for it to be subdivided for building or other purposes it should be valued at today's prices. The Government or the Crown should have the right to intervene in the matter. I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I join with other members on both sides of the House in expressing my congratulations and pleasure at seeing sick members back in their places. Although I have already made all these expressions personally I make them again now and they are no less sincere because I now include a welcome to Mr. Ralston, the new member for Mount Gambier. During the last hour or so we have had a speech from the member for Edwardstown. I am afraid the only point I picked out to which I desire to refer is one he made fairly early concerning the attitude of some South Australian Senators in the Snowy Mountains Agreement controversy. To use a common expression, the honourable member got stuck into them, and he criticized them because they voted against an amendment put forward by Labor members—apparently because they had accepted an assurance given by the Prime Minister. Actually, they were abundantly justified in what they did by subsequent events, because since then a compromise satisfactory to both sides has been reached. That, I suggest, justified the South Australian Senators in accepting the Prime Minister's assurance. That is all I want to say on that matter.

The member for Adelaide interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It ill becomes the honourable member to interject when another honourable member is speaking. He has already spoken. I was not present during the greater part of his speech, but have read it since, and if ever there was an empty speech with no contribution of value to the debate it was that of the honourable member. For the most part it consisted of personal abuse in the worst possible taste. If he thinks that personal abuse is funny, then all I can say is that it did not sound funny when I read it. He should have enough sense and experience to know that personal abuse is not humorous. It is very difficult to guess what his motive was unless it was a deliberate attempt to offend the susceptibilities of other honourable members. If that was his object then I congratulate him, because he undoubtedly succeeded, but if he thinks that is a worthy contribution to the debate I most emphatically disagree. He made no contribution at all to the debate except what was personally offensive to members on this side. This is a very appropriate time for the honourable member to keep silent.

The speech with which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to open this session reflects the achievements of the Government and its plans for the future in carrying out its great aim and policy—and for the benefit of members opposite who may have forgotten that aim is the utmost development of the State's resources, as in fact it is the aim of the Federal Government. We are taunted by members opposite with not having a policy, and with pinching the policy of the Labor Party; but what members of that Party deliberately ignore all the time, apparently for their own political advantage—so called—is that the grand policy of the Liberal and Country League in this State and of the Liberal Party in Australia is the greatest possible development of Australia for the good of all—for it is for the good of all that South Australia and Australia should be developed. Such development is for the good of every section of the community, not just one section. The Government's policy of development was mentioned in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech.

There can be no doubt that at this time Australia is one of the best countries in which to live. At my age, and I hope I have many years ahead, I know of no better country in which to live. Its development is ahead of us, and if it is not wrecked by the Socialists

opposite its future in the hands of a Liberal administration is assured. That is the picture we have of Australia and that is the aim which we, on this side, have before us. No one can doubt the measure of our success.

We all know of the magnificent things which happened in South Australia in March. There was an announcement that a number of industries were to come to this State, such as the establishment of steelworks at Whyalla, of an oil refinery, the proposed expansion of General Motors-Holdens at Elizabeth, and the order for the construction of a super oil tanker at Whyalla. Those are tangible results of the policy of development pursued by this Government—all coming in the one month.

Mr. Lawn—Don't you think that similar announcements are being made in the other States?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No.

Mr. Lawn—Talk some sense. The Premier of New South Wales came back from overseas with three industries worth £1,300,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—He came back empty-handed.

The SPEAKER—Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. If the honourable member for Adelaide continues to interject as he has done I will name him. There have been too many interjections in the last week or so. I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting. Under Standing Orders they are out of order and I will not tolerate a continuance of interjections in the way they have been made in the last week or so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—We have still to hear about the industries which have come to New South Wales and other States. Let us look at the position squarely and see what is going on in Australia. One has only to compare the development of industry in those States that are under a Liberal administration to see the results of Liberal policy compared with those in States still dominated by the Labor Party. Even Queensland, which is now awakening from the long night of Labor rule, is beginning to expand and develop. There can be no doubt at all that that is due in very large part to the policy that has been pursued by Liberals in Australia.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You are not going to credit Queensland's prosperity to the present Government, are you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I certainly am, because that prosperity is only beginning to mushroom since the present Government came into office.

That is the aim of our party, and there you see the results of it. Members opposite might ask why we do it, and I have already given part of the answer: because we have regard to the interests of all sections of the community. That is our aim. We believe that the good of the individual citizen is paramount, that his self development can take place only in favourable conditions, and if he has freedom and liberty to develop his capacity to the utmost. That, of course, is where we get the name "Liberal Party," because we stress this aspect of personal freedom at all times. It is the crux of our policy, and we see it effectively mirrored in His Excellency's Speech.

On the other hand, what have we on the other side of the House? All we have, and it has come out from time to time during this debate, is doctrinaire Socialism and unification. That is absolutely all members opposite have to put, and it is not even practical. They can trot out the catch phrases of socialism, but if you scratch under the surface you find they have no policy at all. That has come out time and time again in this debate, and perhaps I could refer to one or two occasions when it has been manifest. When the Leader of the Opposition spoke on this motion, he said:—

We are told that there is no money but if a war broke out tomorrow there would be no shortage of money. Surely we can do in peacetime those things we have no difficulty of doing in war-time? I think I will leave this subject there.

However, the Minister of Works would not allow him to leave it there. The Leader was not prepared to face the logical conclusion of what he had already said; he was not prepared to admit that Labor policy of war-time controls, which he was apparently advocating, would mean a restriction on our economy and on the personal liberty of the individual. That is the sort of thing the Labor Party likes to keep very much under the lap at all times, and especially just before an election. On that occasion the Leader was caught very neatly by the Minister of Works and was not prepared to face up to the consequences of what he had said.

Mr. Hambour—He did not mention defence powers, either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No, he did not. That only goes to show that while members opposite voice these platitudes of Socialism, old fashioned as they are, they are not prepared to face the effect their policy would have on the community. We have heard many cries about decentralization from members opposite, and

this is another example of their lack of willingness to stand up to their policy. We have never heard from them one constructive proposal, and when the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) was making a powerful speech on the subject, I asked by way of interjection just what he was going to do about it. Of course, the only thing he could suggest, and he suggested it rather lamely, was that some sort of committee should be set up to co-ordinate information. That, after all he had been saying about decentralization, was his only concrete suggestion. Does he not think that any industry preparing to come to Australia or South Australia finds out what is going on? Does he not think that the Government is only too willing to supply information about any part of the State at any time, and does he not know the work done by the Industries Development Committee? It is absurd when you scratch below the surface and see the vacuum underneath, because that is all there is. They have no constructive proposals on this subject or any other. They are entirely doctrinaire in their outlook and entirely careless of the true welfare and liberties of the people. Let the people of this State beware of Labor promises and their real implications!

I have already mentioned decentralization. I do not know what has happened to members opposite: they seem to have disappeared for the time being. I do not know whether my remarks have been stinging them or not, but I shall say no more about the subject.

Mr. Hambour—They cannot take it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Maybe that is so.

Mr. Hambour—They may be having a Caucus meeting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—They may. Decentralization is one of the catch phrases we have heard in this debate. Another one that has come up time and time again is unification. It has been strenuously denied by members opposite that their policy is one of unification, and the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) became quite heated when speaking on this matter. He said that what he wanted was sovereign powers vested in the Federal Government and decentralized administration. That is absolute nonsense, as he well knows—centralized sovereignty is in fact unification. Let the people of this State know that the only reason why the Labor Party wants to regain power here is so that they can wreck this State and do away with it altogether. Perhaps they also want to impose Socialism, but primarily they want to wreck the constitutional struc-

ture of South Australia and all the other States, so let the people beware of their policy. Again we see the doctrinaire approach to this matter. I challenged the member for Norwood to say just what he would do if the States were abolished and we had supreme sovereignty in Canberra, but he could not say just what his Party proposed. They have been prating about unification for decades, but it never gets past talking or theorising. That is the so-called policy of the Labor Party on this matter.

I believe wholeheartedly in the Federal system of government in Australia and that it is in the best interests of the people. I believe in the diffusion of powers of government and that some matters can best be handled by a national Parliament and others at the State level. I do not believe in centralizing power in any one centre on this vast continent. I believe wholeheartedly in the doctrine of Federalism.

We have also heard something from members opposite about the South Australian electoral system, to which the Labor Party ascribes its lack of success at the polls over the past few years. Their defeat, however, is due not to that, but to their own rotten system of pre-selection. They have what is known as the card voting system, which the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) and other members opposite have had the effrontery to say is democratic. Even on the face of it one can see four fallacies in that claim. Firstly, it is impudent of the Australian Labor Party to claim that all trade unionists in South Australia vote for the Party. That is not so, for a good proportion of unionists vote against the Labor Party and for the Liberal and Country League. Secondly—and this is even more glaring impudence on the part of the Labor Party—it is absurd to suggest that every unionist has a say in how his delegate will vote on a pre-selection. We know that, unfortunately, only a small proportion of unionists attend union meetings and it is absurd to suggest that they get real representation of their views at pre-selections.

Thirdly, it is absurd to suggest that all trade unionists would vote the same way and, therefore, that one delegate can represent many thousands of unionists. Fourthly—and perhaps Mr. Stephens (the member for Port Adelaide) will say something about this when he speaks—most people who vote at pre-selections for Labor candidates do not even live in the district for which the candidate is being selected. In fact, the card voting

system merely means that some individuals exercise a greater influence than others on pre-selection ballots. That is the antithesis of democracy. Of course, the real reason why the Labor Party must have a card voting system is that its local branches are extremely weak, if not non-existent. This is the real reason why the Labor Party in this State has been kept in the doldrums for many years. Indeed, the card voting system is not popular even in the Labor Party itself and moves have been made to abandon it, but they have been defeated by the very card vote they desire to abolish.

Mr. King—Do you think unions pay affiliation fees on the same basis as they claim voting strength?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I should like to know that, but it is impossible to find out. Time after time Labor members have said that their platform is available to anyone who wants to see it. Only last week Mr. Dunstan said that the Leader of the Opposition autographed copies and let all members have them, but Mr. O'Halloran has not given me one yet. Mr. Dunstan also said that one could go to the Trades Hall and get a copy of the platform. I took him at his word and this morning called at the headquarters of the Party in Morialta Street to ask for a copy. When I made my request the pleasant lady at the counter looked at me as though I were a ghost and whipped into the office through a door. No sooner had she done that than a pleasant man came out of a luxuriously carpeted office and asked what I required. I said I wanted a copy of the platform of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia. He then told me that the platform was away at the printer's for reprinting. I said, with as much politeness as I could muster, "Could I have an old copy, perhaps not up-to-date?" He said, "No, they have all gone to the printers."

That is what I was told only this morning when I called at the headquarters of this great Australian Labor Party to get a copy of its platform; yet members opposite have the effrontery to say it is freely available to all members. Let them hand out a few copies of this platform if they want to. My experience was in direct contrast to that of anyone desiring a copy of the Liberal and Country League platform: all he must do is to walk into the front office of the Liberal and Country League where he will find them on the counter waiting to be picked up.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Is there a copy of the Labor Party platform in the Parliamentary Library?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—At lunch time today I tried to get a copy from the Parliamentary Library, but I was told that the only copy available there was dated October, 1946.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The member for Norwood will present one to you some time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That will be very good of him. I do not blame the library staff for not having a copy of the platform; indeed, I know that they have often asked for a copy and it has been deliberately refused. This document is, in fact, secret. To use the words of the member for Norwood on another matter last week, I give him the lie direct when he says that the Labor Party's platform is readily available to members of the public. I suggest that it was deliberately kept from me this morning even when I told the man in the Labor Party office that members opposite had boasted that I could get one there.

Mr. Hambour—The member for Norwood has promised to get one for you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Many times, but it has not been forthcoming.

