

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, July 28, 1959.

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

QUESTIONS.

BREAD PRICE INCREASE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have received complaints from persons in different localities about the recent increase in the price of bread. The *News* of July 23 reported that the consumers' representative on the Bread Prices Commission had resigned because "the Committee had refused to recommend an increase in bread prices and the Prices Commissioner had made an increase nevertheless." She also said, according to the *News*, "I am not satisfied the industry is unable to absorb the basic wage increase. From information I have been able to get I believe it could still show a handsome return on investment."

Will the Government inaugurate a public inquiry into all the elements in the cost of bread—preparation, wrapping and distribution—so that this matter can be resolved, as it is one of great importance to everyone?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The question is based on premises that are not correct. The committee on bread prices was appointed under the Prices Act. One of its members did not agree to an increase, but every other member agreed that it was necessary. Incidentally, prices for bread in South Australia are very much below those in other States, and I am confident that the Prices Commissioner would not have recommended increases if he had not felt they were justified. The statement that the industry could absorb the recent basic wage increase is not correct. One of the consumers' representatives would not agree to an alteration in the price of bread notwithstanding that the Commonwealth Arbitration award provided for an increase of 15s. in the wages paid to bread operatives. Obviously an increase of that nature could not be absorbed by bakers. The price of bread has been severely controlled in this State, and it compares more than favourably with that in other States.

One factor that has caused some difficulty in price control is that bakers with large mechanized equipment can provide bread somewhat more cheaply than small bakers who, in the main, rely on manual labour for many of their operations. If we fixed the price any keener

than it is now we would drive all the small bakers out of business. I will not say that some of the large bakers could not exist under a price control somewhat keener than at present, but I say advisedly that a lower price would drive the small unmechanized people out of business. In fact, there has been an alarming tendency for the smaller bakers to go out of business and that is not desirable.

Mr. Shannon—And they are making the best bread.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The price is reasonable from the point of view of the consumer, and more than reasonable compared with prices in other States.

RIVER TORRENS BEAUTIFICATION.

Mr. COUMBE—On June 10 I asked the Minister of Works a question concerning the River Torrens, and stated that a considerable amount of dumping of rubbish on the banks had occurred, with a possibility that the river would be polluted. Has the department investigated this matter, or has the Minister a report on the condition of the river?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I asked for information on this matter and received information that confirms to some extent the honourable member's allegation. I have asked the Engineer-in-Chief to investigate the matter and to institute proceedings against offenders if the evidence justifies that course.

SOUTH ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My question concerns a bridge situated on the South Road near Tonsley, on the eastern side of which is quite a deep creek. A number of children attending school who must cross this bridge have to walk into traffic because there is no footbridge. Will the Minister of Works refer this matter to the Minister of Roads with a view to having the bridge widened to permit a free flow of traffic and to give pedestrians a reasonable opportunity when using the road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer the question to my colleague.

INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION RESULTS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister of Education any further information about the earlier publication of Intermediate Examination results, following on the question I asked last week?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—As I stated in my reply to the honourable member last week,

the public examinations are not administered by the Education Department. They are controlled by the Board of Public Examinations, which has been set up by the University of Adelaide. In addition to the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, the board consists of 24 members, of whom eight shall be professors or lecturers, eight shall be nominated by the Minister of Education, and eight shall be selected to represent schools other than those of the Education Department. The Registrar of the University has informed me that the Board of Public Examinations has agreed that in future:—

1. As soon as they are compiled the results of the Intermediate Examination will be issued to the press in a single list consisting of the names of the candidates, together with the subjects in which they have passed. The names of schools will not be included.

2. Immediately after the issue of this list the Committee of Awarders will meet and recommend the awarding of the Q's, which will be published as a separate list.

3. The next step will consist of the dividing of these lists into the two lists which are issued at present, namely, the list of those who have passed in sufficient subjects to qualify for a certificate and the list of those who have not.

4. The preparation of honours lists at the Leaving Examination will be deferred until after the publication of the Intermediate results.

The Registrar says that it is expected that the time gained by this procedure will be at least seven days in the initial publication of the Intermediate pass lists.

The honourable member stated last week that the results of the Intermediate Examination were declared in Victoria in mid-December. I understand, from inquiries that I have made, that the position in Victoria is substantially as follows:—

Lists of results are published as the marking of individual subjects is completed. Only the subject and the candidate's number are published and results appear from day to day over a period covering approximately the first two weeks in January. At no time does a complete list of candidates with their full results appear in the press. I am also advised that, in Victoria, subjects are only marked for "pass" and "failure," whereas in South Australia each question receives marks which are totalled and form the basis for selection of scholarship and exhibition winners.

I have been informed that there is considerable psychological strain on students in Victoria in waiting for the lists of passes to

be published day by day. I have also been advised that, even if this system of publication were adopted in South Australia, it could not be done as quickly as in Victoria because of our need to have marks for each question and for each subject. The Public Examinations Board has, in the past, considered the possibility of using the Victorian method of publication, but considers that, bearing in mind local requirements, the one used here is preferable.

COMPANY NAMES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I understand that it is an offence for a limited company to omit "Limited" after its name in an advertisement. I have noticed for a considerable time a company that I have good reason to believe is registered as "Le Cornu Factory-to-You Limited" has advertised without including the "Limited." Will the Premier give instructions for this company and others that offend in a similar manner to be prosecuted? Will he consider amending the law to prevent the registration of a company name that is misleading, such as "Factory-to-You"?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I would not like to presume that someone was breaking the law until I had examined the position. I will get a report and let the honourable member know what action, if any, I will advise the Crown Solicitor to take.

UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCES.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Following on the question I asked last week about attendances at the Adelaide University, has the Minister of Education obtained a further report?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. I submitted the honourable member's question to the Registrar of the University, who has furnished me with the following reply:—

Attendance at lectures, tutorial classes and practical work, and the writing of prescribed essays and the submission of prescribed exercises, are compulsory for all students at the University. Typical provisions in the regulations are:—

"A candidate shall regularly attend lectures."

"A candidate shall do such written or practical work in any subject as may be prescribed by the Professor or Lecturer concerned."

"The written or practical work done by a candidate and the results of terminal or other examinations held during the year may be taken into consideration at the final examination in any subject."

"A candidate shall enter for examination on the form and by the date prescribed by the

Council but shall not be eligible to present himself for examination unless he has regularly attended the prescribed lectures and has done the written and laboratory or other practical work where required to the satisfaction of the Professors and Lecturers concerned."

It is the general practice of the University to interpret the word "regular" as meaning "at least 75 per cent." Formal attendance rolls for each class, similar to those kept in schools, are not kept at the University and no action is taken to ascertain why a student is absent occasionally from lectures or practical classes. In the latter case, however, the student usually offers an explanation to the Demonstrator or Lecturer in charge of the class on the next occasion on which he attends. Substantial periods of absence must of course be satisfactorily accounted for; otherwise permission to sit for the final examination would be refused. Although formal attendance rolls are not kept the departments know fairly well from attendance at tutorial classes and practical classes (where absence is immediately apparent) and from the records of exercise and essay work kept in the departments whether a student is, in fact, attending and performing his work regularly. Each year a small number of students whose attendance and work throughout the year has been clearly unsatisfactory are refused permission to sit for the final examination. Those whose attendance and performance of work throughout the year are "in the balance" are usually permitted to sit for the examination.

BREAD PRICES AT ELIZABETH.

Mr. CLARK—My question deals with bread prices at Elizabeth, about which matter I expressed concern previously. I was informed yesterday that a baker who bakes in the district is prepared to deliver bread at the price at which bread is delivered in most parts of the metropolitan area, thus saving the consumer 1½d. a loaf. Would that be contravening our prices legislation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. The Prices Commissioner fixes only the maximum price in the interests of the consumer. It is competent for any person to sell below that price.

LYNDOKH LEVEL CROSSING.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Works received a reply from the Minister of Railways regarding the installation of flashing lights at the Gilbert Street railway crossing at Lyndoch?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Railways, has furnished me with the following report from the Railways Commissioner:—

A recent traffic count at the level crossing at Gilbert Street at Lyndoch shows that the

number of road users traversing this crossing daily is approximately the same as in 1949. There has been, however, an increase in the number of motor cars at the expense of other vehicles, and some increase in the peak traffic densities. The conditions at other crossings are such as to give them higher priority for protection equipment than the crossing at Lyndoch. "Stop" signs were erected at the crossing on July 22, 1959.

LEFEVRE BOYS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Education a progress report regarding the building of the LeFevre Boys Technical High School at Semaphore?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have been advised that the completion of working drawings has been delayed because of doubtful soil conditions. The University was asked to investigate the problem and advise on the load bearing qualities of the soil. This investigation has been completed and the consulting engineers, engaged to prepare structural drawings, will now be able to complete the design of the foundations. It is now anticipated that plans, specifications and a bill of quantities will be completed in time to call tenders by the end of this year. Allowing 18 months for a contractor to complete the school would mean that the building could be completed by June, 1961. I cannot say when the school will be ready for occupation, but I should think that at the latest it would be ready before the beginning of the 1962 school year.

ACQUISITION OF LAND BY ALIENS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Last week the Minister of Lands replied to a series of questions by me concerning the acquisition of land by aliens. Can the Minister say, firstly, when it is likely the Government will come to a decision on whether to introduce legislation to repeal those parts of section 24 of the Law of Property Act enacted in 1945? Secondly, how does this legislation operate to the advantage of aliens, as the Minister says it does in certain circumstances? Thirdly, is the Minister aware that section 24 prohibits the execution of agreement for sale and purchase, subject to his consent, but that in actual practice this is done and is the only practical method of doing business?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—In reply to the first part of the question, Cabinet considered this matter on Monday last and decided not to repeal section 24 of the Act. Cabinet felt, for a number of reasons, that it was not

necessary to do so and that it would be to the detriment of the aliens concerned if it did. I have some figures on the number of aliens who were not naturalized when they applied for land. We have received 36,760 applications up to the present, of which 35,317 have been approved, 119 deferred, 423 withdrawn, 193 declined, 339 lapsed, and 17 submitted, and we are holding 152 to be dealt with. Those figures refer to unnaturalized aliens. Once aliens are naturalized there is no necessity for them to apply for a transfer. In a certain country town 20 aliens applied for consent to purchase several blocks of up to 50 acres for gardening and other purposes. Following investigations by the Department of Lands regarding water supply, etc., and on the position being explained to the agents, 10 aliens did not go on with their application and the other 10 reduced considerably the area required by each. Until investigations had been made those aliens were under the impression that there was sufficient water for their requirements. One other reason, I think, would be sufficient to convince the honourable member and other honourable members that the Act, as it stands, is to the advantage of these aliens. Only in the last fortnight one alien came to the office with an application for two blocks. When asked why he wanted two blocks, he said: "I did not want two blocks, but my agent suggested I buy two." That shows that some agents—although not all—are out to sell as many blocks as they can. The Lands Department considers, and I agree with it, that it is better for sales to aliens to be confined to one block unless there is a special reason to the contrary. This helps to spread them out into other districts.