Mr. Jenkins—Maybe they had their suspicions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Perhaps, and the rump of the Party left in the Chamber at this time is remarkably silent. The others have gone out, but the three members left are silent. I should like to refer to other statements in Mr. Dunstan's speech. He had the effrontery to reflect on the system of pre-selection of members on this side and said that some Government members had deliberately connived, Mr. Speaker, at the defeat of your predecessor (Sir Robert Nicholls) in a pre-selection ballot. It is not so long since the member for Norwood was a member of our Party, and I cannot believe that his memory is so short that he cannot remember how our system of pre-selection works. I do not believe he was sincere in what he said on that matter. He knows that no member in this Chamber, with the exception of the member for Gouger, had anything to do with the pre-selection of the candidate for that district at the last election, for we work on the principle that the members of our Party in the electorate concerned should be the sole arbiters in selecting our candidate.

Mr. Shannon—It is often a great disservice to a candidate to have the support of a sitting member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That is so, and it is absurd and incorrect for the member for Norwood to suggest that any honourable member had any influence upon the result of the Gouger pre-selection, or the pre-selection for any other seat. The member for Norwood knew that.

Mr. Heaslip—Did he ever belong to any other Party?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—He has belonged to almost every Party which is operating in this State today.

Mr. Shannon—Except the Democratic Labor Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—He has never been a member of that, but perhaps that will be the next.

Mr. Heaslip—Did he belong to the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I believe he did. He had the effrontery to reflect upon our system of pre-selection, which is absolutely the fairest that could be evolved. He also said there were no pressure groups or undue influences affecting pre-selections for members on this side of the House. When I started talking about the A.L.P. platform I was going to say it was impossible to learn just what the card system of voting was. I cannot find that even from this venerable copy of the A.L.P. platform which I have here. We shall never know what influence individuals have, but we can get a pretty good idea when we read the reports in newspapers of what Labor members themselves say. The member for Norwood reflected upon the very idea of canvassing on behalf of candidates. He said it was never done in his own Party, but I shall quote from a report in the *Advertiser* of June 16 under the heading "Two Sitting Labor Men Lose Endorsement." One of those members was the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Stephens), and this is what the *Advertiser* reported him as saying after the result of the pre-selection was known:—

I am naturally disappointed, but today's vote does not mean that the people of Port Adelaide do not still have the confidence in me that they have expressed over the years.

That may be the case, for most of the people who voted on the pre-selection had no association with Port Adelaide. Mr. Stephens went on:—

I don't blame the Labor Party, but no man can stand up against it when the vote is keyed up against him.

If that does not mean there was canvassing and organized opposition to the honourable member I do not know what it does mean, yet the member for Norwood had the effrontery to say in this House that there was no canvassing in any pre-selection for Labor Party nominations.

The member for Port Pirie (Mr. Davis) said something about unity in the Labor Party. We hear a lot from members opposite from time to time about the D.L.P. I believe they belong to the Australian Labor Party, and in answer to our questions they say that the D.L.P. is nothing but a splinter group of the Liberals whose aim is apparently to help the Liberals. They say that the D.L.P. is supported and financed by my Party, but they will have to eat their words soon because the Federal Executive of the A.L.P., which is the master of members opposite has decreed that at the next elections the Labor preferences will go to the D.L.P. before going to any other Party. I am glad that the member for Port Pirie has just re-entered the Chamber, and I congratulate him on his courage in doing so. Members opposite often hurl insults at the D.L.P., yet their preferences will go to that Party before going to any other Party.

Mr. Davis—Not mine.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Then the honourable member will be expelled from his Party.

Mr. Shannon—He will find himself in the D.L.P.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That could be. It is proposed to give the A.L.P. preferences to the D.L.P. as an attempt to heal the split in the Party. Members opposite used two main arguments to attack Government policy but they were both empty. One was decentralization, and the other the electoral system. Let the people of South Australia beware of the Labor Party! All we would get from a Labor Government would be Socialism and the wrecking of the Federal and State Constitutions. The power of this Parliament would be swept away, so I hope the people will remember that at the next election.

Mr. Davis—That is wishful thinking on your part.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No, absolute realism on my part. I shall now refer to the vexed question of sewerage in the hills district of my electorate. For a long time the people of Belair, Blackwood and Eden Hills have been awaiting sewerage. We have been told that money is being spent on surveys. I am glad

that the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech said there would be a continuation of the policy of sewerage both metropolitan and country areas, and I hope that the hills area will be seweraged in the not distant future.

In the last six months or so I have had some experience of the working of the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act and have found it the most complicated piece of legislation I have ever attempted to interpret. I do not claim to be perfect in interpreting statutes, but I have had some training and experience in so doing. It is extremely difficult to understand the sense, rhyme or reason behind the Act. How can any man who gains his living as a milk vendor or wholesaler be expected to know his position under that Act which seems to be absolutely riddled with bureaucracy and red tape? The only result of its 10 years' operation has been to reduce the number of wholesalers operating in the metropolitan area from 16 to six and it is threatening to reduce that number even further and is bringing nearer a monopoly, which is entirely opposed to the principles and ideals of the Party to which I belong. I do not blame the members of the Metropolitan Milk Board for that, because, after all, they can only administer the legislation Parliament enacts. I suggest it is time the Government carefully examined this legislation to see whether it could be improved and much of the bureaucracy and red tape cut away.

My next suggestion is for the construction of a swimming pool in the National Park. This matter, which has been suggested by a number of people in my electorate in which the Park is situated, has been brought forward by the Blackwood sub-branch of the R.S.L.

Mr. Davis—Who should build the swimming pool?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I suggest that it should be built and I go no further than that at present. Undoubtedly considerable Government financial assistance would be needed. It would not be the first swimming pool that has been helped by the Government. National Park is an ideal situation for a swimming pool. Swimming pools are notoriously noisy and can be a nuisance to people living nearby, but in the National Park that nuisance could not possibly arise because it would be away from residences. In a circular relating to this matter the Blackwood sub-branch of the R.S.L. stated:—

It is most surprising that the National Park, which is an ideal place, does not have a pool already. The pool will be of great value as an aid to teaching swimming and lifesaving to children and adults and, in particular, a valuable asset for recreational

youth work. It will attract thousands of visitors to the National Park. There have been over 500 deaths from drowning in South Australia since the last war. Neither the police nor military personnel receive instruction in swimming because of lack of facilities. More than 50 per cent of the population is unable to swim.

I give the suggestion my wholehearted support. A swimming pool is needed either in or close to the metropolitan area. We have, of course, the Adelaide City Baths, but with the growth of the metropolitan area's population it is no longer able to cope with those who desire to use it.

Mr. Davis—How do you expect the children in the country to learn to swim if they have no facilities?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—There is a need in the metropolitan area just as there is a need in the country. There can be no better site than National Park for such a pool in the metropolitan area. In the last few weeks the Public Works Committee has recommended the erection of a primary school at Clapham. This is one of the fastest growing parts of my electorate and another rapidly growing part is Blackwood. I am glad that the Clapham school is to be built and I congratulate the Minister of Education on the purchase at Blackwood of a site for a future high school. That has not been accomplished without some ups and downs, but we who live in this part of the hills are delighted that the department will have a site upon which to build a high school. The move which took place at Blackwood in support of the plan to purchase land for that purpose underlines the tremendous fund of community spirit there and I am proud to represent that area. I do not think we would have secured any land there had it not been for the effort made in furtherance of this scheme by people in the district.

At the beginning of July it was announced in the press that a £500,000 building would be erected for the University of Adelaide on the site of the old Exhibition Building. That is a remarkable forward step and it simply complements the building programme which has taken place at the University in the last few years. A few nights ago I was in the new Union Hall at the University and thought it a most delightful building. I congratulate the University upon its erection. The problem we are facing is that the University site is almost filled and it will not be possible to continue to expand the University there much longer.

That is happening at the very time that we are approaching what I suppose can be termed a crisis in tertiary education. Since the last session of Parliament there has appeared the Murray Report on Australian universities. I should like to direct the attention of members to parts of that report. It has been said that it seems to dwell only upon the shortcomings of Australian universities. Of course, to a large extent that is true because that aspect was embraced by the terms of reference given to that committee, but I know for a fact, because I have been told by the incoming member for the Federal seat of Adelaide (Mr. Ian B. C. Wilson) who heard it from Sir Keith Murray himself, that Sir Keith considered there were very many excellent features in Australian universities. They are ignored in the report only because of the terms of reference given to the committee. This is what the committee says:—

In the preceding chapters we have discussed the situation in the Australian universities as we see it today. We have shown the serious problems which are confronting them in their attempts to deal with the student numbers as they are at present. The situation, which may be termed critical, may well become catastrophic in 10 years' time if the problems of the next decade are not anticipated immediately.

Then, having opened the chapter with that paragraph, the report goes on to deal with the population increase in Australia and points out that this has been due not only to natural increase but to migrant intake. It also points out, so far as the universities are concerned:—

In addition to this general increase in population and particularly in the numbers of younger people, there has been a rise in the proportion of boys and girls who are remaining at school to matriculation level and thus qualifying for entry to the universities.

The conclusion drawn by the committee from that is, as I have mentioned earlier, that the present crisis may become catastrophic in 10 years' time if enrolments continue at the present rate. The report continues:—

Various attempts have been made to predict university enrolment over the next few years making allowance for the increase in population the effect of immigration and the increase in the proportion of school pupils reaching matriculation level . . . Compared with the present student population of 36,465, the 1965 enrolment is expected to be as high as 70,785, an increase of 94 per cent.

The expected increase for each of the Australian universities is given in a table. For the University of Adelaide, the figure for 1957 is given as 4,584; in 1965 that figure is

expected to rise to 8,500. In other words, it is expected that by 1965 the number of students in the University of Adelaide will be almost double what it is today. That portion of the report concludes with this sentence, which I suggest is very important and significant:—

The magnitude of this increase and of the problems with which the universities will be expected to deal has not, in our opinion, yet been fully appreciated either inside or outside the universities.

In other words, we have in the University of Adelaide a site that will soon not be large enough for any increase or extension. That we have on the one hand. On the other hand, we have an expected tremendous increase in the number of students desiring to attend the university—almost double in a matter of eight or nine years. That is the problem facing us in South Australia.

How can we possibly solve that problem? My suggestion, which I make now for the consideration of the Government and all others interested, is that it is time we started to think about a second university for South Australia. I am told—and I believe that this is accurate: the member for Burnside will bear me out—that the cost for each student at the Adelaide University is approximately the same as that for the University of Melbourne. In other words, although the University of Melbourne is a much larger university, our costs of administration are the same. That means that, as the size of the university increases further, the costs of administration do not increase. Therefore, we shall not lose anything by not continuing to increase the size of the university of Adelaide but rather founding another institution. I make that suggestion. If that is accepted, where should a second university for South Australia be? Unhesitatingly, I suggest that it should be in or close to the metropolitan area. The Murray Report deals with suggestions for a second university in Victoria. This is the conclusion reached:—

In so far as there may be argument that a second university should be located outside the Melbourne metropolitan area, it appears unanswerable to us that if it is to provide the necessary relief for the University of Melbourne and to meet the needs of Victorian industry, it must be a part of the city which embraces over 60 per cent of the population and the overwhelming proportion of the industry of the State.

I suggest that what holds good for Melbourne in this case holds good also for Adelaide. An

additional point mentioned here is the difficulty encountered in country centres. There is there the tremendous difficulty of libraries. It is almost impossible in these days to get together a library providing adequately for university research. Therefore, institutions of learning, as a new university would be, must be handy to good library facilities. If we are satisfied that we shall need a new university, as I suggest is certain, within the next 10 years and if we accept that it must be in the metropolitan area, for the reasons I have given and for other reasons, then where best could it be located?

I have two suggestions for consideration. I am not wedded to either of them and it could well be that there are more satisfactory alternatives. Often the mental hospital at Parkside has been suggested as a possible site for a university. It certainly fulfills all the requirements I have already mentioned. It may be that, because of the extensive building programme carried out in Parkside in the last few years, it would not be practicable to convert it into a university.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—A sound reason why a mental hospital should be near the centre of the city is that people like to visit relatives.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That is a sound reason. Whether it is desirable, now that the mental hospital is entirely surrounded by houses, that it should be so close to the centre of the city or whether it could not be located at Northfield is another matter.

Mr. Shannon—Its character is changing somewhat. It is more of a hospital now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That may be. I suggest the Parkside site as a possibility. I think it was first suggested as far back as 1917. Another possible site is the Waite Institute, at Urrbrae, where the Adelaide University has moved a number of departments, but I believe the land there is bound by a trust of some kind and that may prevent its utilization for a second university. I hope I speak for all my constituents when I say a university in their area would be welcomed. I put the two alternative sites forward for consideration. The need for a second university will exist, if it does not already exist, within 10 years. Victoria is tackling the problem but I suggest it is too late. Now is the time for South Australia to begin thinking of the problem and working out a solution.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—It is a live question for discussion at present.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am glad to hear that. I am sorry I frightened Opposition members from the Chamber—I did not mean to; but they are straggling back one by one, which will probably give Mr. Stephens a far better go than I have had. I felt I had to mention these matters in rebuttal of some of the nonsense that came from members opposite. I felt also that I should make some constructive suggestions, and that is why I mentioned the Adelaide University. I hope the proper authorities will bear in mind the suggestions I made about my district.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I support the motion and express sincere regret at the passing of the late Mr. Fletcher, whom I knew for many years. He was highly respected in Mount Gambier and in this House. To his widow and family I express sincere sympathy. I congratulate Mr. Ralston on his election. The Mount Gambier electors made a wise choice and I hope he will be here for as many years as I have. I regret that through ill-health Sir Malcolm McIntosh had to resign from the Ministry and I wish him a speedy recovery so that he can enjoy many years of retirement. I had many dealings with him when he was Minister of Marine, and I appreciate the assistance he gave in many matters affecting my district. When some of my constituents had to leave their homes because their land was required by the Harbors Board a satisfactory compensation settlement was arranged without recourse to the court. Sir Malcolm was reasonable in his handling of the matter.

The Harbors Board is rendering a good service to the State. The Port Adelaide wharves were in a shocking condition when owned and controlled by the South Australian Company and other private companies. I saw the wheels of vehicles go through the wharf decking and men injured because of it. I saw three shunt horses fall through the decking into the water and drown. It was fortunate that the shunter and hook boy were not seriously injured. Shed roofs leaked and goods were damaged. There could be no dredging alongside the wharves because the wharves would have fallen into the water if there had been any deepening. Ships had to wait for high tides in order to berth and to leave wharves. At the time Port Adelaide was regarded as the worst port in the Commonwealth and a disgrace to South Australia. Government members talk about the slow working of ships by waterside workers, but that

is nothing to the time that was wasted because the private companies would not put the wharves in good condition. When the wharf resumption legislation was discussed many years ago it was said that the Government was acting wrongly in assuming control. However, if the control of the wharves had been left to private enterprise South Australia would have been a lot further back than it is today. Private enterprise control of the wharves at Port Adelaide was an absolute failure and detrimental to the people of the State.

Mr. O'Halloran—I think it was a Labor Government that took them over.

Mr. STEPHENS—It was a Labor Government that passed the wharf resumption Bill; I think Tom Price was the Premier. In many other instances private enterprise has failed. I remember that when the Adelaide Electric Supply Company had charge of electricity services the people at Kilburn wanted the service extended there. A meeting was held and following that I attended a deputation which submitted its case. We were told that we would have to guarantee payment for the poles and wires and also guarantee a certain income before the company would instal electricity. It was not worried about the service to the people; all it was looking for was profit, and consequently the people there had to go without electricity. Since the Government passed legislation taking over electricity services it has done a wonderful job; I am satisfied that every member of this House will agree with that.

Electricity is now supplied to all parts of the country to help people on farms and in country districts generally. It is giving them something that they require—a real service. Some members opposite say that it is Socialism; we heard a little on that topic from the last speaker, but he knows only what he has been told and has not thought these things out for himself. I remember reading in the paper what he said about the Liberal Union before he was elected to this House, and I also read his condemnation of the Liberal Union that he is today praising while he is criticizing the Opposition. I can take all his criticism, but he should remember that people in glass houses should not throw stones. He said some awful things about his own Party when speaking in the Liberal Union about the democratic vote.

Mr. Dunstan—No, it was at the Liberal Party conference, and he was called all sorts of names.

Mr. STEPHENS—That may be so. If the Electricity Trust can be called a Socialistic idea I do not mind; people can call it what they like, but it is something that has rendered a service to this State. I remember that when the Bill was going through this House it was criticized by many supporters of the present Government. Every member of the Labor Party voted for it, and as a result it had just enough support to get through. That cannot be said for the Liberal Party, some members of which voted against their own Premier. They would not have had electricity to the extent they have today had it not been for the Australian Labor Party. The legislation was thrown out by the other House in the first instance. Although members of the Government voted against the legislation not one Labor member opposed it in either House. After the Bill was defeated by the Legislative Council the Government called a special meeting, and it was as a result of something Government members were told that they backed down and changed their vote. The Labor Party was instrumental in getting the legislation passed, and it has given South Australia the electricity service that it has today.

Public ownership is condemned by some people, but where would South Australia be today if it were not for some of our Government and public-owned institutions? Where would we be today if it were not for our railways which opened up the country and gave us a start? I am disgusted when I hear members opposite complain that the railways are charging so much more for this and that. Some supporters of the Government have the privilege, because they happen to be primary producers, of paying a lesser rate for registration of the motor vehicles that they use on their farms. That concession is only given to them while they use the motor vehicle on the farm, but some have had to admit to the Minister that they have used that same vehicle for carting goods in competition with the railways. That is a disgraceful thing, and the people who do that are not playing the game with the Government, no matter which Government happens to be in power. They are gaining a concession under false pretences. I maintain that private enterprise could never have provided the services that the railways have done.

Where would the people of South Australia be today if it were not for the Housing Trust? I think it was two sessions ago that His Excellency in his opening Speech said that the

Federal Government had arranged to bring migrants to South Australia and that the South Australian Government had agreed to find work and housing for them. I have complained many times about the housing made available to these people.

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

Mr. STEPHENS—Prior to the adjournment I said that our railways had rendered excellent service. I have never considered that they should make a profit, but as a result of their operations large tracts of country have been opened thus increasing the value of surrounding lands. I have often said that some of the increased collections from land tax should be credited to the railways because of their effect on the value of land.

The Housing Trust, with money supplied by the Government, has done a wonderful job. Although we hear complaints about it, we must remember that had it not been in operation thousands of people would still have been without accommodation. The trust has built 33,423 houses in addition to converting 159 army huts. Allowing for four people to each house, which is not an over-estimate, 134,288 people have thus been housed. However, many hundreds are still waiting. Private enterprise failed to provide accommodation and the trust stepped in.

Mr. Shannon—During the same period as many houses were built privately as by the trust.

Mr. STEPHENS—That surprises me. What would have been the position had the Engineering and Water Supply Department not supplied water and sewerage services? Some honourable members would refer to this as a socialistic enterprise. Then we have our forests and tramways. When private enterprise controlled the tramways many years ago the services did not approach those provided today. What would be the position if private enterprise were in control today?—although I believe that an even better service could be supplied. It would be better if our tramways were controlled by a transport Minister, or by a transport board, which could control both tramways and railways. We could learn from past mistakes.

I have heard honourable members criticize the Metropolitan Abattoirs and the Export Depot. When the abattoirs first started it supplied meat only to those living in the metropolitan area. At the same time the Export Depot operating at Port Adelaide also did slaughtering. However, it lost money,

whereas the abattoirs made a comfortable surplus. All the money borrowed for this enterprise had to be paid back to the Government, plus interest. Whereas one Government department made a profit, the other recorded a loss because it did not charge enough for the slaughter, freezing and export of lambs, but the charges were not increased because the object was to provide a cheaper service to the producers. It was the big station owners that those in charge looked after. People in the metropolitan area had to pay more for their meat to counteract the losses of the export depot.

I believe it was the Gunn Government that inaugurated the Government Insurance Office, which returned the following profits:—In 1924-25, £9,825; 1925-26, £14,018; 1926-27, £15,108; 1927-28, £14,224; 1928-29, £13,923. About that time the Liberal Government came into office and being opposed to such Government instrumentalities took action to prevent its competing with private insurance companies, despite the fact that as a result of its activities thousands of pounds had been paid into general revenue, although it had operated only in a small way. I was insured with the Government Insurance Office for workmen's compensation benefits. I received a letter stating that it had been decided that it should not continue in competition with outside insurance companies and that I must make other arrangements for my insurance. The day after receiving that letter from the Government Insurance Office I received a letter from one of the private companies asking me to give it my insurance because the Government scheme was closing. When the Government office closed, it made a present of thousands of pounds to the insurance companies. I could give the names of some of the companies, but I do not want to do so. It was wrong for the Government to give the profits to someone else. A friend of mine who worked out the progress being made by the Government scheme calculated that by this time we would have had sufficient profits from it to pay for all hospitalization in the metropolitan area. It was wicked to give to private enterprise one of the best assets the people had. Mr. Millhouse said he was trying to get a copy of the platform of the Australian Labor Party, and in doing so went to the Labor Party office and saw a man in a room with a luxuriously carpeted floor.

Mr. Millhouse—He did not ask me into his office; he came out to see me.

Mr. STEPHENS—The honourable member said that this man came out on this luxurious carpet. I do not think he knew where he was. What value can we put on any statement he made, because he could not have been in the Trades Hall, where there are no carpets.

Mr. Millhouse—I was in the headquarters of the Australian Labor Party. There was a notice there.

Mr. STEPHENS—What condition were you in? There are no carpets on the floor, and as the honourable member says he saw the carpet, what value can we place on other things he said he saw?

Mr. Millhouse—I did not really see very much, because the door was not open.

Mr. STEPHENS—If the honourable member had a witness in the box who said he had made a mistake, he would be one of the first to say to the judge, "How much reliance can you place on the evidence given by this witness who said there were carpets on the floor when in fact there were none?" This statement reduces the value of all he said. As members know, I expect this will be the last opportunity I will have to speak to the Address in Reply, so I take this opportunity to thank the electors of Port Adelaide for their loyal support during the 25 years I have represented them in this House. I have always tried to do the best for my district and as a result I have not only been at the top of the poll in each election, but have increased my majority each time I have come before the electors. In 1933 I had a majority of 2,506, in 1938, 4,421, in 1941, 4,480 and in 1944 I was elected unopposed. In 1947 I had a majority of 12,804, in 1950, 17,908, and in 1953, 22,919. I think this was the biggest vote gained by any member of Parliament in Australia for a single electorate. In 1956, after the alteration of districts, and when 7,000 electors were transferred to another district, my majority was 13,645. The vote of 16,320 I received at the last elections was the highest number of votes received by any candidate in the State.

My loyalty to my Party and to the electors of Port Adelaide has never been questioned. Although the Party to which I belong has been in opposition all the time I have been in Parliament, I have been successful in securing some benefits to the people. When we had State taxation I was able to get deduction allowances for amounts paid to friendly societies and trade unions. Although they were not big amounts, they meant a lot to the workers over the years. I was also successful

in getting the Government to amend the Marine Act to bring it more into line with the Commonwealth Navigation Act and the Board of Trade Regulations—an English Act. This was altered in the constitution of the South Australian Marine Board. I think some members in this House remember the fight I put up over what I will refer to as the *Nelcebee* case. I am proud that after years of fighting I got the Act altered, and although the man who had his certificate taken away from him could not get the same certificate returned, he became one of our leading naval officers and did a wonderful job during the war. I am pleased that the Government realized that an injustice had been done to the master of the *Nelcebee* and paid him damages and most of the costs. I felt that I was doing what was right, that the man had been unjustly treated, and although it took me a long time to convince members, I am glad that I finally convinced them and saw that justice was done in that case and that the Act and the constitution were so amended as to obviate the chance of the episode being repeated. I was also successful, after many attempts, in having a resolution passed by this House, favouring free milk for school children.

Mr. Quirke—How about orange juice now?

Mr. STEPHENS—I know that some members consider that free milk did not do all we thought it would for school children, but I am satisfied that it has done much good. The other day I heard the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) say he thought that orange juice might be better and, although I will not contradict him, for I do not know, I am able to quote the authority of leading medical men, such as the late Dr. Cowan, who was an expert in the treatment of tuberculosis and said that it had made much difference to the health of the children. A lady doctor who was attached to the Education Department said in her report that free milk had been beneficial. However, if orange juice or any other beverage will do the children good I hope that they will get it.