GILLES PLAINS PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS—I have had numerous complaints recently from parents of children attending the new Gilles Plains primary school about the inadequacy of the toilet accommodation there. I understand that 200 children attend the school and that for the last few months there has been an average increase of six children a week; but there are only two toilets for each sex and this necessitates the children's queueing up during their breaks. I appreciate the difficulties of the Education Department, but I appreciate even more the difficulties of the children, particularly in this weather. Will the Minister of Education take up this matter urgently with a view to giving some relief as soon as possible?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes, I shall be pleased to do so.

CLARENDON-BLACKWOOD MAIN.

Mr. SHANNON—Last week the Minister of Works promised to obtain information regarding the new main being built from the Clarendon weir to serve the Blackwood, Belair and Eden area, and also information concerning the Onkaparinga Valley scheme. I think that the third part of my question to the Minister dealt with the possibility of linking these two mains, when completed, to the country between the two mains. Can the Minister say what progress is being made with those projects?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have the following full report on those matters from the Engineer-in-Chief:—

Clarendon-Blackwood Main.—1. This scheme is being constructed to a planned programme and progress to date is slightly ahead of schedule. With the exception of a few pipes, the 36in. steel concrete lined pipes have been laid from near the Clarendon weir to the tank site on Chandler's Hill. Tenders will shortly be called for the construction of the tank on Chandler's Hill and the laying of 21in. main from this tank towards Blackwood will proceed during the present financial year. Specifications for the large pumping station and pumping plant, which are to be erected near the Clarendon weir, are being prepared, but as it will be some time before the machinery can be obtained, it may be necessary to install a temporary pumping plant to charge the main which has already been laid and to provide water for the construction of the tank.

Onkaparinga Valley Scheme.—2. Good progress is being made with this scheme and water has already been made available to a large area of country lands and to the townships of Charleston, Woodside and Lobethal. The scheme is nearly completed so far as Littlehampton, Nairne, Mount Barker, Oakbank and Balhannah townships are concerned. Work is in progress and the main is now being laid towards Hahndorf and Verdun Park.

3. It is possible to link these two schemes by means of a connecting main from near the tank on Chandler's Hill through Cherry Gardens to the terminal tank of the Onkaparinga Valley scheme near Heathfield.

4. The pumping station near the Clarendon weir to the Chandler's Hill tank has been made large enough to allow a branch main from near the tank through Cherry Gardens to near Heathfield at some later date, but there is no proposal at the present time for this connecting branch.

MANNUM-ADELAIDE PIPELINE.

Mr. BYWATERS—According to this morning's *Advertiser* Cabinet has approved the expenditure of £31,000 to boost the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline and £415,000 to construct a large pipeline in Grand Junction Road from Brien's Road to Hanson Road to boost the

metropolitan supply. Apparently the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline is unable to supply the requirements of the present population in a year like this. In view of the estimate that the population on the Adelaide plains will double can the Minister of Works say whether it is intended to duplicate the pipeline to meet the need as it arises?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The measures Cabinet approved yesterday are emergency steps caused through the lack of rainfall in the catchment areas of the metropolitan reservoirs. Every effort is being made, firstly, to get more water into the reservoirs of the State from the River Murray, which is our only source of supply in times like these, and, secondly, to ensure a better distribution of the water that is available to the metropolitan area. There is an inequality in the availability of water as between the northern and southern areas of the metropolitan area. The scheme on Grand Junction Road is designed to assist in the more equitable distribution of water.

The expenditure now proposed on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline is of an emergency nature to get more water through at short notice. A proposal has already been approved to install a fourth unit in the pumping system on the pipeline for which provision was made when the pipe was laid and the pumping stations built, but at present only three units of the four which could be used have been provided. It is proposed to install the fourth unit but, because we are unable to get the machinery and motors for it in time for the present emergency, temporary installations are being made, and these are what Cabinet approved yesterday. When the fourth unit is installed—and this will be as soon as machinery can be obtained—it will materially boost the quantity of water that can be brought through the pipeline and will, in conjunction with other measures, take care of the requirements of the metropolitan area for some years to come.

INTRASTATE AIR SERVICES.

Mr. KING—Reports that a large airline organization with interstate ramifications would like to take over the air lines at present being conducted by Guinea Airways Ltd. have caused some concern in my district that the local air service to Renmark might be jeopardized by a company more interested in profit-making than in providing services to develop South Australia. People at Radium Hill and on the West Coast may be interested in this matter because they are also served by Guinea Airways. Can the

Premier say whether the Government has power to give protection from unfair competition to small South Australian airlines by the issue of licences or any other means should such be necessary to enable the small airlines to continue operating?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In the last few weeks press reports have indicated that Ansett-A.N.A. is seeking to gain a controlling interest in Guinea Airways by purchasing sufficient shares from shareholders. Shareholders have every right to consider the proposal, but it has caused the Government some concern. We are proud of our South Australian companies and hope they will continue in existence providing services as in the past. This is a matter that will no doubt require future consideration. To answer the question specifically, I have had the matter investigated and there is not the slightest doubt that this Parliament could pass laws to license and regulate air transport within the State. Whether it is desirable to do so is a matter on which Cabinet has not yet reached a decision.

WHYALLA LIBRARY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Earlier this year as a result of a deputation from the Whyalla Institute Committee approval was given for a subsidy in respect of that part of the library which is to be used as a free library. The committee has not been advised in writing of that approval and consequently its work is being delayed. Will the Treasurer forward a letter to the committee so that it can call tenders for the necessary work?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This matter was the subject of some conversations in my office when I informed the deputation—as stated by the honourable member—that the Government would provide assistance on the basis of the property that was held by various sections in the building. However, I understand that this matter has been delayed by the Libraries Board because the proposition does not comply with the Act and because there is something in it to which the Board is not prepared to consent. If the honourable member examines the principal Act he will see that the granting of a subsidy is subject to a favourable report by the Libraries Board. I have not received a report but I will have the matter further examined. In fact, I have already taken some action and will advise the honourable member as soon as possible.

BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL—My question, relating to the Bordertown High School, perhaps involves a matter of policy on making additions to schools. The people of Bordertown are proud of their new high school, and they have been informed that it is to be enlarged in the next two years. I find it hard to understand why provision is not made in original plans to cater for an increasing intake. Will the Minister of Education say what additions are expected, and will he consider making these additions of a permanent nature rather than temporary?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I share the pride of the honourable member's constituents in the new high school, and I think that applies to all of the many new schools built, but unfortunately there is such a tremendous demand for the building of new schools throughout the State that it is impossible to build all the rooms that will be required in the future, particularly when they are urgently required. In almost every instance it has been necessary to make temporary additions soon after completion of a new school, and that has applied at Bordertown. I cannot supply exact information as to what final additions will be made to Bordertown School, because it is a constantly growing district and I think that substantial additions will be necessary. They will be of a temporary nature, but I hope that finally further permanent buildings will be constructed.

FOOTBRIDGE OVER STURT CREEK.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked last week concerning a foot bridge over the Sturt Creek?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has furnished me with the following report of the Commissioner of Highways:—

It is not the responsibility of the Highways Department to provide footbridges. Generally, if existing conditions at the time of construction require it, a footway is provided on a bridge at no cost to the local authority. As Departmental funds for this work are derived wholly from motorists' taxation, this practice is very favourable to local authorities who are responsible for providing for pedestrians. Until this bridge is rebuilt or widened, the local authority concerned should provide a separate temporary pedestrian crossing, or submit a definite scheme to this Department for consideration.

TEACHING OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN.

Mrs. STEELE—It has been reported in the press that the Education Department has taken an important step forward in the training of special teachers for opportunity classes and classes for handicapped children. This is most gratifying. Would the Minister of Education state:—

(a) What will be the duration of the training courses?

(b) Will this training scheme include teachers who may be sent to the training college for teachers of the deaf at Kew, Victoria?

(c) To what types of classes for handicapped children will these teachers be appointed?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The exact details of the scheme have not been finally settled and I would much prefer the honourable member to ask me a question this time next week when I shall be able to supply further information. This matter has been the subject of discussion between the Director of Education, the Deputy Director and myself.

WATER RATING.

Mr. RALSTON—Last week, in asking a question on water rating, I said that according to the *Government Gazette* the metropolitan rate for rebate water was 7.5 per cent, or £7 10s. per £100 of annual rental value as against 10.8 per cent, or £10 16s. per £100 of annual rental value at Mount Gambier. The Minister agreed to investigate whether these amounts were correct. Has he completed his investigation and, if so, what is the result?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The figures, which give the percentage of the assessed annual rental values used in the metropolitan area and at Mount Gambier, are correct. The 10.8 per cent that applies to Mount Gambier is used not only in one country town, but in practically every country town throughout South Australia. As regards the background of this apparent disparity—and I say "apparent" advisedly—I have learned two factors that, in the main, apply. Firstly, the density of housing in country towns is not nearly so great as in the metropolitan area, or at least it has not been so hitherto. Blocks in country towns tend to be larger, therefore the number of dwellings assessed per lineal foot of main laid is so much less. Secondly, the values of houses in country towns, and particularly the values of the land on which they are

built, have not reached the same level as similar houses in the metropolitan area. These two compensating factors are offset against the apparent disparity in the two percentages of annual values. The 10.8 per cent is applied to country towns and is based on some of the reasons I have already stressed.

TANTANOOLA HOUSING.

Mr. CORCORAN—Some time ago when the Housing Trust decided to build houses at Millicent representations were made by the District Council of Tantanoola to have some of them built at Tantanoola, and ultimately the Trust agreed to build at least 12. Can the Premier say when building is likely to commence and whether Mount Gambier stone will be used in their construction?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will check on the information I have, but to the best of my belief the houses will be included in this year's programme and, following the ordinary course of building by the trust in the South-East, Mount Gambier stone will be used. I understand that the houses are urgently wanted for the new industry. I hope to have further information later this week.

BROKEN HILL ROAD.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether the bituminizing of the main road to Broken Hill, between Mingary and Cockburn, has been commenced, and, if not, when it will begin?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes.

BIRDWOOD HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Education any further information regarding the negotiations that have been going on for some time over the purchase of land to provide playing grounds for the Birdwood high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have no up-to-date information. It is a long time since I discussed the matter with the honourable member but I was favourably impressed with the proposal put forward by him and members of a deputation he introduced, and I recommended it to Cabinet. All Cabinet members were favourably disposed towards it and the only stumbling block was the great disparity between the Land Board valuations and the prices at which the various owners were prepared to sell. In an effort to resolve the difficulty the Premier made a practical and constructive suggestion to the Land Board. The matter was referred back to the board

and since then it has been the subject of inquiries by the board, the Architect-in-Chief's Department and the Education Department. I think the docket is still with the Land Board. I will inquire immediately to see whether I can have the matter brought to early finality.

ROADS IN HOUSING TRUST AREAS.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week regarding roads in the Housing Trust area at Ferryden Park?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received the following report from the chairman of the Trust:—

The roads mentioned in the question of Mr. Jennings were formed and temporarily metalled by the Housing Trust about 1953 when by arrangement it was left to the council to carry out the permanent road construction. So far the council has not carried out this work, but the attention of the council has again been drawn by the trust to its necessity. Whilst these roads need attention their condition is no worse than many roads in the metropolitan area where the councils have, for some reason or other, been unable to keep pace with development. The present practice of the trust is that whenever practicable it constructs or secures the construction of roads more or less contemporaneously with houses being occupied. The roads are sealed and in many cases water tables, kerbs and footpaths are provided.