When I visited New Zealand I saw many schools and was proud of what the Education Department of that country was doing. If any other member gets the opportunity to visit New Zealand to see what is being done there, he should go. In South Australia we have a dentist who examines the teeth of school children and if he finds that teeth should be removed, filled or treated in some other way,

he recommends the treatment and that is the end of it; some of those children do not receive the consideration from parents they should receive. In New Zealand, however, when a child has bad teeth a report is sent home to tell the parents that the teeth should be removed or filled and that on a certain date the treatment will be given in the presence of the parents, if they can attend. Whether or not the parents attend, the teeth are removed or filled on that date. The child is then sent home in the company of a teacher. All that treatment and care is given free. I saw the room and the equipment used for treating teeth and I thought it excellent. Most schools in New Zealand have a swimming pool, besides many other educational and medical facilities.

I remind members that at my instigation a resolution was passed by this House that in its opinion free milk should be supplied to school children. When I first moved the motion it was defeated; the second time it was defeated by five votes; the next time by three votes; the fourth time it was defeated on the casting vote of the Speaker. I do not blame the Speaker (Sir Robert Nicholls) for that, because he could vote in no other way: custom dictated that he must not cast his vote in such a way as to increase expenditure. He was prepared to give me all the assistance he could, but he could not give me his casting vote. I moved the motion again next session and I am pleased to say it was carried by a majority of one; but the Government did not carry out the terms of the resolution. We say that the people are governed by Parliament, but even though this beneficial action was recommended, the Premier said that free milk would not be given to school children and it was left to the Federal Government to implement the terms of the resolution.

I was also successful in having the Lottery and Gaming Act amended to provide better facilities for trotting meetings. One result of this move has been that South Australian charities have received many additional thousands of pounds as donations. I remember when the late Hon. A. P. Blesing was the Minister controlling the Bush Fire Relief Fund. He told me that they did not have enough money to feed and clothe all the people who had been burnt out. I immediately rang up the Trotting Club, called a special meeting of the committee and we were able to donate a large sum. We also donated a large sum to the *H.M.A.S. Sydney* fund, and we were able to finance a mobile kitchen which had

been proposed by the boys stationed at Wayville under Col. Waite during the second war, to feed bombed-out people in England. Later, it was suggested that we make another donation for the war effort and we were able to provide the cost of an air fighter. Besides that, we have assisted many charities. For instance, we gave £46,183 15s. 4d. to the R.S.L. Welfare Fund; £18,216 5s. 8d. to the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital; £17,598 16s. 7d. to the Legacy Club; £1,676 11s. to the Children's Hospital; and £7,488 12s. 3d. in miscellaneous donations, making a total of £91,164 0s. 10d. Totalizer fractions amounted to £41,323 18s. 3d., making a grand total of £132,487 19s. 1d. from the funds of the South Australian Trotting Club for charitable institutions, and I have not mentioned many smaller bodies to which the club has made donations. I feel proud that I was able to do something for many charities.

I have seen my district develop remarkably, and today Port Adelaide is one of the most modern ports in Australia. People who have not seen the port for many years are surprised when they return and see the improvements that have been made to our wharves and foreshores. I hope the Government will do something to make the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act function more fairly. I do not think any member opposite ever thought that landlords would take so much advantage of this legislation. A few weeks ago I asked the following question in the House:—

Paragraph (d) of section 6 (2) of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act states:—

“With respect to any lease in writing of any dwellinghouse the lease of which is for two years or more and which is entered into after the passing of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act Amendment Act, 1954;” That section excludes such leases from rent control. Is there any law that compels a lessor or lessee to have leases registered, or is there anything in the Act to prevent lessees from being forced to pay exorbitant rents? Landlords can put a tenant out and then lease the premises at more than double the previous rent. If the prospective tenants do not sign a lease they cannot get into the house. Is there any way the rent control board can deal with these cases?

The Minister of Works replied as follows:—

I think the honourable member has virtually answered his own question, because he said that by using the provisions of the Act the matter is taken out of the control of rents; but it is a legal question and I am not competent to give a firm reply. I will refer the question to the Attorney-General and ask him for a considered opinion.

Later, when I asked the Minister whether he had a report from the Attorney-General, he said:—

Section 6 (2) (d) of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, 1942-1957, provides that the Act shall not apply to a lease in writing of a dwellinghouse where the term of the lease is for two years or more and the lease is entered into after the passing of the amending Act of 1954. Thus, the provisions of the Act relating to the control of rents do not apply to such a lease and the rent will be that agreed between the parties. There is no provision in the Act requiring such a lease to be registered.

Members can see the effect of that section. Landlords can charge whatever rent they like provided they get their tenants to sign a lease. Generally, a landlord or a tenant can apply to the Housing Trust to fix the rent of premises. I am not criticizing every landlord because I realize there are good and bad landlords just as there are good and bad tenants. The Housing Trust fixes a fair rent after hearing the case, but if a landlord wants more he may apply to the court for possession of the house. He may say he wants it for his son, daughter or other relative or employee, or he may say he wants the house renovated. If the court makes an order granting him possession the tenant must get out. I know of many such cases, but the court does not follow up the case to see whether the landlord's statements were genuine. A few weeks ago I asked the Premier for assistance in one of these cases.

After the tenant has been evicted someone else sees the house empty and wants to get it. Perhaps the Housing Trust had fixed the rent at £2 a week, but the landlord insists on the prospective tenant signing a lease for two years at a rent of perhaps £4 or £5 a week. In the case in which I sought the Premier's assistance the tenant had been evicted. He was a German migrant—a man with a good reputation—and the only accommodation he could secure was a house at Prospect for which he was charged £7 7s. a week. Landlords should be empowered to use premises only for the purpose for which they secured possession. Members will agree that the present situation should not be tolerated and I appeal to the Government to put an end to this practice by amending the legislation immediately. This injustice should not be permitted to continue. The greatest offenders are New Australian landlords. It makes me blaze when I know that returned servicemen or their parents are being evicted by migrants so that they can lease them for higher rentals. It is time Australians woke up: it is time this Government woke up and did something.

I have recently asked several questions concerning the provision of number plates on interstate trailers and as the Minister has promised a reply I shall not go into that at present. However, it is time consideration was given to regulating the length of these vehicles. The maximum length at present prescribed is 66ft. and when one of these vehicles is turning from one street into another it causes traffic congestion. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) is aware of the build-up of traffic behind these vehicles on our hills roads. Sometimes 40 or 50 cars are delayed. At the Eagle-on-the-Hill, where the road has been widened, the position is not so bad, but in other places it is chaotic.

Yesterday I inspected some of the buildings purchased by civic-minded citizens for the treatment of alcoholics. Those responsible for these purchases include the mayor and councillors of the Port Adelaide corporation, a banker, doctor, industrialists and ministers of religion. They are all working for the success of this scheme and they have had good support from business people. Their objective is to help inebriates. I am satisfied that, with some, alcohol is a disease and they should not be treated as criminals, but as patients requiring treatment. They cannot be blamed entirely for their condition because often they never had a chance.

Let me mention just one case. A union I represented had a case before the court and a young boy gave evidence on our behalf. Mr. Angus Parsons was the solicitor acting for the employers and after the case he said, "My word, he is a bright young fellow. He will make good if he gets a chance." He never had a chance, because he came from the wrong family. His father was a drunkard and one night as I was passing his home with some friends we met the boy on the street. He had been thrown out by his father. It was a cold night and he had no coat, just a thin blue shirt. I told the father that if he did not take the boy back I would go immediately to the police. One of my friends did not want to bother the police, and told the father, "If you don't take him back I'll punch your nose," and he would have. The boy worked for some time as a shunter in the Railways at Port Adelaide and then he took to the drink. I saw him a few months ago, but hardly recognized him. He told me who he was. His body was found a few weeks ago on the Meyer Reserve. I cannot elaborate further on this because it involves a matter that is soon to

come before the criminal court. However, this is an instance where a person could have been saved. Section 22 of the Inebriates Act states:—

The Governor may, by proclamation published in the *Government Gazette*, establish any house or premises as a place for the reception, control and treatment of inebriates, and may at any time revoke any such proclamation; and may license institutions for the reception, control and treatment of inebriates; and may grant subsidies towards the cost of erecting or purchasing institutions, whether now existing or hereafter coming into existence, so licensed or to be so licensed, and the maintenance and extension thereof, and towards the maintenance, care, and custody of subjects of orders placed in institutions under orders made under this Act.

From information I have received I understand that there is not one such home in existence. Civic-minded citizens of Port Adelaide are spending thousands of pounds on premises to help inebriates, and I ask the Government to implement the purposes of section 22 by helping these people.

I have noticed statements in the daily press about our floods. We had a disastrous flood some time ago and I then suggested that we should make some provisions to prevent flood damage. It was said that I was wrong when I suggested that we could make a release channel from the Upper Murray to divert some of the water coming down the Murray today and take it through to the sea by another route. The levels will show that that could be done by gravitation. I believe there is only one place where it would be necessary to have the water pumped. What a wonderful thing it would be for those lands along the proposed route to have the benefit of that water for irrigation! It would save the damage done both to the banks of our river and to the properties of those people who suffered so much misfortune during the last flood. It would provide water for irrigation for those who needed it and would increase the value of that land considerably.

I should like to see our engineers do something about it. It is no good our saying "Oh, well, that cannot be done." When the Mundaring Weir scheme in Western Australia was suggested they said they would never be able to pump the water from Perth to Kalgoorlie. The papers and everybody said it would be a failure. The day before that water was pumped up to Kalgoorlie the engineer who had done all the work was so worried about it that he lost his reason and committed suicide

just a few hours before the water reached Kalgoorlie. If water can be pumped from Perth to Kalgoorlie, surely our Murray water could be diverted by gravitation as I have suggested. I hope that something will be done in this matter.

In conclusion, I want to say that this is the last time I shall speak on the Address in Reply. I shall not be here with you after the next elections. I signed a pledge that I would not oppose an endorsed candidate; I have never yet broken my word and I am not going to now. I shall stand by my pledge and not contest the seat. No matter what else I do, I would sooner be a pauper than be a rich man with a bad character. My father passed on to me a good character and a good name and I desire to pass on the same to my sons and daughters. This is my answer to my many friends both inside and outside my Party who have asked me again to contest the election. I support the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I rise to make a brief contribution. In the debate on the Address in Reply, it is usual for members to address themselves to matters of home political interest since the Parliament last met. I propose first to add my sincere regrets to those already expressed at the retirement of the former Minister of Works, Sir Malcolm McIntosh, from his portfolio and also his intended retirement from Parliament. I sincerely hope—I do not think that the ex-Minister will disagree with this—that, whatever political differences there have been between us, they have not prevented me from enjoying his friendship for the relatively limited time that I have had the honour of knowing him. Sir Malcolm set a very good example as a Minister. No doubt he would not have retained the confidence of various Governments for so long if he had not done such a splendid job. When one dealt with Sir Malcolm, one always had the impression that one was dealing with the Minister and knew that, whether or not the Minister agreed with the proposition put forward, he had seen it and given it his personal attention, and that one was not discussing the matter through the Minister with some clerk in his department. That is an example that other Ministers in many cases would do very well to emulate.

I also congratulate the new Minister of Works on his elevation to a more senior position in the Cabinet, and the Minister of Agriculture on his elevation. I wish them both a very happy and successful, but certainly not

protracted, term of office. I deeply regret the death of my former friend, the late Mr. Fletcher. We all enjoyed his friendship and regarded him as a very dear friend. If a man gains the friendship of such an assorted assembly as this, then certainly he must have outstanding personal qualities.

I now come to a much more pleasant part of my duties tonight and congratulate the new member for Mount Gambier, Mr. Ralston. I can assure him that pleasure is greatly enhanced because of the almost three weeks I had in Mount Gambier during this notable by-election campaign. As many have already said, it was a campaign that stimulated a tremendous interest, not only in Mount Gambier but also in the rest of South Australia. I do not suppose we could say that the reverberations from it were confined to South Australia alone. I certainly enjoyed being in that campaign. Excellent and splendid though it was, the result was even better. It was a clean fight. The candidates with their supporters comported themselves with the utmost fairness and dignity. All three candidates as far as their personal attributes were concerned would have made excellent members of this or any other Parliament. This election result had tremendous significance in the political set-up of South Australia.

One of the most notable features of the campaign was the extent to which the Premier personally identified himself with it. He addressed two highly organized political meetings in the town. I cannot say whether that helped us or not, but it did us no harm. I rather fancy that at times he helped the Independent campaign. Also, the Premier had his photograph on every piece of Liberal Party propaganda. It was a photograph which exploded the old saying that the camera cannot lie. In addition, he sent what purported to be a personal letter to every person on the Mount Gambier roll, and it was written on Treasury paper, which is paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—That is not true. It was not Treasury paper.

Mr. JENNINGS—I accept the honourable member's statement, but if it was not Treasury paper then it was a deliberate attempt to mislead the people into believing it was.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member is out of order. I have pointed out that he cannot use the expression "a deliberate attempt to mislead" and I ask him to withdraw it because it is un-Parliamentary.

Mr. JENNINGS—I withdraw the word "deliberate."

The SPEAKER—Order! I heard the honourable member say "a deliberate attempt to mislead."

Mr. JENNINGS—I withdraw.

Mr. Heaslip—I saw a letter from Senator Toohey written on Senate paper.

Mr. JENNINGS—I do not think there is an analogy because this other letter was sent to constituents telling them their entitlement under an Act. Everywhere at Mount Gambier it was emphasized by the Premier, no less than by his assistants in the campaign, that it was an election where the voters might frivolously elect a Liberal or Labor man, whereas it was a matter of the Playford Government depending upon the Liberal candidate being returned. At his first meeting he said in unequivocal terms something like this—"If you want a Liberal Government elect the Liberal candidate but if you want a Labor Government elect the Labor candidate. There can be no half measures." The Premier got his answer and it was in no half measures.

Coming to a more amusing subject, I turn to that infant prodigy from the Federal district of Barker, who had his little intimate chats with electors per medium of the Border Watch. Dr. Forbes would commence "Watching out my window," but it must have been the only window known to medical science that could be looked through in all directions at the one time, because the things seen from that window were to the north, south, east and west. In one instance there was smoke circling upwards, which is most unusual. In another edition the honourable gentleman closed his eyes and had a glimpse of what Mount Gambier would be like in 15 years' time. If he had opened his eyes and seen what was going to happen on the next Saturday he would have had a better glimpse of the true position. Finally he drew on his greater experience of political science and solemnly advised the electors in his last article to vote for the Government because if it did not have a majority in Parliament it could not get its legislation passed. Once again the electors were not impressed.

Most members in this debate have spent some time in referring to what other members have said, and I intend to have something to say on the matter. There is not much left of Mr Hambour's remarks to answer, if ever there was anything to answer, but he did make this ill-advised statement:—

If the Labor Party changes its attitude on immigration we may be able to use some of the defence expenditure to bring in more people.

Obviously that was in answer to an interjection asking whether defence expenditure could be reduced and the money used for other purposes. I remind Government members that the present Commonwealth immigration policy is Labor's policy. Labor conceived it, nurtured it and has always supported it. The policy was adopted perhaps reluctantly by the present Government following the defeat of the Chifley Government. We have always clamoured for a proportion of the defence vote to be allocated to such things as roads, houses, standardization of railway gauges, which in the long run are a greater asset for defence purposes than some of the things upon which so much money has been spent over the last nine years. If money were spent in that way it would provide more employment and enable us to bring more migrants here without their having to face unemployment and being homeless.

We have asked that the proportion of British migrants be kept up as high as possible. This is not because we reflect in any way on non-British people, but merely because we think the traditional balance in this country should not be drastically dislocated. It appears now that the present Commonwealth Minister for Immigration agrees with us on that matter. I refer to migration only because it is typical of the many untrue statements that have come from Government members in this debate. We are always at a loss to know whether these misstatements have their origin in ignorance or mischievousness. I will not say what I think it is.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) treated us to an unusually belligerent speech. I certainly do not mind that, nor do I mind a man experimenting. No doubt the honourable member thought this matter over and decided that a vigorous style of speech comes better from members of the Opposition and that he would get in training for next March. What he obviously overlooked was that if his colleagues in what will be the Opposition Party after next March are to get the benefit of hearing his new belligerency he will have to find himself a different seat. He spoke well and with a knowledgeable air about some matters on which he had no knowledge whatsoever, and it would perhaps be better if in future—and this advice could also be offered to a near neighbour of his—he confines his remarks not to Labor Party doings but to subjects on which he had some knowledge—although on second thoughts the silence might be too long. He said that Mr. Chambers,

M.H.R., was expelled from the Labor Party for attacking his leader, Dr. Evatt. Let me educate the honourable member.

Mr. Davis—You are an optimist.

Mr. JENNINGS—There is no harm in trying. Mr. Chambers was expelled from the Labor Party because he broke a rule of the Labor Party which forbids public attacks on another member of the Party.

Mr. Coumbe—That is the same thing.

Mr. JENNINGS—It is not the same thing; the expulsion was the result of a breach of the rule and not the result of an attack on one individual.

Mr. Shannon—Even a lawyer would have some difficulty in understanding that one.

Mr. JENNINGS—That was why he was expelled from the Party. The rule was one with which Mr. Chambers obviously was very familiar. Subsequently he applied for re-admission to the Party admitting he had done wrong, and was quickly re-admitted by an overwhelming majority. Mr. Coumbe implied that his admission was an abject apology. It was nothing of the kind; it was an admission that he had been wrong and that, coming from a public man, is not a sign of weakness but a sign of strength and character, and it is a sign of tolerance on the part of the Labor Party to readmit him so soon.

Mr. Coumbe—Who's kidding who?

Mr. JENNINGS—One other thing probably worthy of only slight mention is what the member for Torrens had to say—and he showed signal ignorance here—about the system of voting operating in the Labor Party. He said that under our system of voting a delegate could come along and have 20,000 odd votes. I do not mind how wrong the honourable member is on this or any other subject, but the real significance of this is that by some peculiar coincidence the figure he mentioned was not the result of any research or inquiry of his own but merely the result of hearing the Premier make an equally erroneous statement at a public meeting at Mount Gambier at which the honourable member was an ardent claqueur.

Mr. Coumbe—Is it wrong in fact or only in detail?

Mr. JENNINGS—That was well explained to the honourable member the other night.

Mr. Coumbe—Do you deny it?

Mr. JENNINGS—It is a long way from being right. Two thousand votes is the most any delegate has. A further typical example of the honourable member's confusion of

thought was that in some way he associated the Democratic Labor Party with the Australian Labor Party. He said:—

Apparently some members opposite do not agree with the announced decisions of the Democratic Labor Party.

I assure the honourable member that no member on this side agrees with the decisions of the D.L.P. any more than he does with those of the Liberal Party, except—and this applies to both Parties—when they borrow our policies.

Mr. Coumbe—Why don't you finish the quotation?

Mr. JENNINGS—We cannot help it if a Party includes the word "Labor" in its name, nor can we help what any Party chooses to call itself. What a misnomer the name "Liberal Party" is if it comes to that! A Party that has used the same name proudly for 60 years and has never changed it in victory or defeat is rather different in importance from one that chooses to use a name because it may draw to it some transient support.

The member for Torrens admitted that we still have a deplorable housing situation. The Opposition agree with that, and is better informed about the position than he is. Despite his statement he went on, no doubt feeling obliged to do so, to attempt to justify South Australia's housing record in comparison with other States. He produced some very interesting figures, which would have been much more helpful to the House if they had had any relationship to the truth. He quoted figures for the year ending June 30, 1957, of the number of houses that Government housing authorities in each State had built, and they were as follows:—New South Wales, 3,030; Victoria, 2,580; Queensland, 1,912; South Australia, 3,131; Western Australia, 1,191; Tasmania, 686; Australian Capital Territory, 868. Those figures are correct as far as they go. However, I have no doubt that the honourable member knows the true figures that can be applied to this position because they appear not far away from the page from which he quoted. The figures for the number of new homes completed in the same States, firstly in the year 1955-56, are as follows:—New South Wales, 26,369; Victoria, 22,652; Queensland, 7,396; South Australia, 7,721; Western Australia, 7,760; Tasmania, £2,721.

In analysing the housing shortage position, what one needs to be concerned about is the number of houses built in each State and not who chances to build them.

For example, in Victoria there are huge housing co-operative schemes and the number of houses they built are not included in the figures quoted by the member for Torrens. The actual numbers give an entirely different picture from that painted by the honourable member. Let us consider the number of houses completed. In South Australia in 1948-49 only 3,989 homes were built, whereas Queensland built 9,354; in 1949-50 the respective figures were 4,904 and 9,447; for 1950-51 they were 6,725 and 10,275; for 1951-52, 7,711 and 11,803. In the following year South Australia took a big leap owing to the number of imported homes erected, building 8,940, but Queensland still built 10,598. Western Australia, with a much smaller population than South Australia, in 1952-53 built 7,965 and South Australia 8,940. Respective figures for the following years were, 1953-54, 7,627 and 7,522; 1954-55, 8,792 and 7,323; 1955-56, 7,760 and 7,721. It will be seen that the number of homes built per head of population in the various States does not show South Australia in a good light. If the figures in Queensland have been reduced in the last few years it is only because it has caught up with its housing requirements.

Mr. Shannon—That is the real measuring stick.

Mr. JENNINGS—The measuring stick is the number of people who still need homes. This figure is hard to get, but we have it on the authority of the Premier when addressing a meeting of Young Liberals that Queensland had caught up with its housing shortage, and I think it is common knowledge now that in Western Australia no housing problem remains.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—There is an unemployment problem over there.

Mr. JENNINGS—Don't worry, there is one here too. For the benefit of Mr. Coumbe, although admittedly he did not quote these figures, I will give the number of homes built by the Housing Trust each year since 1950-51. The figures are taken from the annual report of the trust. For the year ended June 30, 1951 the number was 3,059; 1951-52, 3,118; 1952-53, 4,126; 1953-54, 3,555, 1954-55, 3,268; 1955-56, 3,238; 1956-57, 3,140. Therefore, over the last five years the number of homes completed by the trust each year was progressively reduced, despite what honourable members opposite say about our rapidly growing population. We know that we have this rapidly growing population, but do not members think that in these circumstances by some

means or another the rate of building by the trust should have increased tremendously instead of being progressively reduced?

Perhaps the administration of the trust is becoming a greater problem because of increased unemployment, resulting in evictions from Housing Trust homes owing to the non-payment of rent. Members should not think for a moment that I suggest that if people cannot pay their rent they should be left in the house. That is too silly for words, but this part of the trust's operations should be more sympathetically administered. I know that the man who deals with these cases is sympathetic, but he has to follow the policy laid down. In fairness to all concerned, I must admit that sometimes a case which is submitted to a member by his constituent has been proved to be slightly wrong when the trust checked up on it, but this has not occurred to any great extent. The greatest fault of the tenant is that when he gets into trouble he, being fearful of the consequence, does not approach the trust and take it into his confidence. Despite all that, I believe this is something which in these days of genuine hardship should be more sympathetically viewed by the trust. I have had instances where a tenant has owed only £16 to £20, which has accumulated owing to sickness or unemployment, and he has been turned out into the street without hope of finding other accommodation, still having to pay what he owes to the trust, whereas if he were given reasonable time to get well or to find employment he would be able to pay what he owed without any unpleasant court action or anything of that nature. I plead with the Premier to take up with the chairman of the trust this aspect of its administration to see whether his board will in future interpret this section of its policy a little more sympathetically.