The honourable member gave me some photographs showing the conditions in the area, and I now return them to him.

PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—

1. Has the Deputy Superintendent of the Enfield Receiving Home visited the United States of America, Canada, England, Denmark and the Continent during recent years to study the psychiatric services of those countries?

2. Has he prepared a report of his findings?

3. If so, will this report be tabled for information of members and the public?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. It is not proposed to table the report, but it will be available to any honourable member for perusal.

MOUNT GAMBIER WATER DISTRICT.

Mr. RALSTON (on notice)—What was the revenue and expenditure, including debt charges, for the Mount Gambier Water District and the Blue Lake Country Water District for

each of the financial years from 1954-1955 to 1958-1959?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The following information shows the position:—

MOUNT GAMBIER WATER DISTRICT.
(including Blue Lake Country Water District.)

	Earnings.	Expenditure (including debt Charges).	Profit.	Loss.	Accumulated Loss.
	£	£	£	£	£
1954-5	27,804	36,448		8,644	81,044
1955-6	38,076	37,522	554		80,490
1956-7	43,152	39,506	3,646		76,844
1957-8	55,673	44,618	11,055		65,789
1958-9	59,174	46,500*	12,674		53,115

*The financial statements for 1958-59 have not yet been finalized but the expenditure shown will be very close to the actual figure. The earnings for 1958-59 are actual.

The amount invested to 30/6/59 is approximately £400,000 and it is anticipated that a further £50,000 will be expended during the current financial year.

PENSIONERS' COTTAGES.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Is it the intention of the South Australian Housing Trust to provide an adequate number of pensioners' cottages when development of the Osborne-Taperoo area is being planned?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The chairman of the Housing Trust reports that the Housing Trust has not yet considered a building programme in the Osborne-Taperoo area.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table an interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on:—

- Elizabeth Girls' Technical High School (additional buildings),
- Angle Park Boys' Technical High School,
- Elizabeth Boys' Technical High School,
- Magill Primary School (additional building),
- Millicent Primary School (additional building),
- Vermont Girls' Technical High School (additional buildings),
- Railway from Hallett Cove to section 588, hundred of Noarlunga,
- Blackwood High School,
- Elizabeth Vale Primary School,
- Mitchell Park Boys' Technical High School (additional buildings),
- Taperoo High School,
- Willunga High School, and
- Penola High School.

Ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 23. Page 168.)

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—When the House adjourned on Thursday last I was speaking of the difficulties of milk distribution in Broken Hill. I accuse the Milk Equalization Committee of mis-using powers and abusing the privileges extended to it by the Government. The dairy cattle in my district are equal to the best in the State; on several occasions they have proved that in exhibitions and shows, yet my producers receive for their milk less than two-thirds the price received by those producers who supply the Milk Equalization Committee. The reason is that the price of milk depends upon the quantity sold as whole milk. It has been shown that whenever the firm that handles the products in my district endeavours to expand its sales, pressure is brought to bear upon it and it is forced to restrict the quantity of milk it sells in Broken Hill, the area with which I am particularly concerned.

I referred previously to two firms in particular, but I think in fairness to them I should say that all the correspondence that has taken place and all the pressure that has been brought to bear originated from and has been signed by the secretary of the Milk Equalization Committee. If any blame is to be apportioned I think the members of the committee should share the blame equally, and it is only fair to say who comprise the committee and whom members represent. Mr. Elliott, the chairman, is a producer from Gawler River; Mr. J. Gormley, of Pompootea, is a producer; Mr. Easton, of Clarendon, is a producer; Mr. C. Carroll, of the S.A. Farmers Union, represents merchants; Mr. L. M. Hanson, of Jacobs, represents merchants;

and Mr. A. Garrett from the Myponga Co-operative Milk Company, also represents merchants.

That committee has the right to sell milk in an area protected by this Government—a privilege that many people in the State would like to enjoy. Another qualification is that the milk that comes into this area has to pass a methylene blue four hour test, but that is not a difficult test and I am sure that most of my producers can meet that standard. The dairies certainly have to be hygienic, and that is desirable in all dairies. They are subject to inspection by inspectors appointed by the Metropolitan Milk Board. Regarding whole milk, a levy is paid into a fund and subsequently distributed, and that gives a much greater return for whole milk overall than that enjoyed by the people further north.

The merchants take the privilege of selling milk outside the area at a greatly reduced price because they do not have to pay a levy. Honourable members will admit—and I am sure the Government will, too—that, where a market and the suppliers to that market are protected, those suppliers should confine their attention to that and not use their weight unfairly against people who are endeavouring to expand their sales in an open market or in an area that is not confined to the committee in particular.

The chairman of the Milk Equalization Committee promised me a reply but unfortunately I have not received it. In brief, what happened is this: in 1954 A. W. Sandford had the initiative, or the temerity (whichever it can be called), to sell milk in Broken Hill. In 1955 the Equalization Committee reduced the price of milk by 1s. 4d. a gallon in Broken Hill only, but the two firms that supplied that market lost nothing as they did not have to pay a levy. The individual producers supplying that area possibly lost one-eighth of a penny a gallon which they would not notice. Sandfords and Golden North, the other suppliers to Broken Hill, had to bear that loss. Hall Sandfords took over Sandfords in September, 1956; a conference—virtually a compulsory conference—was held and certain gallonages were allocated. In May, 1958, Hall Sandfords tried to sell another 1,000 gallons to an associated company in Broken Hill, but again an objection was raised and a threat to reduce the price was made. It will be seen from those actions that all has not been fair and above board. In December, 1958, Hall Sandfords were advised to attend a conference at which its quota was

reduced from 20.5 per cent to 18 per cent of the Broken Hill market. This was again under the threat of drastic action.

Mr. Bywaters—Would the producers of the north have sufficient milk to supply Broken Hill all the year around?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I ask not for the Broken Hill market, but merely that this threat be removed. In particular, the firm in my district which I referred to handles approximately 8,000 gallons per week, but at present it is confined to 2,200 gallons in Broken Hill. I do not ask for the Broken Hill market *in toto*: all I ask is that my people be allowed to enter Broken Hill in open competition without having the threat and the weight thrown against them as has been done. I believe that I live in a free State and a free country, and I ask the Government to investigate this matter. It will find that what I have said is true. I believe the Government will find that this committee is mis-using its powers and that it should be told to confine its activities to the area it is entitled to serve, and not to use outside that area any powers it might derive in respect of a confined area.

In the whole of my district of Light there is not even one registered veterinary surgeon. I have endeavoured to obtain permits under the Act which provides that the Veterinary Board may issue permits to suitable persons to serve and give veterinary services in a particular district. We have neither a professional nor a registered veterinary surgeon, nor have we anyone with a permit to operate under the Act, with the result that people in my district have to resort to illegal use of persons to practise for a fee. Failing this, their animals just wither and die or live on with whatever disease and complaints, whether contagious or infectious, they may have. That can happen with cattle, pigs and sheep.

The nearest veterinary surgeon to my home town is 45 miles away. I live in the centre of my electorate, and it would be reasonable to assume that the minimum distance the veterinary surgeon would have to travel from either north, south, east or west would be 25 miles to get anywhere near the middle of the electorate. When a man has sick animals he has to make up his mind whether he is willing to pay between £10 and £20, sometimes even £40, to bring the veterinary surgeon 43 miles to inspect the animals. I know that the decision in most cases is to call in the local man who actually has no right to practise, but who gives them good service with which they are completely satisfied.

This state of affairs is not good; it is outside the law, and those people all know it is, but they have either to break the law or to permit the animal to remain sick and probably die. Many people do this rather than go to the expense of bringing the veterinary surgeon such a long distance. In an endeavour to remedy this position I have endeavoured to obtain permits. In my district there are three people qualified to give good service in the treatment of animals. On the first application I approached the Minister, who told me the procedure to be followed. I passed the information on to the person concerned, and he in turn obtained the necessary character and other references regarding his ability to serve in that capacity. He forwarded those references to the department and was subsequently told that they were insufficient and that he must obtain more. That person travelled some 200 miles at considerable expense, and after a further delay was told that the area was adequately served. I point out that the Veterinary Board knew whether the area was served or not before it put this person to the trouble of getting further references. Surely the board could be considerate enough to make a decision on whether or not an area is adequately served without putting a person to all that trouble. I do not believe the area is adequately served.

Mr. Quirke—How can it be if there is no veterinary surgeon there?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The nearest registered veterinary surgeons are at Clare and Gawler, and those places are quite a distance away. I believe that £5 or £10 is as much as most producers are prepared to spend in the treatment of an animal, because they do not know whether the animal is going to be cured or not. Parliament provided for permits to be issued, and they should be issued where the people of a district are satisfied with the man's ability. Those people were prepared to make a recommendation and send it to the Veterinary Board, and the board did not question this man's qualifications: it merely said that the district was adequately served. I refute that suggestion. The district is not adequately served: it is not served at all, except by the type of person I have mentioned. I ask the Government to look at this question with a view to influencing the board into being a little more liberal in granting permits. Failing that, I am willing to move an amendment to the Act to make it compulsory for the board to give a permit to any person with the necessary qualifications who is approved by

the people of the district. This would enable that person to carry on his work without breaking the law, which he is doing today.

In my maiden speech I referred to decentralization and mentioned water, electricity and roads as being first requisites. I am delighted to see that the Electricity Trust has done magnificent work in my district. During my term in Parliament I think about 400 extra farms have been supplied with electricity, and although there are between 600 and 700 awaiting supply, they are gradually being supplied. The surcharge which once applied has now become a fixed charge and is reaching reasonable proportions. I think £20 a year is about the maximum levy today, and the people are quite content with that for the time being. I hope, indeed, I believe, that the trust will probably have the most profitable year of its existence. I sincerely hope its profit this year will be £1,000,000, and with that profit it will be able to give further relief by way of releasing another year (as it has previously done twice) from this charge and progressively eliminating it altogether. I think members will agree that those who are penalized the most should be the first to enjoy relief, and there are a considerable number of them. When the Government introduced the £200 a house subsidy last year it met with all-round approval, but anomalies have become apparent. The subsidy was on the capital cost of an electrical installation or a series of installations by a group. Some groups failed to make the grade economically four or five years ago and the subsidy had little impact. Their annual charge may have been reduced by £3 or £4, whereas the average with economic new installations was about £16. I know a man who was responsible for the establishment of a group and he made a significant guarantee initially to enable the group to be economic. When his annual charge was fixed he agreed to use £150 worth of electricity a year and his annual charge, from the surcharge which was then about 70 per cent, was fixed at £124. When he received the subsidy that charge was reduced by £4 to £120 because the extension was expensive. Instead of using his guaranteed quantity of £150 worth of the power annually, his total payment was £313. However, because the remainder of the group did not measure up to the grand total, he did not enjoy the concession of almost 20 per cent discount to which he would have been entitled had he been connected on his own. I will not enlarge on this particular instance, but I believe the trust knows of these anomalies

and I hope it attends to them and treats fairly those who have measured up to their agreements and fulfilled their promises.

Three years ago I suggested the decentralization of road work forces and I am glad that this is happening. The roads in my district are receiving attention. According to the Governor's Speech, £2,000,000 is promised to local government and this will further decentralize work forces. In the past I have submitted to the Minister of Works propositions concerning water reticulation and he has been most sympathetic. These propositions have not conformed with Government policy which stipulates that the return on water reticulated for rural development shall be 2½ per cent, for semi-rural about 4 per cent, and for water solely used as an amenity 5½ per cent. Just prior to the last election the Minister said that water was the key to better living. I am sure all members agree with that, but how are we to take water to the 6 per cent of our population which has not got it today? Those who enjoy the privilege secured it at a low cost and their overall return today is about one-fifth per cent a person. Last year it cost the Engineering and Water Supply Department £1,600,000 to make up the interest on the capital cost. People who now seek water are expected to pay 5½ per cent. One does not have to be a mathematician to work out that it will cost them 27 times as much as it cost those who are at present served with water. The Government should modify its approach to this question. I was disappointed that the recently announced increased charges were so low, because the department cannot operate successfully on its present receipts. Losses will continue until charges are increased. If people on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline pay 2s. 6d. a thousand gallons for rebate water and 2s. 6d. a thousand gallons for excess water, there is no reason why people on the Mannum-Adelaide line should not do likewise.

Mr. Bywaters—They do. It is a fixed price.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Those at the end of the line do not pay it. If the price of water were uniform throughout the State it would be fair for all.

Mr. Lawn—But that is socialism and you don't agree with it.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member can talk about his own philosophy and no doubt he will bash our ears for about an hour and a half when he gets to his feet. I believe that

the Government should increase water charges to 2s. 6d. a thousand for rebate and 2s. 6d. a thousand for excess water to all people. If that is done it may be possible to extend reticulation services to uneconomic situations.

Mr. Quirke—That would not be socialism!

Mr. HAMBOUR—It would be justice and there is a great difference between the two. Not far from where I live is a small area that has been clamouring for water for years but the residents would have to pay about 4s. 10d. an acre—2½ times the rate fixed under the Act for water for farm lands. In my district one area is already paying 3s. 4d. an acre, which is too much. If people in the metropolitan area have to rely on pumped water they should pay the appropriate price for it. People in uneconomic locations have to pay a surcharge on electricity: is there any reason why a surcharge should not be imposed on the supply of pumped water? All people should be treated alike. We have to increase the revenue from our water supplies if we hope to reticulate even two or three per cent of the six per cent at present not supplied. I will discuss this matter further when the Loan Estimates are introduced and I will be disturbed if some provision is not made for extending water supplies to my district.

I desire to refer to hospital administration and the circumstances applying to country hospitals. I have been connected with hospitals for most of my life and was quite disturbed by what the member for Norwood, Mr. Dunstan, said in an election speech when he recounted Labor policy on this question. The member for Adelaide also referred to the subject and was supported by the Leader of the Opposition. In South Australia we have four types of hospitals: private hospitals, which rely entirely on fees; community hospitals, which until this year received a pound for pound subsidy on capital costs, but will now receive two pounds for one pound; subsidized hospitals, which have always received a capital subsidy and an annual grant, and which receive 12s. a day for each occupied bed from the Commonwealth Government—an advantage of 4s. over other hospitals; and Government hospitals, which are a Government responsibility.

In general terms subsidized hospitals are quite happy with the treatment they receive and I believe that that form of hospital administration is best suited to this State and it should be extended to cover all country areas

and the metropolitan area, if necessary, excluding possibly the teaching hospitals. Their average charge would be 50s. a day and I object to Government hospitals charging 36s. a day irrespective of whether a patient can afford 50s. or 15s. The charge should be commensurate with the cost or have some relation to it. If people outside the metropolitan area can pay 50s. a day I do not see why people who can afford it in the metropolitan area should not pay the same. I ask the Government to raise its charges to at least 45s. a day. It may be argued that that would penalize pensioners and those who cannot afford it. I have taken out some figures relating to the Royal Adelaide Hospital to indicate just how hard the Government has been on the indigent, pensioners and those who cannot afford to pay fees. Last year that hospital cost the Government £1,557,000. Patients' fees due were £632,545 and patients paid £221,771. The Commonwealth contribution was £140,000. The balance not received was £270,174. I do not think anyone can claim that the Government was unduly hard on those who could not pay. By way of question the member for Adelaide, Mr. Lawn, said that the Government should allow pensioners free treatment at the Royal Adelaide and other Government hospitals, and I think the Leader of the Opposition endorsed that suggestion. Although I cannot fault that submission, I point out that country pensioners are asked to contribute £3 10s. of their pension for which they receive board and lodging and excellent care. They are allowed 17s. 6d. for sundry expenses and an additional amount where they have to pay rent. I do not believe any person with an income should receive free treatment, but say he should contribute a reasonable sum. It is quite obvious that in certain cases pensioners are not charged at all.

The member for Norwood, Mr. Dunstan, in his election speech, said that the Treasurer lost £1,600,000 from the Commonwealth Grants Commission because he did not spend money on our hospitals. I do not believe that. I have more confidence in the Treasurer and the Treasury officials than I have in Mr. Dunstan. However, if by some remote possibility he were right, I still do not agree that we should spend £1,600,000 unless it were necessary. Our people generally are well catered for by our hospital services; the only hospital that is ever crowded is the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and there is a definite reason for that—the charge of 36s. a day or nothing. Many patients do not pay anything.

If that is considered one can appreciate that our hospitals do cater adequately for the population. Most members visited the Queen Elizabeth Hospital some time ago, so I need not refresh their memories that in both the general and the maternity sections only half the beds were occupied. The reason is that the charges are higher than those at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Are we to go on building hospitals that are a drain on the Treasury, or are we going to ask people to make a contribution? We should treat all people in this State the same, and if there is a contribution to be made, it should be made by all.

Mr. Hutchens—Has the Queen Elizabeth Hospital been only half occupied?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Subsidized hospitals in this State have only a 50 per cent occupancy, country Government hospitals 58 per cent, and Government hospitals in the metropolitan area 77 per cent, so how can members opposite make out a case that there are not sufficient beds? The only hospital occupied anywhere near its capacity is the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Mr. O'Halloran—Have you tried to get a bed in the Royal Adelaide?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am sure the Leader has not been listening. I admitted that that hospital is crowded, but that is only because of its lower charges. If people had to pay probably they would not want to go there, but rich or poor, if they can go there they will.

Mr. O'Halloran—They go to get the specialist treatment provided there.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Be that as it may, should not the people going there pay when they can afford to pay? That is all I am putting. The daily average at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which has 1,108 beds, is 963, which I would call full because on occasions some of the beds must be empty. However, I did not intend to debate that. The next charge made by the member for Norwood was, I thought, quite unjust, and I have found since it was not true. He said that a hernia, cancer, and some other case were kept waiting months for admission to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I checked, and found that when a patient is recommended for admission there by a doctor and his case is urgent he is admitted. I challenge the member for Norwood to state when an urgent cancer case was refused admission. Charges such as this reflect on the State and do not do justice to a good service.

Mr. Millhouse—Will you give figures of the occupancy?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Nobody can do that, because they are incomplete. Excluding interest and amortization charges, the cost per patient at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is £5 0s. 4d. a day, of which £1 16s. is recovered. The cost per patient in country Government hospitals is £5 0s. 9d., of which £1 16s. comes back, and in subsidized country hospitals the cost is £3 4s. 6d. and £2 10s. is recovered. Is it not reasonable to ask that the community in Government hospital areas be asked to contribute a little more to the bill we have to meet for hospital services? Now that this is a non-claimant State I sincerely hope these things will be rectified in justice to the people.

Mr. O'Halloran—Take it out of the hides of the sick!

Mr. HAMBOUR—I do not think that statement does the Leader justice. He knows I do not mean that; it is the last thing I would suggest. We should take it out of the cash of those who have it.

Mr. O'Halloran—Then we have that in common.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I would not be worth anything if I felt I could not make some contribution to the administration, and that is what I am trying to do. I now turn to the affairs of pensioners, and ask whether it is right that the dependents and beneficiaries of pensioners should enjoy the privileges of an estate, or whether that estate should redeem some of the services given to the pensioner in his or her dying days.

Mr. Jennings—The circumstances dictate that.

Mr. HAMBOUR—It should go to the hospital that gives the service.

Mr. Loveday—It depends on the service given to the individual.

Mr. HAMBOUR—From 1932 to 1934 it was the practice to proceed against the sons and daughters for an account incurred by the parents, but that practice was dropped years ago.

Mr. O'Halloran—That practice has not been dropped. I can mention several country hospitals where it is still continued.

Mr. HAMBOUR—If it is Peterborough, I can see why they would have to chase money. I could give figures to show that, but I will not go so far. When a pensioner leaves money, it should be taken to pay for services.

Mr. O'Halloran—Pay the undertaker first!

Mr. HAMBOUR—If the Leader wants that, it is up to him entirely. The Government has been generous in country areas where there

are Government hospitals. Let us look at the local government rating in areas where there are Government hospitals. I think these figures will surprise members when they see how little they contribute as compared with what is contributed in other areas. I have obtained figures of rate revenue from the last report of the Highways and Local Government Department, for 1956-57, and the population figures from the last census taken in 1954. At Port Augusta, with a population of 6,704, and a rate revenue of £36,397 the contribution was 29d. a head, or 2½% of rate revenue. Subsidized hospitals average six! The contribution paid by the corporation of Port Augusta, about which we hear so much from the member for Stuart, was £800. I can mention many country towns that contribute £800. Why should not this corporation contribute £2,000, which is the amount it should contribute on a proportionate basis? Peterborough, the biggest town represented by the Leader of the Opposition, contributes 20 per cent compared with Port Augusta's 2½ per cent. Is there any justice in that?

Mr. O'Halloran—I think that figure might be a little exaggerated.

Mr. HAMBOUR—It is not exaggerated, but even if you halve it, it is still unjust.

Mr. O'Halloran—Should they all be government hospitals?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Your policy is that all hospitals should be free.

Mr. O'Halloran—Of course they should.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Then socialize everything and the people will reject you as they did last time. For Port Lincoln, with a population of 5,871 and a rate revenue of £36,197, the contribution was 41d. a head or 2½ per cent of rate revenue, and the council contribution was £1,000. At Mount Gambier, where the rate revenue was £61,579, and the population 10,331, the cost was 55d. a head. The member representing that district will start to shuffle in his seat! That represents 3½ per cent of revenue, and the contribution was £2,400. At Port Pirie it is getting better: there must be a better member! Rate revenue in that town was £124,116, and the population was 14,223. The contribution was 26d. a head, 1½ per cent of revenue, and the council contribution was £1,600. This in a place like Port Pirie! I think the contribution for the Strathalbyn hospital, which is not subsidized, is as much as that. Members opposite who criticize the Government week after week and throw bouquets with the wrong odour surely can see the generosity shown to

the hospitals they represent. I want those contributions increased, because the extra money derived could be apportioned a little more justly to hospitals that should be getting more. At Barmera, with a population of 3,009 and a rate revenue of £13,687, the contribution was 39d. a head, or 4½ per cent of revenue, and the council contribution £650. At Wallaroo, with a population of 2,403 and a rate revenue of £6,807, the cost was 35d. per head, which was 5 per cent of revenue. This is the highest of the towns I have quoted, but they get off very well. The council contribution there was £350.