The member for Burnside (Mr. Geoffrey Clarke) mentioned about hire purchase, and said that much nonsense had been talked on this subject. If it is anything to be proud of, I think he can justly claim to have added compound interest to that nonsense. Most members will agree that it is arrant nonsense to say that people do not care what rate of interest they are charged in hire purchase transactions. Anyone who knows the plight of those who have to depend on hire purchase to get the things they need will realize that they do care what interest they pay, but have to agree to the rate of interest charged, which is usually agreed upon

by the fraternity of hire purchase exploiters. If a person wants to buy something on hire-purchase, which most of us have to do these days, he has no alternative but to accept the rate of interest agreed on by the hire-purchase cartel, and even if he does not like it, he is still obliged that pay that high rate. I sincerely believe hire-purchase interest rates should be restricted, not only in the interests of the purchaser, but in the interests of the economy of this country so that money would be diverted as a consequence into other investments which would then be almost comparable with the dividend rates of these companies. As a result more homes would be built and more things genuinely needed would be bought than those covered by hire-purchase agreements. People possibly purchase things they do not need because of hire-purchase. I shall now comment on a couple of things the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said. Unfortunately, I have not been able to study *Hansard*.

Mr. Lawn—You do not mind interjections?

Mr. JENNINGS—No, and it ill behoves the member for Mitcham to object to them when the Chairman of Committees last week interjected, "Tell me a story, tell me a story," when members of this side were trying to speak. Mr. Millhouse claims that his Party represents every section of the community. That might be right, and I do not disagree with it; it certainly represents every section in a lopsided manner. It very adequately represents the profiteering section, whose welfare is to the detriment of the much larger section of the community that does the work and creates all the wealth. We, on the other hand, seek to represent other sections of the community, irrespective of their station in life, that are contributing something gainful to society. The only section we do not seek to represent is that section living exclusively on the labour of others. I shall now refer to obtaining a copy of the platform of the Labor Party.

Mr. Millhouse—How do you know of that?

Mr. JENNINGS—I have my informants. The honourable member could not find a luxurious carpet, or a carpet of any sort, in the Trades Hall. The member for Norwood gave this elusive platform of the Labor Party to him years ago, but he found it was wrong.

Mr. Millhouse—It was one out of the library.

Mr. JENNINGS—If the honourable member has a good memory, as he should have, he will recall that not so long ago, when he was going to give a speech or enter into a debate,

he asked for a copy, and I gave him my personal copy, which was a copy on which the 1956 elections were fought. I have been informed that on one occasion the member for Gawler approached the member for Alexandra asking if he would give him a copy of the Liberal Party platform, and the member for Alexandra duly obliged, but the member for Gawler, on having a look at it, found it was about five years old, so these things are not all up-to-date. We hear from members on the Government side only vague statements and all sorts of generalities about the great record of stable government and the record term of office of the Premier. We know it is a record, but when we analyse one Government activity as against another and compare it with other States we see all too frequently that this Government lags behind in most cases—in education, housing, transport, hospitalization and many other things.

I express my regret at some of the rather sneering remarks and innuendos made about my Party in the course of this debate by members opposite. The references of the member for Burnside (Mr. Geoffrey Clarke) about the attitude of members of my Party on unification and State Parliaments were well answered by the member for Norwood the other day. In a recent speech delivered by Sir Arthur Rymill to a political meeting in the metropolitan area, which was reported in the *Advertiser*, he went out of his way to imply Communist sympathies to members of the Labor Party. We object to these vile imputations, not only because we object personally, but because some of us represent 20,000 good loyal South Australians, and others 8,000. To impute such things to members on this side is a slur on the people we represent and something that can be ascribed only to the fact that members opposite represent a decayed and outworn political system that is completely bereft of policy and devoid of political integrity.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—In supporting the motion, I express my sympathy to the widow of the late John Fletcher, who represented Mount Gambier so well for many years. I worked with him on the Public Works Standing Committee as well as in this House, and consequently I knew his worth. I feel that the respect he gained in Mount Gambier was well deserved. When I took part in the Mount Gambier by-election some weeks ago I was pleased to hear the laudatory remarks accorded to the late member and I know that all members concur in such expressions.

I congratulate the recently appointed Minister of Agriculture (the Hon. David Brookman) who, I believe, has the ability to fulfil his important office and do well. His late father served for years in this Parliament with much distinction and no doubt his son will emulate that fine service. I believe, however, that the chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee (Mr. Shannon) was bypassed when the Government was considering appointing another Minister. Although we belong to a different party, at the same time we on this side cannot but appreciate the ability shown by Mr. Shannon, who has proved himself over the years. The Government should have recognized his ability and brilliance on this occasion. Labor members show Mr. Shannon every respect: they know his worth and courage as a debater and claim that he should have been rewarded recently.

I pay a tribute to Sir Malcolm McIntosh, who has recently relinquished his office of Minister of Works and Marine. For the past 11 years, since I became the member for Semaphore, I have often conferred with Sir Malcolm. All members have found him tolerant in any approaches they have made to him in his official capacity. Every member on this side wishes him well and regrets that it was necessary for him to retire from his important office. I recall an occasion when Sir Malcolm and I had a private conversation in this building. He told me then that if he gave a member—irrespective of Party—an unkind answer to any question submitted he could not sleep that night. That was typical of his attitude. Any member who emulates the service given to this State by Sir Malcolm will, at the end of his career, hear the words "Well done."

Mr. Lawn—He had a record term as Minister.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes. I also congratulate the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) on their appointment to the Public Works Standing Committee. As my colleagues on that committee they have already shown their worth in the way they handle the business of that committee, and I believe it will be better for their appointment to it. From my experience on the committee since 1953, I can say without equivocation that it is entirely divorced from politics. No matter what project is being discussed, all political issues are submerged and only the good of the State is considered. I am proud to be a member of that committee.

I congratulate the recently elected member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston). I agree with the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) that the Mount Gambier by-election was fought by the three candidates in a most proper manner. The campaign was vigorous, but to my knowledge no personalities entered into it. I feel that by sending Mr. Ralston to this House the people of Mount Gambier have shown their confidence in him. I wish him well as he represents that important district.

Paragraph 12 of His Excellency's speech concerned railway services, which have been a problem in this and every other State for many years. This problem has been accentuated by the crippling interest burden, which today in New South Wales amounts to about £6,500,000 and in this State to about £2,000,000. This burden makes the administration of our railways department difficult, but progress has been made with the inauguration of diesel services, which are playing an important part in meeting the demands of patrons. Before the diesel trains were introduced on the Port Adelaide line the journey from Port Adelaide to Adelaide took 31 minutes, whereas today the same journey in a diesel train takes only 19 minutes. Because of that improvement in the system the Railways Department in gaining patrons on that line, but it is ironical that the new patrons are coming from the bus services on a nearby route. It is also unfortunate that both these enterprises are conducted by the State Government. On the other hand, the people have the choice between these two means of transport, both of which are satisfactory.

Although the railway services have been improved over the last couple of years, the department should still try to gain more patrons throughout the State. I have previously referred to the desirability of running a daylight express between Adelaide and Melbourne. True, the present night-time express is satisfactory and the roomettes and twinettes comfortable and appreciated by patrons, but the train leaves Adelaide at 7 p.m. and most of the distance is travelled in the dark, whereas if this Government could convince the Victorian Government that a daylight express is desirable, passengers would be able to see the country as they travelled, more patrons would be won to rail travel, and the department's financial problems would be eased.

Further, I believe that salesmen should be sent out from the Railways Department to various organizations, such as football, cricket

and swimming clubs, which annually pay visits to various parts of the State. If propaganda were issued I believe the number of passengers on our railways would increase. The main thing is to make railway travel more popular and I believe that can be done, for the carriages are satisfactory and most towns to which members of these sporting clubs travel on their annual trips are connected to Adelaide by rail.

I now come to the most important part of my address. Paragraph 22 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech refers to harbours. We must watch matters concerning our harbours closely because of changing circumstances. Factors affecting our harbours today are entirely different from those affecting them four or five years ago and they need special attention by the Minister and the Harbours Board. Last year I spoke on this matter and referred to the board's report of 1957. I said that the overall tonnages handled through-out the State increased by 746,528 tons, but the export and import figures for Port Adelaide dropped by 101,148 tons. The board's report for 1958 is not yet available, but I confidently predict that the figures for this year will be even worse than for last year. This has been caused by many factors. For instance, the rail carriage of concentrates from Broken Hill to Port Pirie has diminished considerably. The world demand for these commodities has diminished, so railway and harbours revenues are suffering. In 1956 the lead bonus paid to employees at Broken Hill was £14 a week, but today it is only £9.

Mr. Davis—It has been higher than £14.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes. I believe that the future position at Port Adelaide will be worse than at outports. Other forms of transport are being used to a greater extent today. For instance, road hauliers are playing a most important part now and are taking thousands of tons of trade from our wharves. Consignors and consignees favour road transport because it is usually more economic and expeditious. Further, there are usually not so many breakages and there are only two handlings—from one warehouse to another. If goods are shipped six handlings are usually necessary. Again, with road transport there is no wharfage to pay. Recently the Adelaide Steamship Company put the *Moonta* and the *Morialta* on the market, and those vessels have not berthed at Port Adelaide for some time. The company found that the boats were not paying, and they have not been replaced. Less than a fortnight

ago I read in the newspapers that the *Duntroon*, which has traded for many years between Sydney and Fremantle and often called at Port Adelaide, would be taken off that run in about a month. I doubt whether the *Duntroon* will ever go back on that run, for I do not think the position will brighten.

In 1949 the Harbors Board promulgated a major scheme for the improvement of Port Adelaide. It is proposed to construct eight or 10 new berths opposite the Osborne power station. This will cost much money, but I doubt whether we shall get a reasonable return, and I believe that the board's plan is too extravagant. In addition to losing trade to road transport the Harbors Board is losing revenue on account of import restrictions. Any Government in power in Canberra would be forced to impose import restrictions because our overseas trade balance is unsatisfactory. Of course, our exports have increased, but prices for those commodities have dropped, especially the prices received for grain and wool.

The establishment of new industries means that we shall not have to import so many commodities. That is a good thing for Australia, but harbour revenue will suffer. The waterside workers' quota has been fixed for some years by the Stevedoring Industry Board. I have authentic figures which show that in 1956 the quota of waterside workers at Port Adelaide was 2,200, but it is now only 1,850. The ship-owners have applied to the board for the quota to be reduced to 1,700, and people associated with this industry have told me that the quota will be reduced to less than that later. I do not want to convey the impression that this situation is confined to South Australia, because it applies also in Melbourne and Sydney. The employers, at a conference on July 23, sought a reduction of 800 men in the port quota in Sydney. If granted this would reduce the quota to 4,500. In Melbourne the employers sought and were granted a reduction of 250, bringing the Victorian quota to 4,000 waterside workers. It is obvious that this problem is Australia wide.

The increase in appearance money paid to waterside workers is further justification for my worrying about the future of the Harbors Board. When waterside workers are not working they are paid 24s. a day appearance money. If they offer for work and it is not available, or if they do not get a call on the radio, they qualify for appearance money. In 1956 the average amount paid weekly to a waterside worker was 4s. 11d.; in 1957 it was 15s. 10d.,

but this year it has increased to 24s. This reveals that there is less work on the waterfront. People who are more familiar with the situation than I—shipowners and organizers of the waterfront—predict that the position will worsen.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—In which year was the appearance money increased?

Mr. TAPPING—About two years ago. Before then 16s. a day was paid. Our Harbors Board has been progressive and has constructed some of the best wharves in Australia—wharves that will last 60 or 70 years. For some months the board has been erecting four huge cranes at berths 13 and 14 at Port Adelaide to speed the unloading of vessels. This week an iron boat took up a position at berth 13 and the first discharge by these cranes took place. They certainly expedited the unloading because they unloaded 5,000 tons of steel and iron in 48 hours, whereas previously it took five days. This unloading is carried out by what is known as the "pre-slung" system. The board has spent thousands on this innovation, but as a result its income will be depleted because steamers will be in port for a shorter period and the port dues payable will be considerably less.

Mr. O'Halloran—Does the board get a return from the use of the cranes?