I shall not deal with the metropolitan area, except to give the average figures. The corporations or councils in the metropolitan area contribute 3½ per cent of rate revenue, or an average of 41d. per head. In the areas where there is no Government hospital, which contribute about 57d. a head, the amount is about 6 per cent of rate revenue. For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition I shall give the figures relating to Peterborough. In that town, with a population of 3,473 and a rate revenue of £5,242, the Government subsidy was £5,590, which is a most generous subsidy.

Mr. O'Halloran—Is the Peterborough Corporation the only one that pays rates to the hospital?

Mr. HAMBOUR—No, but the figure per head is high.

Mr. O'Halloran—You would not know that that hospital serves the whole of the north-east.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am not crying it down, but saying that the people there are paying more than anywhere else.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear, hear!

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am glad the Leader is with me for a change. I am saying that the variation in the country is very wide, ranging from 3s. 4d. to 20s. 10d. at Cowell. A hospital that concerns me is that at Hamley Bridge. That is a community hospital conducted by the people from the Pinkerton Council, part of the Mudla Wirra Council and part of the Owen Council. These people do not receive anything from the contribution they make through the council. The contributions from Mudla Wirra go to the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler and the Owen contributions to Balaklava or Riverton. I want all the areas that pay council rates to be included in one category and become eligible for the subsidy. The Strathalbyn Hospital gets £1,490 through district council rates. This

comes from two areas by voluntary contribution. Then it gets £90 by direction from the Meadows Council. This is another set of circumstances. Should they not be entitled to the benefit through the contributions they make in the district council rates? I should like to see the whole position investigated and the money allocated in proportion to what the people pay. If a community makes a contribution it should be entitled to the benefit.

Mr. O'Halloran—We would get another couple of thousand pounds.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes, and honestly deserve it. It is wrong that different situations should get different treatment. The argument that the Government sets up hospitals to do certain work will not hold water. Mount Gambier is proud of its hospital, yet I heard the chairman of the auxiliary committee say ungratefully that it was no more than Mount Gambier deserved.

Mr. Ralston—And he meant it.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Mount Gambier had £2,000,000 of State money presented to it. It has had the capital cost of the construction, which is met by the taxpayers, and it gets a top class service with the best of equipment for 36s. a day. Does the honourable member say that is justice for all the people in South Australia? We have six hospitals in so-called strategic positions. Some of them compete with subsidized hospitals. Penola and Naracoorte compete with Mount Gambier. Many anomalies exist and I hope that the Minister of Health when considering the position will iron out a few. I could give him a list of a few to be ironed out. Government hospitals in the metropolitan area and the country should contribute more. I hope that the Government will accept a subsidized hospital in an area that contributes through district council rates. I support the motion.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie)—I join with other members in supporting the motion. I congratulate the previous speakers, but I feel they have made it difficult for the members who follow. I congratulate the Speaker on his re-election to his high office. As the new member for Port Pirie I am proud to be associated with members on both sides of this House. I thank them sincerely for the valuable assistance they have given me. I also thank the people of Port Pirie for the confidence they have reposed in me. I deem it a great honour to represent them in Parliament. To the best of my ability I will do what is expected of me and will endeavour to

serve them as ably as did my predecessor, the late Mr. C. L. Davis. I appreciate the honour of being able to take part in this debate. Like those of previous speakers my remarks will be of a local nature.

Port Pirie is about 150 miles from the metropolitan area. With its giant smelting works and excellent rural surroundings, together with the first class rail service through to Western Australia and the sheep and cattle country in the north, more of Port Pirie's potential should be recognized. The population has not increased materially for some years and unless the Government changes its policy on decentralization of industry there will soon be some ghost towns in South Australia. At present 90 per cent of the youth of Port Pirie are forced to leave in search of employment and this results in the breaking up of homes sooner than should be the case. Port Pirie should be able to retain its youth and the Government should provide them with the opportunity to get full employment.

One major drawback at Port Pirie is the urgent need to rehabilitate the wharves and to deepen the channel. If this work were done soon Port Pirie would be assisted and ships would be given access to the port at all times. Greater tonnages would be handled and the efficiency would reduce handling costs. Also, more work could be provided for the waterside workers and this would help the economy of the Commonwealth in general and of the State in particular. At present, because of the low draught, overseas vessels wanting to take on a load of ore concentrates for stiffening purposes, which is necessary if wool or some other light cargo is to be loaded in the eastern States, have to by-pass Port Pirie. The ship must go to the discharge port, which in some instances is Brisbane, and then come back to Port Pirie as an empty ship, take on the stiffening and proceed to, say, Brisbane for the overseas cargo. This results in extra costs and loss of time. These additional costs must be met by increased freight charges and that means higher prices when the goods are placed on overseas markets. We are 12,000 miles from the United Kingdom and Continental markets and costs and prices must be kept to a minimum if we are to operate on those markets. If we are complacent about the lack of these improvements Port Pirie will soon be in the same position as Port Augusta. Mr. Riches would readily agree that this could happen. The proposed rehabilitation work by the Harbors Board at a cost of £1,500,000 will not

achieve the desired result, and it will not bring the port to the position where it can be used by overseas vessels at all times. It is essential for each berth to be dredged to a depth of 27ft. and the channel to at least 23ft. or 24ft. at low tide.

Another important matter is the standardization of the railway gauge between Port Pirie and Broken Hill. It is essential in the interest of the economy of the State that this work be one without further delay; otherwise the Broken Hill ore traffic may go to Port Kembla. To assist Port Pirie and its people in the future I ask the Government to seriously consider these matters.

The member for Light stated that he was living in a free country. We claim to be a democratic country, therefore the people should be given their democratic rights to elect and put into power the Government of their choice. I refer to the gerrymandering of electorates in this State.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert)—In supporting the motion, I consider it fitting to refer to my able and highly respected predecessor (Sir Malcolm McIntosh) who represented the electorate of Albert for 37 years and was held in very high esteem by his constituents, not only because of what he was able to achieve for his electorate during his record term of 28 years as a Minister, but because of his personal interest and approachability in all matters concerning his electorate.

I intend to confine my remarks to those matters contained in His Excellency's Speech of which I have some knowledge and which more specifically concern my electorate. Since 1948 there has been tremendous industrial expansion. Figures prepared by the Australian and New Zealand Bank show that since 1953 factory production has risen by 43 per cent. This has been coupled with a big increase not only in overall building, but industrial building in particular, and that in itself augurs very well for the future development of Australia. This development has been necessary to absorb the work force of our growing population. Other members probably know better than I the strain imposed upon the resources of the Government to provide the necessary facilities such as housing, schools, hospitals, transport, power and other social and domestic necessities to maintain this growing population.

In this growth we have tended to overlook the fact that this expansion is not being paid for by the expansion of our rural or

export industries. Most of it has been paid for and accounted for by the fact that over the last 10 years there has been an inflow of £700,000,000 of overseas credit into Australia, and this is continuing at the rate of a further £100,000,000 a year. This, and the fact that our diversified production has acted as a buffer, helped us to weather the storm of 1957 without feeling serious repercussions in our home or domestic field. To show the position a little more clearly, over the last 10 years we have seen that the rural industries, which in 1951 contributed 24 per cent of our national income, produced in 1958 only eight per cent of our national income. That shows the expansion that has taken place in industry within Australia.

But what of the other position? Our purchasing power is derived from our overseas credits. About 80 per cent of our present imports are producers' goods, not consumers' goods, and our primary industries still produce 80 per cent of our export income, as they have done over the last 30 years. I say without reservation that the statement that Australia rides on the sheep's back is as significant today as it ever was. Since 1953 the position of those in rural industries has declined markedly. During the period prices received for commodities have dropped 45 per cent overall, whereas costs have risen by 53 per cent. This is rather a dramatic change, particularly as it has been coupled with a lean season in 1957 and uncertain prospects for 1959. We are now in the unhappy position where our margins are small and our commitments big. It is therefore understandable that the member for Ridley (Mr. Stott) is able to get together meetings of people interested in orderly marketing, because it has become fundamentally important to the producer that he should be able to budget his expenditure. As honourable members know, we have to meet our expenses before we get our returns; in other words, we are gambling on average returns.

I contend that the solvency of our rural industries today depends largely upon two things, firstly, automation or mechanization, and, secondly, the ability to absorb costs by entirely discounting the need for interest on capital. Further, they can make no provision for sinking funds—they are not able to—against those inevitable bad years. I believe this recession is only a temporary one and I do not wish in any way to cast any reflection on the present set-up, but I feel that the long term prospect for agricultural production is one about which we in this House

should be perturbed. I feel that the decline we are permitting our rural industry to slip into is going to have serious repercussions within the next 20 years.

I have extracted some figures from the *Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics* which show that if we continue our expansion at the normal rate, if we continue our normal rate of production of meat, poultry, rice, milk, citrus and other fruits, potatoes, eggs and other commodities, and if the intake of migrants maintains an average of either 50,000 or of 100,000 per annum over this period, we can expect the population by 1976 to be either 13,000,000 or 14,000,000, respectively, and in those commodities I have mentioned the demand will greatly exceed the supply. We will also have considerably reduced surpluses of wheat, barley, oats and other things on which we now depend for our overseas credits. It has been estimated that to maintain our level of producer goods and provide for our overseas commitments we will have to expand our exports by 62 per cent or 77 per cent, respectively, depending on the population increase. That is quite an undertaking.

I therefore suggest that we provide for some long range programme of expansion of our rural industries. I consider that we can best do that by promoting a positive and progressive agricultural policy, by embarking upon a long term civilian land settlement scheme, and thirdly, by making sure we do not lose any of our present markets and by endeavouring where possible to establish new ones for our exports. I believe that the Commonwealth Government is aware of this and of the difficult problem in our marketing which results from dumping and gifts of food. I believe that we can do a lot to promote progressive agricultural policies, but in doing so we need a progressive Department of Agriculture. The position, as I see it, is very difficult so far as improving the status of our department is concerned. I have been made aware of this through my association with the Australian Wheat Research Advisory Committee, because it is apparent that it is almost impossible to recruit senior officers to undertake the work the department wishes to undertake in conjunction with this scheme. The South Australian Public Service award does not permit the department to offer sufficiently attractive salaries to induce people to leave jobs in the universities, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization or other departments to accept a

job of this nature with our present department. I therefore suggest some revision of salaries in the department or, more important still, an increase in the number of appointments in senior positions so that more promotion is available to those lower down the scale.

Regarding land settlement, I listened with dismay to the member for Light's suggestion that the scheme as set out in the Speech was to be a restrictive one, and that it would assist only the sons of farmers and not be open to all eligible persons. The Leader of the Opposition raised the question of Crown lands; he asked where they were and why they had not been exploited before. He went on to say that the Government had had the opportunity to carry out such a scheme ever since the war ended, and that these areas could have been exploited for soldier settlement so as to enable all qualified men to go on the land. My reply is that in my electorate there are still some 400,000 acres of such Crown lands, receiving between 16 inches and 22 inches of rain a year, capable of such development, but there are very good reasons for this land's not having been developed previously.

Two such reasons have been the lack of know-how in handling the problem of deep sandy soils, and the inadequacy of the water not only for stock but for domestic purposes. We have found an answer to this problem of deep sandy soil, but it is a very recent acquisition to our knowledge. It has been founded by the application of one bag of lime per acre, superphosphate, and trace elements that are added with the seed at seeding time. That is sufficient to reduce the acidity of the soil in close proximity to the seed, thus increasing not only effective germination, but in the case of legumes, effective nodulation.

With this information we are now able to establish fairly satisfactory pasture on this type of land. I believe that any such developmental scheme could be financed without any write-off by the Government. I feel that if the terms are made suitable the scheme can finance itself as the A.M.P. scheme is doing. I suggest that if we had a scheme which gave adequate living areas, which provided the capital on long term repayment and low rates of interest, the scheme itself could not be other than successful. I consider that the task of development should be made as easy and as profitable as possible because, after all, these people will be developing what

is virtually a national asset, and financing of a scheme of this nature should be a function of the new Commonwealth developmental bank.

In old-established districts there is a problem of maintaining land tenure in the face of the present cost structure once a property is valued for probate. We must develop a more realistic approach to land values if this problem is to be overcome. Land values were stimulated during the boom years of 1950 to 1953 by people, with surplus money, who desired to increase their farm holdings in closely held districts to provide for their sons. They acquired neighbouring farms at prices probably twice as high as they valued their own properties. When the cost was spread over their total holding it did not appear excessive, but when the seller of the land sought another property in a different area he was obliged to pay a price far above that previously existing in such areas. Consequently a higher set of land values developed in that area. This would have adjusted itself had it not been for the programme of securing urban areas for closer settlement. Exorbitant prices have been paid for small properties for subdivision. People who sell their farms seek new properties and are prepared to pay excessive prices for them. That is why land has retained a fictitiously high value.

When a man leaves his property to a son he leaves him the means to earn a livelihood. We should agree that a property is designed to provide a living and determine a reasonable salary for managing and working it. If a man's work is worth £1,000 a year for such work it would require a capital of £16,500 to return £1,000 a year at current bank interest rates of 6 per cent. It is not unrealistic to suggest that some such method be employed in determining the amount for probate and only the value over and above that necessary to provide the income should be taxable.

I am rather perturbed at the prospect of over-draining the South-East. With the increased emphasis on the possibility of large-scale irrigation projects in the South-East one wonders what effect this could have on the water table in the artesian basin. I understand that the C.S.I.R.O. Soils Division is at present examining the position and is using lysimeters to measure the water lost through evaporation, transpiration, and drainage. Indications are that these losses are high and if extensive irrigation projects are implemented it may be necessary to replenish

the basin with drainage water during the winter. A number of people have been concerned lest the drains should be made too deep and break into the water basin which, in many areas, is high. However, the position in the eastern division, where 700,000 acres are to be drained, is slightly different. Most of this water originates in Victoria and drains into South Australia through the Mosquito, Naracoorte, and Moorabbin Creeks. Therefore, it is worth considering the possibility of diverting some of this water into the cavernous limestone areas east of the Naracoorte range before it becomes a problem on the plains. This would ensure a replenishment of the underground water supplies.

The completion of this comprehensive drainage scheme will eventually affect a vast area, including large areas in County Cardwell as far north as Alf's Flat. However, there is evidence to show that the removal of surface drainage water from this area will affect the supply of stock water in the coastal regions south of Meningie. Work undertaken by the C.S.I.R.O. and the Mines Department in this area reveals that there is no build-up of stock water in this basin. By using both pasture plots and plots under native vegetation they have established that local rainfall does not contribute to the ground water supplies at 25 to 35 feet, but as there appears to be a gradient of one foot in a mile northwards it seems reasonable to assume that this water is fed from overland surface water from the Alf's Flat and Bordertown areas. Limited water supplies, which depend on local catchment of ground water alone, have restricted the further development of Crown lands in this area. The answer to the problem lies in the proposed Taillem Bend-Keith water scheme. Until this is established production will be retarded in County Cardwell and in a large section of County Buckleuch. This country has considerable potential and the reticulation of water could result in the carrying of an additional 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 sheep plus cattle. The overall increase in production will without doubt justify the heavy expenditure necessary in implementing the scheme. The proposed route of the trunk main should provide for eventually reticulating water west and south of Keith. The implementation of the scheme will also result in the eventual electrification of the upper South-East because of the tie-up between the Electricity Trust and the pumping stations. We are now on the fringe of the feeling fingers of the Electricity Trust

and I hope the scheme proceeds soon with sufficient speed to provide electricity to the Meningie-Narrung area.

The development of Crown lands in the Counties of Buckingham and Chandos is being retarded by the lack of access roads. Three through roads between Duke's Highway and the Pinnaroo main road will be necessary to open up this country. It was hoped that the Highways Department would form the Pinnaroo-Cannawigara road, but the Minister of Roads has advised the Pinnaroo and Tatiara councils that although the re-survey had been completed no further action is pending. A number of people in the area are forced to use 4-wheel drive vehicles to get into their properties. Even Land Rovers are being bogged in the sand. I hope the department reconsiders its decision. When these access roads are provided 400,000 acres of Crown land can be developed.

Like all members I am aware of the tremendous job confronting the Minister of Education and his department. Nevertheless, I draw attention to the proposed Coomandook area school which residents understood was to commence in 1960. If promises cannot be honoured I suggest that those sponsoring these projects should temper their enthusiasm with reality because I have to answer for their promises. This school is necessary and 20 children from the area are at present obliged to board away from home to secure the necessary education, and that number will increase. These children should not be denied secondary education in their own district. Every effort should be made to establish the school, if not in 1960, at least in 1961.

The member for Burnside, Mrs. Steele, has referred to various social reforms, and it was my intention to discuss capital punishment, but as a Bill is coming forward relating to that subject, I shall defer my comments thereon. I would, however, commend the Government on the support it has given to the Prisoners Aid Society to assist rehabilitate prisoners. Despite the Opposition's criticism of the Governor's Speech as a means of Government propaganda, I believe that it contains a progressive and constructive policy. I support the motion.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the motion and congratulate the mover, Mrs. Steele. Some years ago I advocated the desirability of having women in this august Chamber. We are democrats and the Labor Party has for

years sponsored and endorsed women candidates without success. Women have a place in our Parliament. They are better able to expound the ideals of the mother and the children—ideals that members generally may overlook, because a woman is a specialist in some matters. The speech made by the member for Burnside was most commendable and I agree with most of what she said because I believe it had some link with my Party's policy, particularly her remarks relating to price control. Since this has diminished a serious form of inflation has developed and has been accentuated almost daily. I commend the honourable member for her contribution to this debate.

I also congratulate the seconder, the member for Gouger who, as a young man, did very well. Although I did not agree with all he said I was impressed by the way he delivered his speech. The member for Albert has a mighty task in front of him in that he succeeds a former Minister of the Crown, Sir Malcolm McIntosh. It can be said as a tribute to Sir Malcolm that all members of this Party revered him for his special attention to matters they raised relating to his department. I am sorry he is indisposed, and I hope he and Lady McIntosh will soon be restored to health. The member for Albert possesses much knowledge of the land, and he displayed this knowledge in his speech.

I turn now to members of my Party who have spoken. I congratulate the member for Port Adelaide on his fine speech. He spoke on matters of which he had knowledge, which is sound practice. He, too, has quite a task in that he follows in the footsteps of Mr. Stephens, who gave years of service and was always on duty to serve his Party and this Parliament, even when indisposed, and he did it well. I trust that Mr. Ryan will emulate Mr. Stephens' service: I believe he will. The speech made by the member for Port Pirie was most satisfactory. I have always believed that a member's maiden speech should not be long, and Mr. McKee made his points most concisely, dealing very well with matters he knew. He also has a mighty task in following in the footsteps of the late Charles Davis, the member for Pirie for over 12 years. I was a pallbearer at Mr. Davis' funeral, and I think all who attended were convinced that he had made a fine impression in Port Pirie and had endeared himself to the people for his services in Parliament and in the municipal affairs of Port Pirie. Without doubt it was

because of his efforts that Port Pirie made great advances. He was very persistent in his claims, and we owe a lot to him for the contribution he made in Parliament. The problems of hire purchase have been raised by members on this side for many years, and Bills have been brought down in an endeavour to control this vicious form of credit, but the Government will not yield to our desires; consequently people are signing contracts costing them 40 per cent more than they should have to pay. These people are forced to resort to hire purchase because of their financial position, and are paying dearly for it. The Labor Party has felt for some time that there should be some control over hire purchase. When I was married I had to resort to it, and men who start married life with only £40 or £50 need hire purchase to buy essential things. This business is growing to extraordinary proportions and is having a big effect on home building in that some of the banks have entered into it because it returns a lucrative interest rate. Because of this participation by the banks, directly or indirectly, home building has been penalized. That is an important aspect of hire purchase. Only last week I obtained information from the State Bank that over 1,000 applicants await satisfaction, and the position will worsen while hire purchase is so lucrative. As more applications are being made each month, it seems to me that many will never be satisfied. Professor H. W. Arndt, Professor of Economics at Canberra University College, when interviewed for a Sydney television session on July 19, said:—

The remarkable thing in this country is that people seem to be quite unconcerned by the fantastic interest rates they pay for these things, partly because they have been concealed. Any member who has studied hire purchase finance will know that, generally speaking, an agreement contains between 35 and 40 clauses in fine type, and that a person seeking credit signs on the dotted line without considering the niceties of the various clauses. In the last three or four weeks the case of a widow living at Albert Park was brought to my notice. Some years ago, when her husband was alive, she bought a Frigidaire, paid a few hundred pounds by monthly payments, and when her husband died she was financially embarrassed until she found a job at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The hire purchase company repossessed the article. I agree that under their contracts such companies can do these things, but they have no Christian ideals; they stand

by business, and business alone. They do not consider the circumstances of a widow with a family such as the woman I mentioned. The repossession was not the worst feature, however; but I am concerned about the means they adopted in repossessing. While the lady was at work one afternoon a bailiff and a man from the company came to her home, broke a window, opened the door, and took away the refrigerator. When this was brought to my notice I immediately thought this could not happen in a democratic country, where even the police are bound to produce a warrant before entering one's home, but after inquiring at the company concerned, and reading the contract, I realized it could be done. The contract contains a long clause dealing with this matter in which it is stated:—

I hereby licence you or your servants or agents to enter by force if necessary.

I hope that if members on the other side of the House are aware of this position they will protest against that sort of thing happening in a democratic country.