Mr. TAPPING—Yes, so much an hour, but the loss in port dues is considerable. How can we offset the lost revenue? I do not think we can increase wharfage dues, which at present are on a par with charges elsewhere in Australia. If we increase the dues it will only reflect on the cost of the commodities. A similar situation exists in respect of bulk handling. We have spent a lot on the Wallaroo installation and ultimately Thevenard, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln and possibly Port Adelaide will be similarly equipped. The board's income will diminish because the steamers will be loaded within three days as compared with eight days under the ordinary system. I believe it is necessary for the board to be extremely careful in its future planning and it must make certain that it will get a return from the money it expends. The position so alarms me that I suggest the Government appoint a committee of inquiry comprising representatives of employers and employees to examine the position, take evidence interstate, gather data from all over the world and present a report to guide Parliament. Is it wise to continue building berths in any harbour if the future is in jeopardy, as I believe it is?

Another matter that concerns me is the proposal to build a new bridge to replace Jervois Bridge. I was reluctant to introduce this topic because I am a member of the Public Works Committee and I know I should not disclose secrets belonging to that committee. However, a report on this subject was before Parliament three years ago. The Highways Department has made it clear that the present structure is becoming unsafe. So it came before the Public Works Committee and evidence was taken from the experts of the Harbors Board, the Commissioner of Highways and others. It took a long time because so many people were involved, including the Chamber of Commerce, who had some say as to what might occur. One plan was that traffic should go down Dale Street, through Walter and Morris' timber yard and across a bridge to Ethelton Station. That was rejected because Walter and Morris resisted the move and pointed out that, if the Government built a bridge through their property, it would put them out of business. The compensation payable would be as much as £250,000. That idea was scrapped and we returned to the Jervois site where the existing bridge is.

The next question was: should it be an opening bridge, a lifting bridge or a fixed bridge? After much evidence had been taken and the Harbors Board and other people had given their opinions, it was resolved to recommend that it should be a fixed bridge that would cost £315,000. To have a bridge known as an opening bridge would cost about another £200,000. I raise this matter here because I am concerned about certain moves being made about which I learned recently in Port Adelaide. It is true that, after the Public Works Committee had made their recommendations to the Government that a fixed bridge be placed on the existing site of the Jervois Bridge, another reference came back to the committee for them to consider a lifting bridge, because the Harbors Board had consistently opposed the recommendations of the committee. I attended a function some weeks ago and I was disappointed—as a matter of fact, I was amazed—to realize that the Harbors Board had sought a conference with the Port Adelaide Council to discuss a new bridge over the Port Adelaide River south of railway bridge. The Harbors Board met the Mayor and Town Clerk of Port Adelaide, some of the councillors and I believe Mr. Meyer was there too. They proposed that the council should agree to a new proposal to demolish the Jervois Bridge and not replace it but build a new bridge on

the southern side of the railway bridge. Through so much traffic going from the LeFevre Peninsula to Port Adelaide there is a need for two bridges, one at the present Jervois Bridge, and one south of the railway bridge. To demolish entirely a bridge that has given so much service for so many years would, to my way of thinking, be a calamity for Port Adelaide. All the council and important administration offices are in St. Vincent Street. If it was brought before the committee in the usual way, to seek opinions and take evidence, I would not mind but I object strongly to the fact that on this occasion the Harbors Board, having attended the committee and knowing its feelings, adopted the method of approaching the council before coming back to the committee. Those sorts of tactics by the Harbors Board are not fitting in view of the great esteem in which it is normally held.

In regard to the attitude of the board, I regret to say this but it is the fact. In my experience some of the actions of one or two members of the board have not been what they should have been. There is a tendency today in South Australia for some civil servants to be inclined to take command in a situation, and it behoves any Minister here to make certain that the public servant is always doing the reasonable thing and is *au fait* with all our doings. We do not provide for a situation where we have "rubber stamp" Ministers. (I do not suggest there are any here tonight.) Some things appearing amongst civil servants I do not like. The only cure is that Ministers should be more rigid in their dealings with them and see that they are *au fait* with the situation all the time. The position with the Harbors Board is very serious. I trust that it will not be repeated in future.

Although there are many other matters on which I could speak, I intend to curtail my remarks but I must repeat what I said on a matter that I raised the other day when I asked the Minister of Education what the position was when the Government tried to buy land to build schools. In reply, the Minister told me that the procedure was that, if there was any dispute about price and if the person who expected to sell was asking too much, it went to the Land Board for consideration. I doubt whether the Land Board have much power because, since 1949, the control of land sales has been abandoned. It is remarkable that from 1949 onwards land became hard to

get. We found that those who owned land, and particularly land for building hospitals, etc., were asking tremendous prices for it. Some of the sales made today amount to £1,000 an acre. In those cases the Government has been obliged to pay because the land is needed to build valuable schools. Some of that land may be worth £400 or £500 an acre. To ask £1,000 an acre is exorbitant and unfair.

I believe that the Premier should exercise his power to introduce some form of legislation, in effect to control land sales. I make it quite clear that neither I nor my Party have any desire to inflict controls on anybody unless they are necessary; but, when people are asking for land a figure that is exorbitant and twice as much as it should be, something should be done.

Mr. O'Halloran—We desire to use control to curtail exploitation.

Mr. TAPPING—Recently the Government has acquired land at Elizabeth to build a school. It was bought from the Housing Trust for £300 an acre (which is different from £1,000 an acre). Nobody here can convince me that the Housing Trust would sell that land to the Government unless it made some profit; at least, it would not sell at a loss. What the Housing Trust can do other people can do also. I appeal to the Government because this is very serious. Whilst we pay more for land than it is worth, we shall not be able to build so many schools—that is what it amounts to. It will absorb our money unfairly and unnecessarily. I ask the Government to take heed of my remarks. I support the motion.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I do not propose to speak at any length at this juncture having in mind that opportunities will be available to us later to deal with most of the subjects affecting my district, but that does not imply that my district does not have problems equal to and as important as the problems referred to this afternoon. Unlike members sitting behind the Government, I am afraid I cannot find anything in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech to arouse my enthusiasm. It seemed to be uninspiring and lamentably lacking in legislative programme. As I understand it, the Address by His Excellency is supposed to outline the legislative programme to be conducted during the session. This year the speech started off in a similar strain to previous speeches, for His Excellency said, "I have called you together for the despatch of business." Then nothing more was said about the business to be considered until after His Excellency had made a long review of

seasonal conditions and given a progress report of some public activities. Paragraph 5 of the speech dealt only with seasonal conditions. The only omission seemed to be a long range weather forecast by Lennox Walker. That would have made good reading and something for dissemination in country areas.

Paragraph 6 referred to the fact that it has been established that the addition of lime to sandy soils causes an increase in growth. There were paragraphs in regard to country sewerage. This is a matter that seems to have been in the last four or five Opening Speeches. I suggest it is all designed as a sop to country people because the Government has nothing really worth-while to tell them. That leads me to believe that there was a special significance attached to paragraph 2 which referred to the retirement from the Ministry of Sir Malcolm McIntosh, who is to be congratulated on his record. He was a Minister during the whole of my association with Parliament and I join with other members in paying a tribute to his record. I think his retirement marks the final passing of any influence the country might have had in affairs of State. Sir Malcolm is the last of the Country Party members. That was an organization once looked upon as providing a voice for the country but it has now been completely swallowed up by the Liberal Party. It has finally disappeared.

This is a somewhat strange commentary in a State that has always placed such emphasis on the role it has played as a primary producing State. It is correct to say that the country has scarcely noticed the passing of the Party because the country people are learning that rural and secondary industries go hand in hand, and that the best development is a balanced development. If the Labor Party is a sphere of influence in the political world it can best represent all people and provide an effective voice for all who labour, whether on the land or in the workshop. The only people not fully and adequately represented by Labor in these days are non-producers who exploit the industrious people in one way or another. The Country Party is dead and the Labor Party has taken over. It is a significant development in the history of political South Australia and a significance we can attach to the retirement from the Ministry of Sir Malcolm McIntosh.

Paragraph 4 of the Opening Speech refers to the provision being made for an extension of water supplies. Here again there is more significance attached to the paragraph than the

padding which would present itself to the casual reader. It is designed to distract attention from important omissions which are ominous and which are of great concern, particularly to the northern districts. For several years past the Opening Speech has said that consideration is being given to the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, and like Mr. Heaslip and the Leader of the Opposition I voice the fear of the northern people that the long delay in doing this work will inevitably result in restrictions being imposed on water consumers in northern areas. There was a reference to this matter in the Opening Speech of 12 months ago and in earlier speeches, but in the speech opening this session there is no mention of it. What happened I do not know, but perhaps the type got lost somewhere. The omission is noticeable. It is a matter of concern to all of us who know how dependent we are on water supplies for our continued existence in the north. It is a matter of first importance and I hope it will not be lost sight of in the welter of schemes for the metropolitan area. Too often we find provision being made in the city to the exclusion of work in the country.

Later in his speech His Excellency referred to power stations. I have traced through the last eight Opening Speeches references to the power stations at Port Augusta. I was asked to mention this matter by Mr. Hambour and I will not disappoint him. The whole State is grateful for what is being done in developing our natural resources. It is all working well in the interests of the State and I join with the honourable member in paying a tribute to those responsible. It is a type of industrial expansion that is good, and is an expansion by a Government instrumentality designed to serve the people. It is the kind of Socialism which appeals to me and which the people endorse. It is a type of expansion that Mr. Hambour spends so much time in vigorously opposing whenever he has the opportunity.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is because of Socialism in which the Labor Party believes.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, and it works; that has been proved, and it is a complete answer to those who find some stigma in the word "Socialism." Another reference in the Speech concerns the provision of a further conventional power station in the metropolitan area. I had asked that this matter should be examined by the Government to see whether it was necessary that this station should be established in the metropolitan area or whether, in accord-

ance with the findings of the Royal Commission which a few years ago inquired into the desirability of decentralizing the production of power in South Australia, it could be situated somewhere in the country. We have ports and towns in the country that could be rebuilt and revitalized if this power station could be taken there, assuming that fuel would have to be brought to it by sea. We do concede that with the establishment of the oil refinery envisaged in His Excellency's Speech it might well be that the products of that refinery will be used as fuel for the new conventional power station. We have not been told anything in that regard, but if it were proposed to use that fuel it could be an overriding consideration in the location of the station. If that is so we ought to be told about it, but in any event I still urge that the Government should give very careful consideration to the re-location of that power station.

Subsequently to His Excellency's Speech some Federal members have suggested that the Federal Government should finance the erection of an atomic power station. If we go back about 10 years' into the speeches with which His Excellency has been pleased to open Parliament we find that the Government was very keen on an atomic power station. This was held out to us as a definite programme to which South Australia was pledged. We were told that after the B station at Port Augusta was completed in 1960 it was confidently expected that atomic power would be available for industrial use.

Mr. O'Halloran—We were told that Lake Leake in the South-East was the proposed site, but that was just prior to an election some years ago.

Mr. RICHES—That is so, and another site was also suggested. The Government 10 years ago was enthusiastic about a nuclear power station in South Australia; we were told that it was the whole of the planning of power production and that such a station was envisaged in 1960. Certain Federal back benchers now feel that some definite steps should be taken in the erection of an atomic power station somewhere in Australia, and they are urging the Federal Government to build it in South Australia, which seems to me to be a logical proposition. However, we do not find any enthusiasm on the part of our Government. It has said in an offhanded sort of way that if a station is built and if energy is produced at a satisfactory rate it will consider using the energy so produced, but I have never

seen the Government getting behind the scheme or showing any enthusiasm for supporting it, and I have never seen anything damned with such faint praise or enthusiasm.

I would like to see the South Australian Government give a lead in this matter, to show some enthusiasm and give the Federal Government some encouragement because it will need all the prodding we can give it to embark upon such a venture. I have already mentioned that it is not our prerogative to pick sites, but since the uranium treatment works are established at Port Pirie and Radium Hill is the source of supply it would seem to me that land which is being reclaimed by the Government and which is available to the Government near the Port Pirie harbour might be considered as one of the logical sites for such a project.