I was informed only last week of a person who wanted to buy a television machine costing about £200. The interest rate on this machine would have amounted to another £78, and as a result, the person refused to buy it. I am convinced beyond doubt that something must be done to control hire purchase in this State. I realize that hire-purchase is necessary, firstly, to serve people who cannot afford to pay cash, and secondly, to maintain a decent level of employment in South Australia. The figures published annually show that the amount of money spent on hire-purchase is increasing enormously and this method of purchase will always be retained because it does such a good job. However, it comes as a shock when a person checks a four-year contract on which he believes he is paying 8 per cent or 9 per cent interest to find in fact, that over the whole period the rate paid has been 16 per cent because interest has been charged at a flat rate. We have tried to impress on this House that some control of hire-purchase interest rates must be undertaken. I hope that before long, because of the things that are occurring and because people are being exploited, something will be done to protect people not able to pay cash for the things they desire.

All members are concerned about the position that has arisen as to the sale of meat in South Australia. Some control is necessary to protect the consumer and at the same time to give a fair deal to the producer. When we know how much the consumer pays for his

weekly meat bill the need for something to be done becomes even more urgent. This item of food has been controlled before and the control proved satisfactory, but today people in business can charge just what they desire.

The average breadwinner pays about one-third of his wage for meat and rent. That is extraordinary and both items should be controlled. It is remarkable that since the outburst appeared in the press, and following what members on this side of the House said about the high price of meat, the matter was referred to the Prices Commissioner (Mr. Murphy) and there was a gradual reduction in prices, which shows there was cause for complaint. Meat grading is essential. Most butchers in the metropolitan area are charging a fair price compared with what they pay at the abattoirs for their meat, but on the other hand many butchers buy second and third grade meat for which they still charge the same price as for first grade meat, although that does not apply in all cases. The practice is not fair and I believe that control of meat prices is essential and that meat grading goes with price control. In some cases butchers are charging first grade prices for third grade meat. This is so obviously unfair that I hope the Premier (as the Minister in charge of Prices) and the Prices Commissioner will take a rigid stand and see these things are attended to.

The proposed new Jervois Bridge at Port Adelaide is causing much concern amongst the people of my district and of Port Adelaide because there is so much uncertainty as to what is going to happen. On March 24, 1955, the Government sent a reference to the Public Works Standing Committee to consider replacing the existing Jervois Bridge. When the committee had before it the former Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Richmond) he made it clear that because the bridge was 78 years old it had outlived its usefulness, and those who have observed the condition of the bridge and the approaches on either side of it marvelled that the bridge could still take the enormous amount of traffic it did. The inquiry undertaken by the committee was protracted, involving 17 witnesses from the district. Their evidence was to the effect that there should be a new bridge to take the place of the existing Jervois Bridge, which was in a bad state of repair.

The committee worked hard on this project—as it does on all projects—and finally made a recommendation to the Government that a bridge should be built (at a cost of £315,000

plus approaches to the bridge costing £20,000) to replace the existing bridge. During that inquiry the Harbors Board persisted that it was essential to have a bascule bridge but I expressed myself to be against that proposal on the inquiry and the committee decided that it should be a fixed bridge. It is wrong to have a lifting bridge on a main artery and when lorries, motor cars and tramway buses continually travel over that bridge it becomes obvious that traffic should not be impeded. It was because of that, and because of other circumstances, that the committee decided that the previous bridge should be replaced with a fixed bridge.

The Harbors Board argued that we should have an opening bridge because of the span of water between Jervois Bridge and the railway bridge. The evidence plainly showed on that occasion that very few steamers travelled between the two bridges. Indeed, in the year the Committee asked the question regarding income only £2,000 had been derived by the Harbors Board as revenue. True, Corporation Wharf is in a bad state of repair and if it is reconstructed it may attract more shipping, but the Harbors Board has for some years been reclaiming land opposite Osborne on the Port River for the purpose of berthing steamers from other States and overseas and it has made remarkable progress. In a few years there will be berthing space for eight or nine steamers when in port. The committee had all this in mind when it took its stand and considered that the upstream part between the two bridges was no longer useful and that it was wrong to impede traffic operating on a main artery.

The Harbors Board was never happy about our conclusion and, after our recommendation that a new bridge replace the existing bridge went to the Government, another reference came to the committee asking that it consider another form of bridge. So this matter has been going on for some years and little, if any, progress has been made. In the meantime various aspects have been raised by the Harbors Board and we have heard various proposals, one of which has been that there should be a causeway from the Old Port Road to Bower Road on the southern side of the existing railway bridge. There is another plan to take a road across the canal at Port Adelaide, running down Church Place and shortening the journey, taking some of the traffic out of Port Adelaide—a commendable idea.

So we have had three proposals before the Public Works Standing Committee. It was almost a waste of time because the Harbors Board was determined to do certain things running counter to the wishes of the Committee. The Board plans to use the space between Jervois Bridge and the railway bridge for berthing trawlers. That is the plan for the distant future. They plan also on the northern side of Jervois Bridge to berth a roll-on roll-off steamer. So we are entangled in these projects and not making much progress. I hope that the Harbors Board will declare its intentions. What disgusts me so about the whole thing is that we have learnt indirectly through the Port Adelaide City Council that, for many months past, members of the board have been discussing with the council the possibility of getting rid of Jervois Bridge entirely. The Public Works Standing Committee is not acquainted with this; I am hearing it outside in my own district, which is most embarrassing.

Mr. Lawn—Shame!

Mr. TAPPING—It is embarrassing. There have been secret conferences with the Port Adelaide City Council. Again, it has been planned to duplicate the Birkenhead Bridge, because of the volume of traffic, and possibly build a causeway, which we have already looked at, Jervois Bridge being taken away entirely. Why has not the Public Works Standing Committee been acquainted with the reason for the change?

I have been most disappointed with some members of the Harbors Board. I have referred to the fact that the board as a board is understaffed. Three members try to run it, one of whom is overseas getting information—I do not condemn him for that. But I am not convinced that the affairs of the board can be conducted by two members. We are perturbed in Semaphore, particularly at the thought of Jervois Bridge being entirely removed with nothing to take its place. The Government, through the Harbors Board, should be fair to the Public Works Standing Committee and impart knowledge which I claim the board is at the moment withholding from the Committee.

Many times some civil servants in this State are willing to run the business of the Government. I realize that the Ministers have a big job to perform because of the way in which this State is growing. I have mentioned important cases about which the Ministers knew nothing. Most senior civil servants are helpful

and nice to talk to, but some are not very keen on Labor members. I say that from my own experience. It is the duty of every Minister of the Crown, irrespective of Party, to make certain that he approves of what is to be done. It must be embarrassing for a Minister to say, "I am not certain; I shall have to see my officer about the position."

The Harbors Board has failed to do certain things. Some members of that department have little regard for Parliament or Parliamentarians. I hope that the Government will see fit to tell the Harbors Board that there is a problem at Port Adelaide about the bridge. Let us have the correct evidence and the comments of the Harbors Board so that this work can be proceeded with.

I come now to the lack of control on land sales in South Australia. Some years ago they were controlled with every satisfaction and, under that method, both buyer and seller were treated fairly. Today, however, although the seller is treated fairly, the buyer is in a precarious position, which is being accentuated because most of the land in the metropolitan area has been taken up and those who hold any can get any price they desire. Exploitation is taking place. It is having a big and disastrous effect on young people desirous of getting married and building a home. In some cases they are forced to pay as much as £800 or £900, or even more, for a block of land. That is a great burden on the shoulders of young people launching out in life.

Mr. O'Halloran—They got a home for that amount a few years ago.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes. Besides paying an excessive amount for land, they are bound to pay £3,500 in an attempt to build a home, which is a real millstone around their necks for the following 30 or 40 years. They are lucky to see it through.

The time has arrived for some control of land sales in South Australia. I am not disclosing secrets of the Public Works Committee, all of whose reports are published, when I say that sometimes the amount of money the Government has to pay for land for, say, a school is terrific. I have heard of £60,000 or £80,000 for 20 acres of land on which to build a school. I appeal to the Government to recontrol the sale of land and, by so doing, give a fair deal to both seller and buyer. What is going on is obvious. I understand that the Land Board in some cases goes into what is a fair price; but nothing is done about it. Finally,

the seller wins and the Government has to pay much money for land for a school.

Let me at this stage commend the Minister of Education for the part he has played, because this State has grown and is growing rapidly by reason of immigration and natural increase. Schools are urgently needed. He has done his best to meet the circumstances obtaining here. I appeal to the Minister to consider the point I have made. It is not fair for the State to have to overpay for 20 acres of land on which to build a school. It could be, as time went on, that the Government, having bought enough land for 20 schools by paying more than it need pay for it, would have had enough money to pay for an extra school had it not had to pay such high prices for the land. That is no exaggeration.

I now come to housing in South Australia. Every member of this House is concerned about the lack of homes and desires to see our people housed decently. Like other members on this side of the House, I am vitally concerned about the freedom given to some oil companies and others to demolish homes at will. I am concerned about the attitude of some firms who buy situate homes and demolish them for the purpose of building a service station or extending their industries. I do not object to any firm—in fact, I commend it—desiring to progress and extend its business, because by so doing it naturally employs more men. But here the human element must be considered.

At one time it was essential, when a firm desired to demolish homes, for the matter to go before the Minister for his consideration and, in some cases, he disapproved. Today, however, all one has to do is buy situate homes, give the tenant 30 days' notice to quit, and then at the end of a further 12 days, which gives the tenant a chance to make an appearance in court, the court proceeds to make an order. Rarely has there been a rejection by the courts. It is almost automatic. However, some of the companies have given an extension of time. If the housing position were satisfactory no-one would quibble, but thousand of families are still waiting for homes. It may be asked why the tenant does not try to buy a home. This cannot be done on the basic wage and sometimes by those who receive above that wage.

This morning, with other members of the Public Works Committee, I visited the Magill Boys' Reformatory and spoke to a gentleman there about the inmates, who number 94. I asked where these boys generally came from

and what were their circumstances. I learned that nine-tenths of them came from workers' homes. In some cases this is because the mothers have to go to work to supplement the family income, and thus the children are neglected. The result is broken homes. Actually in some instances there was no proper home, considering that a husband, wife and four children had to live in one room. This is not uncommon in Semaphore and Port Adelaide. Cannot we expect a moral breakdown under such circumstances?

I consider there is too much concentration in the building of homes at Elizabeth. Many of the residents there have to travel miles to my district to their employment and this entails heavy transport costs. I have every confidence that tomorrow the Premier will announce over 5AD the creation of a garden suburb between Osborne and Taperoo, which I have advocated for many years. Enough land has been acquired there by the Harbors Board for the building of 1,500 to 2,000 homes. The board started to acquire this land about seven or eight years ago and the owners have been paid for that land. Let the Government build homes in that area and also at Semaphore South where plenty of land is available. The Government is catering for families at Elizabeth, but not for those in the metropolitan area, where the building programme is comparatively small.

We were given to understand by the Premier a few years ago that the oil companies operating in South Australia had given him an undertaking that they would not increase the number of petrol stations, and some weeks ago he brought down a statement to the House in reply to a question by Mr. Ryan that there had been very little increase in the number. I was never convinced by that report because members of Parliament must have observed, as they moved about, that demolitions have taken place and additional service stations have been erected. I consider there has been a steep increase in the number. I gleaned from a report of the Shell Oil Company that another undertaking has been given to the Government by the oil companies that as from September 1 next they will build no more than 270 stations a year in Australia, and the undertaking is to continue for three years. Although their prices are uniform, undoubtedly the oil companies are engaged in vicious warfare, and because of this they are paying exceedingly high prices for land and homes so that additional service stations may be established. A number of the lessees of ser-

vice stations in my district have gone out of business and others plan to leave it because they cannot make even £20 a week. Considering the worries involved, they do not consider their returns good enough. The companies never lose, because when one goes out somebody else takes his place. I ask the Government to do something about this and control this type of business. I hope that the points I have raised will be considered by the departments concerned and that the Premier will keep in mind my comments regarding the price of meat, control over the sale of land, and the other matters I have mentioned. I support the motion.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved with outstanding ability, grace and distinction by Mrs. Steele and seconded by Mr. Hall in a manner that reflected great credit on him. I especially congratulate Mrs. Steele on being the first of the fair sex to become a member of this House. In this regard, not only has she made Parliamentary history but has rendered a real service to the cause of feminine emancipation. I wish her well in her Parliamentary career, as I do other new members.

Allow me to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election to your high and important office. Three years ago when it was necessary to select a successor to the Honourable Sir Robert Nicholls members of the Opposition nominated a candidate, but on this occasion you had the unanimous support of both sides, which I feel reflects the esteem and respect with which you are held. I also congratulate Mr. Dunnage on his re-appointment as Chairman of Committees — again a tribute for services well rendered. There is perhaps no place more subject to change in personnel than is a House of Parliament. As I glance around the Chamber I miss familiar faces that were here at the beginning of the 35th Parliament. Some have passed on to the Great Beyond and others did not seek re-election. I pay my humble respects to the memory of those who have passed on and remember their kindly personalities and their good works, as I remember also the good fellowship and services of other former members.

Speaking of change, I commend the Minister responsible for the improved lighting in this Chamber, and for the incidental accentuation of the beauty of design and workmanship of the ceiling. I hope that the pendant lighting fixtures which have adorned this building, and which have been a feature of it for many

years, will be retained and used in conjunction with the new lighting effects. I hope this will be done rather than the aesthetic than utilitarian point of view. If medium candle-power globes were to be used the cost of the extra lighting would not render the suggestion prohibitive.

Before proceeding to comment on the contents of the Speech with which His Excellency was pleased to open this 36th Parliament, I take this opportunity of complimenting the Hansard Staff on the amazing amount of detail they give in the official reports of the Parliamentary Debates. Last week we received our copies of the reports for 1958. In the indexes to subjects, questions and speeches is revealed a phenomenal degree of attention to detail and dissection. These reports provide an invaluable and easy reference to members and I most heartily congratulate and commend those responsible for the compilation.

Without any deep research into His Excellency's Speech certain facts in respect of the State's economy are abundantly evident. Foremost among these is that we have achieved a strong, well-balanced and soundly-based economy. Its strength lies in its proven ability, through the years, of consistently showing a large surplus in our overseas trading account. This is directly attributable to our primary industries. As the degree of solvency of any State or nation in the ultimate must be in relation to overseas funds, that is inability to pay for our purchases, the part played in our economy by our primary industries is one of vital importance. For the year ended June 30, 1957, this State exported commodities to the value of £122,924,000, 85 per cent of which were products of the soil in some form or other. Imports were to the value of £45,406,000, so that South Australia had a favourable balance of trade of approximately £77,500,000, less invisible charges for freight and insurance.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do the figures include Broken Hill products?

Mr. LAUCKE—These figures are the complete export figures for South Australia.

Mr. O'Halloran—Including the products from Broken Hill?

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes. Last year we had a favourable balance of £35,000,000. The rapid industrial expansion in recent years has given us the well-balanced aspect of our economy. The growth of secondary industry can best be gauged by the gross value of secondary industry output in recent decades. It has grown

from £37,000,000 in 1938 to £141,000,000 in 1950, and to £316,000,000 last year. Allowing for world-wide inflationary tendencies in monetary values, these figures indicate and prove nothing less than a remarkable advance in secondary industries. In the past 20 years, 2,300 new factories have been established in this State.

These advances are excellent and enable a greater population to be carried and materially assist primary industry in providing an expanding home-market for primary produce. But there is one danger inherent in industrialization in a State which is fundamentally a primary producing one, and that is if uneconomic secondary industry is established and protected there could be severe repercussions in the cost structure of rural pursuits. As our primary products must be placed on keenly competitive overseas markets, and as we depend in the main on primary products for overseas credit, any jacking up of farmers' costs arising from uneconomic local secondary industry could seriously upset our whole national economy. It is, therefore, vitally important that under no circumstances should secondary industry be permitted to react to the detriment of the primary section.

My third point in reference to our economy is that it is soundly based. It is so because it is based on private enterprise. The thing that pleases me most is to see the degree of confidence expressed in the State by private investors. It is essential to our welfare that we retain this confidence. An economy in which private enterprise is fostered and encouraged in any activity that it is competent to undertake has as a natural sequence personal responsibility, initiative, incentive, and a virility that makes for success. If a person or organization in business is successful, the benefits of that success are shared in some way or other by the whole community. A successful business is one that makes profits, and provided the profits are fairly and honestly made I am always pleased to see such profits. I believe in profits so made, as without them there can be no progress, individually or collectively as a nation.

It amazes me that a company like General Motors-Holdens should be the butt of criticism because of a successful and profitable year. In recent weeks much has been said derogatively about this company. And worse still, the employment of overseas capital has been decried because of its repatriating some of its net gain. Whether we like it or not,

the cold fact is that we cannot hope to develop our country adequately and increase our population at the tempo necessary to give us moral grounds for retention of it, having in mind the teeming millions to our north, without outside capital and technical knowledge.

Mr. Loveday—Irrespective of the price?

Mr. LAUCKE—The price would be the repatriation of the net gain on the original capital invested. There is some wrong thinking in respect of the activities of major industries in Australia generally, and South Australia particularly, where we have some mighty big operators, such as General Motors-Holdens, B.H.P. Company, Philips Electrical Industries, Chrysler-Dodge, Kelvinator, and Simpsons. We have industries in this State that are doing magnificent work for the population and doing a national good in their activities.

Mr. Ryan—Showing magnificent profits, too.

Mr. LAUCKE—Thank heaven they are. Let us look at Holden's figures. I feel that these matters should be discussed in this Chamber at times, lest a wrong construction be placed on discussion and criticism by people who do not, in my opinion, think deeply.

Mr. Ryan—Can you explain how they made £15,000,000 profit, if it were not by overcharging on their commodity?

Mr. LAUCKE—Competition is such that if the Holden car were being overpriced to the buyer the sales would not be what they are today, and we would have unemployment in this State. Are we seeking to advance, to get more employment and better industry, or would we kill the goose that lays the golden egg? Let us consider that, when no other organization would think of opening up industry to manufacture motor vehicles in this State, G.M.H. had the confidence in this State and its people to embark on a very risky enterprise.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Federal Labor Government assisted that enterprise.

Mr. LAUCKE—I thoroughly admire any Government that assists industries such as this one. We as a nation have been given a first class industry through G.M.H. Without its means and technical know-how we might not today have had a motor car industry in the present extensive operation that we have. I take my hat off to G.M.H. The total funds employed by the company amount to just under £70,000,000, and last year 68,700 Australians received their livelihood from its successful operations, 15,000 from the distribution of G.M.H. products, 18,700 from direct manufacturing, and 35,000 in supplying raw materials,

etc. In 1948, the year the Holden car was first produced, G.M.H. purchased goods and services in Australia to the value of £9.17 million.

Mr. Ryan—What was its capital then?

Mr. LAUCKE—I am not concerned with that. It got cracking and began manufacturing cars in Australia, for which I admire it. Last year—10 years later—this expenditure had increased by £53.6 million to £63.3 million. I think it is necessary to put our thinking into the right perspective regarding overseas capital investment and not, by irresponsible thinking and statement, to dry up the flow of capital to this country. We just cannot afford to discourage or frighten away prospective investors. With this in mind I draw the attention of the House to some pertinent and enlightening figures.

Mr. O'Halloran—How much money did G.M.H. bring into the country?

Mr. LAUCKE—I cannot answer that.

Mr. O'Halloran—About £3,750,000.

Mr. Dunstan—Even then some was lent by the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. LAUCKE—In the year ended December last the sale of G.M.H. products amounted to £116,377,000. If we take this figure as 100 per cent and then note the disposition of the proceeds of these sales in figures and percentages, we have some enlightening information. There is a story in this, and it is a very good story to read—a success story. The sum of £63,399,000, or 54.4 per cent of the total, went to suppliers of materials, parts, components, services, etc., within this country, creating wide employment through that demand for leather, steel, paint, and all the various components necessary to build a car. The sum of £21,717,000 or 18.7 per cent went to employees as wages.

Mr. Ryan—What was the percentage of profit?

Mr. LAUCKE—I will come to that in a moment. The figure of £22,000,000 is not a bad pay-roll. An amount of £12,684,000, or 10.9 per cent, went to the Federal Treasury for taxes, duties and customs—a nice little rake-off for the Government. The sum of £7,766,000, or 6.7 per cent, was retained for use in the business. It is a very good principle to retain funds within the company for future expansion and increase of employment. In answer to the member for Port Adelaide, the amount of £7,471,000, or 6.4 per cent, went to shareholders as dividends, and an equal amount was retained for reserves.

Mr. Ryan—It is a manipulation of figures, and it is still a profit.

Mr. LAUCKE—It is good business technique and practice to put aside money in kitty.

Mr. Ryan—Because the company cannot take it out of the country.

Mr. LAUCKE—The amount of £3,340,000, or 2.9 per cent, went to the depreciation account to allow for replacement of plant and equipment. That is another necessary business provision because unless there is sufficient money to replace obsolete plant and equipment, these good profits I have referred to could be very much thinned down. When I consider the benefits accruing to the nation from the story that unfolds from these figures, I cannot understand the criticism levelled at this company.

Mr. Ryan—It is not a story: it is a fairy tale.

Mr. LAUCKE—It is an epic. What concerns me is that the criticism is made because the company has made a profit. If we have no profits we cannot progress.

Mr. Ryan—We don't want excessive profits.

Mr. Jennings—Who made the profit anyway?

Mr. LAUCKE—The other criticism is that portion of the net gain of this organization was repatriable to another country. I still think the initial investors in this industry in

Australia served our nation mighty well, and even though some of that profit is repatriable it is not too high a price to pay for all that has accrued to our nation through the activities of this great company in the past. I wish the company and similar organizations every success in the future. If they succeed, we as a nation succeed.

Mr. Ryan—It was well rewarded financially.

Mr. LAUCKE—Whilst recognizing that good seasons and favourable prices—which we enjoyed until the last couple of years—have been the *sine qua non* of our prosperity, I consider that our progress is due in a large measure to the purposeful direction of affairs by this Government and the Ministers who support the Premier. Our progress is directly related to the vigorous and conscientious work of the Government. Every Australian can be proud of what this Government has achieved in recent decades. Good prices and good seasons have been the basic foundation of our prosperity, but good government has directed our thinking. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 29, at 2 p.m.