Another passage in His Excellency's Speech—and this has been hailed by members opposite as the highlight of the Speech—refers to the establishment of steelworks at Whyalla. Of course, this matter also has been included in opening Speeches over the last 10 or 12 years, but this time the Government informs us that an agreement has been entered into with the B.H.P. Company for the establishment of such a steelworks. The importance of that announcement, of course, goes beyond the boundaries of Whyalla and is of first importance to the people of this State. In and out of season members of the Labor Party have urged that the iron ore resources of South Australia should be used to a far greater extent than they are today for the industrialization of this State. It seems to us to be ridiculous that a State so rich in mineral resources should have these resources exported to bolster industries outside the State. Some of the biggest industries in Australia have been built up on our own iron ore resources while we are chasing all round the globe for some compensating industry to be established in this State.

We have lost out all through the years to New South Wales because we have allowed our ore to be shipped over there and industries to be established there. We have argued that that ore should be used for the production of steel in South Australia, and that the development which is now taking place at Port Kembla should rightly have taken place at Whyalla. I know that view is not held by members opposite, because when a resolution expressing that opinion was tabled in this House two years ago we heard the members who are now

hailing this announcement of the agreement with the B.H.P. stating that it was uneconomical to produce steel in South Australia; they said it would inevitably add to the cost of steel in Australia, and they expressed their opposition to any suggestion that a steelworks should be established in this State. I will be most interested to hear the reactions of those same members when this Bill comes before us in the very near future.

I want to make one or two comments on the statements that have been made concerning these negotiations. The first is that I welcome, I suppose as enthusiastically as any honourable member, the announcement that we are to have steelworks, small as they will be in comparison with what was promised. I believe that it should be available to us in consideration of the undertaking given by the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. in 1937. I believe it promised South Australia that because of the leases then obtained the steelworks would be established at Whyalla, that a blast furnace would be only the first step, and that when it intimated that it was prepared to establish steelworks and coke ovens, then the Government would undertake to provide a water supply for Whyalla. I have argued previously that the company was morally and legally obligated to establish steelworks in this State because of the concessions obtained in 1937.

Now, it does not make good reading for me to learn that in 1958 the company says that unless South Australia makes available to it all the remaining reserves of iron ore there will be no steelworks. I am not satisfied that that price is not too high. There should be a full investigation as to the value of the iron ore. Someone should be advising South Australia whether this is a good deal or not, or whether we are not handing over in perpetuity the rights to some of our most priceless possessions in return for this industry which was promised and for which the company was obligated because of the terrific concessions it received in 1937. The ink on the announcement had hardly dried before the chairman of the company announced that we must not expect much development in less than 10 years. The people should be given some right to discuss the terms of an agreement such as this before it is signed. Here is an agreement that has been entered into, and when it is produced to us we shall be told it is an honourable agreement entered into between the company on the one hand and the people on the other, and we shall have to accept it *in globo*,

or dismiss the whole scheme. We can discuss the terms, but we shall not be able to alter them.

The people of South Australia are not considered in these discussions. As I can understand the position, in return for the company at long last indicating that it is now prepared to carry out some of the promises it made in 1937, the people on the other hand have to sign over all their rights in the iron ore leases for all time. The people, through the Government, have had to drill these iron ore leases and prove the existence of 30,000,000 tons of high-grade iron ore. They will have to provide the pipeline to supply water to Iron Knob; they will have to build 1,500 houses at Whyalla; and will probably have to construct a railway from Port Augusta to Whyalla. Although the latter is not part of the agreement, it is being pursued. What will the people get in return? They will not share in any of the profits. It seems to me to be a lopsided deal.

I should like to know the value of the iron ore as mined and its value f.o.b. Whyalla. If it is £6 a ton, as my friends in Western Australia have advised, and the Government has located 30,000,000 tons of iron ore, it appears that there may be some sound reasoning in the advice of the former South Australian Director of Mines. He advised this Parliament that it would be advantageous to the State to set up a trust to control the State's iron ore resources. If that iron ore is worth £6 a ton f.o.b. Whyalla, the ore already proven is worth £180,000,000 f.o.b. Whyalla. We are giving this to the B.H.P. Company for what? What are we to get in return? Would it not be possible for the State to mine that ore and sell it to the company? If the company needs the ore what is wrong with the State selling it as mined? The State has already proved that it can successfully operate mining ventures. All honourable members have praised the Government's work at Radium Hill and Leigh Creek. No-one can truthfully say that the State cannot conduct mining operations efficiently and economically, and it can do this at Iron Knob as easily as it has done at other places. I plead for a full investigation into the value of the consideration that the State is giving away under the agreement and what it is to get in return.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Does it not mean that the cost of the iron produced is that much cheaper and that this in turn benefits the consumer?

Mr. RICHES—I have yet to learn that the production of ore at Radium Hill could be

carried out more cheaply than at present. I was under the impression, and still am, that the operation is efficient.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—But if the iron ore is made available at the lowest possible price does not that keep the cost of the product down and if the State made an extra profit on the iron ore, would not that keep up the cost of the product?

Mr. RICHES—I am not in a position to answer that. We have been told glibly over and over again that the B.H.P. Company turns out the cheapest steel in the world and that its steel sold in Australia is cheaper than imported steel. That is not the truth.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—What is it?

Mr. RICHES—This is the truth. A few weeks ago the Commonwealth Government let a contract for the construction of a power line from Port Augusta to Woomera. The successful tenderer on that occasion quoted for steel fabricated posts instead of Stobie poles, thereby reducing the cost to two-thirds, but he quoted a price of £50,000 less if allowed to use Italian steel, which is astounding.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Isn't that a reason why they should get the ore cheaper?

Mr. RICHES—No, it is an argument for examining the accounting of the B.H.P. Company and its profits. It is a wonderful argument in favour of my contention that a trust should be set up and that the State should hold an interest in iron ore to make sure that it is mined in the interests of the State at all times, and that the exploitation of the ore resources should be in the hands of the people so that they will always be in a position of strength when talking to the B.H.P. I am not suggesting that the State should make big profits out of mining, but I want to ensure that the company does not make big profits out of the State and that it is not allowed to continue in the course it has set itself in recent years of absolutely denying the claims of the State. The State should see to it that the ore that is mined is used to the best advantage of the people. We will have another opportunity to discuss this, but I have introduced it now because we do not know anything about the terms of the agreement. We will be interested to deal with them when they come, and I hope that between now and the time when they do come members will give some thought to the matter. If I am proved wrong no harm will have been done, but I am interested to see that the iron ore and other resources of this State will be used to the

interests of the State, and I am not convinced that they will be. More knowledgeable men than I have said in the past that South Australia has not received the full benefits of its iron ore resources.

I shall now refer to the decentralization of industry because statements have been made during this debate that call for answers from this side of the House. From Port Lincoln to Mount Gambier there is concern at the unbalance in South Australia, so much so that many of us are wondering whether it is of much advantage to bring additional industries to this State if it is essential that they must be established in the metropolitan area, and if the only effect of their coming is to build up the metropolitan area as against the country, thereby worsening the state of unbalance that is causing so much concern. Some members opposite have taken this urging for the establishment of industries as a criticism of the Government, and they object to it, but in so far as the Government is to blame it must accept that criticism, and as far as industry is concerned, it must also accept criticism. However, the matter is unbalanced and the great need is for industries to be established in country areas.

All progressive towns in South Australia are alive to this need and are working to correct it. Members advocating the establishment of industries have been charged in this debate with writing down their towns. There has been no writing down but a forthright advocacy of the expressed desire of the people. There must be a better balance of the economies of country districts. That is not only felt in the country, but in Elizabeth. The people planning that town are already recognizing the need for balanced development, and it has been placed before them that there is need for industry there to absorb the people living there, females as well as males, and that a balance is necessary if the community is to be happy and if development is to be soundly based. Every country town in this State is feeling the need for some form of profitable employment for young people and female labour.

The member for Light said that this falls squarely on the shoulders of members of Parliament, who should get around and obtain industries for their districts. What sort of development are we going to have? Members of Parliament, with all the goodwill in the world, have not the facilities available to them in the first place to find out what industries are

interested in country districts. In the second place, they have no authority to tell an industry what can be provided or offered for them to come. Others have said that the Industries Development Committee has done great things for the country. That committee is performing a very useful service, but I think there is a misconception as to its function. It was set up to watch the interests of this Parliament in the expenditure of Government money on industry, and entrusted by Parliament to examine schemes the Treasurer may refer to it. He is given the right to give assistance by way of guarantees to the bank or loans to industry, provided that the matter is examined by the committee in the same way as the Public Works Committee examines public works. It cannot initiate any inquiry of its own; the initiative has to be taken by the industries themselves, which have to apply to the Treasurer. If he is sympathetic applications may come to the committee, but if he is not, they stop right there. I think something more than that is necessary, and something along the lines of what is taking place at Elizabeth should be expanded to include the rest of the State. In order to establish industries these days inducements are essential, such as the offer to build factories, to provide services and to guarantee all the requirements of an industry going into the country. No country committee can do that: only a Government instrumentality can. True, the Government says it can guarantee electricity, water and housing at places where industries are to be established, but only the Government can do that and the initiative can only be taken at the Government level. Every committee that is interested in this matter in country districts has discovered that. The best assistance the Premier could receive would be from a department fully equipped to make overseas contacts. I have a terrific regard for the efficiency of Housing Trust officials in this matter. They have made contacts overseas and followed them up, and if that service could be made available to country districts the same as it is to Elizabeth we would be doing more than we are today.

I now turn to the matter of public buildings at Port Augusta. Earlier this session I asked the Minister of Works why a start had not been made on three important projects for Port Augusta—a new police station, the building of new offices for the Waterworks and Agriculture Departments, and a new maternity wing for the hospital—and when it could be reasonably expected that the work would commence. In reply, the Minister told me that

no provision had been made on the Estimates at any time for a new police station at Port Augusta. He continued:—

Provision was made for new cells and an additional lavatory block. Sketch plans have been prepared and an estimate will be submitted shortly for approval. This is one of hundreds of relatively small jobs which are being fitted into the department's programme having regard to the urgency of major works. Twelve months ago, in reply to a question I asked on notice, the Minister's predecessor said that the Port Augusta police station was built in 1883, that the building was not considered adequate to meet present-day requirements, and that consideration was being given to the desirability of rebuilding it, which might necessitate the partial demolition of existing premises; meanwhile plans and specifications were being prepared for additional offices and cell accommodation. The people of Port Augusta are not very much comforted to receive the same reply this year: that plans and specifications are being prepared. On July 30 this year, in reply to my question regarding the building of new offices for the Waterworks and Agriculture Departments at Port Augusta, the Minister said:—

Consideration was given some years ago to the question of constructing a new office building at Port Augusta. Demands for funds for water main extensions and other urgent works were so great at that time that the proposal was deferred. Recently, further consideration has been given to this matter and plans are now being prepared for a new office to accommodate employees of both the Engineering and Water Supply and Agriculture Departments.

We are not even holding our own, because 12 months ago the Minister's predecessor told me that plans and specifications were being prepared, and if approved, work might commence later that year. I do not know whom the department thinks it is fooling, but that reply it not acceptable to the people of Port Augusta. This sort of thing has been going

on from year to year and we feel that here again work that has been promised, provided for, and outstanding for some time is being overlooked because of the demand for work nearer the general post office. I do not know how consistently members have to be on the backs of Minister to get undertakings honoured.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—What undertakings? You read certain things and inferred other things.

Mr. RICHES—The wording of the reply was that plans and specifications were being drawn up, not in August 1958, but in 1957, and that the work might commence later that year.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—You said promises were broken, but they were not.

Mr. RICHES—What do those words mean then?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—You read an inference into the report.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, I inferred from that that the Government had drawn up plans and specifications and, further, that the work might be proceeded with in 1957. Then, when in 12 months' time I asked the same question, I was told that consideration would be given to drawing up plans and specifications and that the work had not been commenced; therefore, I felt we had been let down.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Don't get up and say that promises have been broken, because you know they have not been.

Mr. RICHES—If I had made that statement I would regard it as a promise, but if the Minister does not, then I am prepared to accept his statement. I support the motion.

Mr. FRED WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 20, at 2 p.m.