

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 6, 1959.

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

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Governor intimated by message his assent to the following Acts:—

Electoral Act Amendment.

Public Purposes Loan (No. 2).

GIFT FROM INDIA.

The SPEAKER—The last five days have been made memorable by a visit to this State of a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Delegation representative of practically every part of the Commonwealth of Nations. I have the honour to inform the House that, on Sunday, I received from the hands of Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao, M.P., Deputy Chairman, Rajya Sabha—and in the presence of Members of the Indian Delegation—a presentation from the Speaker of Lok Sabha, the Lower House of the Indian National Parliament (The Hon. Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, M.P.).

The gift took the form of a beautifully hand-worked copper plaque depicting two Indian damsels carrying baskets of fruit, an exquisite example of the skill of the Indian artisan. It was handed to me as a tangible token of the goodwill of the Parliament of India towards the Parliament of South Australia, and I expressed, on behalf of the House, my deep appreciation of this fine gesture of friendship made by our Parliamentary colleagues from India.

QUESTIONS.**RAIL GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier anything further to report to the House on the progress of negotiations between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments regarding the carrying out of the agreement to unify the railway gauge from Cockburn to Port Pirie and in other parts of the Peterborough division?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yesterday afternoon, from the Commonwealth Minister, I received a report, which included a report by the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner on this matter. This is the first considered report the Government has had setting out the Commonwealth's attitude; it was a comprehensive report that contained much detailed information as to the reasons for the figures

and the conclusions arrived at. At this stage I could not say what conclusions the South Australian Railways Department has reached, because the report will of necessity require much examination and, no doubt, much research. I have only made a casual examination, so I should not like this to be taken as a final view of what the report contains but, before sending it to the Railways Commissioner, I concluded that the Commonwealth believes that it is economically important to standardize the railway line from Port Pirie to Broken Hill and that economic advantages would justify that line, but that it does not consider that there is any economic advantage in standardizing the line from Quorn to Peterborough.

The report deals similarly with the Wilming-ton to Gladstone line, which the Commissioner considers should be provided with diesel engines but should not be standardized. He has given some comparisons of working costs on that line, pointing out that material savings to the Commonwealth and the State would result if, instead of standardizing the line, modern traction were provided. I would not under any circumstances commit the Government on this at the moment because the agreement we have with the Commonwealth provides for the standardization of those lines. I think the advantages enumerated by the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner regarding the Quorn to Peterborough line can be obtained under his report only if the line between Peterborough and Terowie is duplicated so as to give a two-gauge line between Peterborough and Terowie to enable railway freights to go to Terowie without a change of gauge.

Other conclusions were that the Commonwealth should negotiate direct with the Silver-ton Tramway Company and I think from glancing at the report that the Commonwealth now favours the retention of that company provided that it is prepared to standardize the line, to provide the necessary rolling stock, and to allow through traffic. I emphasize that I had only a casual glance at the report before sending it to the Railways Commissioner for examination, and I should not like what I have said to be regarded as a conclusive summary of what it contains. One other interesting paragraph in the Minister's letter was that, as substantial differences exist between the submissions of the South Australian Government and those put forward by Mr. Hannaberry, the Commonwealth Government desires in due course to confer with the State.

AERIAL SPRAYING FOR VERMIN.

Mr. HARDING—My question relates to the indiscriminate poisoning of vermin from the air, which in Victoria is becoming a common practice. Although I realize that aerial spraying with insecticides is common and effective in this State, the indiscriminate poisoning from the air within the inside areas for such things as rabbits could become a dangerous practice. Will the Minister of Agriculture seriously consider this matter before it becomes a problem in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will confer with my colleague, the Minister of Lands, who is in charge of the control of vermin, and will obtain an answer for the honourable member.

SEACOMBE GARDENS HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Education obtained the report he promised concerning work at the Seacombe Gardens high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Minister of Works has supplied me with two reports: a lengthy one from a survey officer of the Architect-in-Chief's Department and the covering report from the Principal Architect for Schools. I will read the short report and make the other available to the honourable member if he desires it. The report of the Principal Architect is as follows:—

On receipt of the Parliamentary inquiry I personally inspected the work. As Mr. Walsh, M.P. will know, the school land has considerable natural rise from Seacombe Road. Had a better site been available we would have recommended its purchase. I am personally pleased with the way our officers have designed the earthworks. To get such a good result on an unsatisfactory site at such a low cost is a real achievement. Earthworks, like building works, are always unsightly and messy during the process of construction. Evidently there have been some complaints about dust which is understandable. We did not know that we would have a long, dry winter. It is one of the vagaries of nature which we all have to contend with.

FLUORINE IN WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I recently noticed an article in a country newspaper concerning the fluorine treatment of water. That article states:—

Chronic fluorine poisoning by ingestion in food and water can become a potent factor in accelerating the cancer progress. Kidney, heart, nerve, and brain tissues are violently attacked.

Has the Minister of Works considered whether the statement is substantiated by inquiries, and

can he say whether fluorine is used in South Australia?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The department has from time to time given much consideration to the general question of the advisability of fluorination of water supplies for human consumption. I think it is fair to say that every expert in this matter has his own opinion, and so far as I am aware the evidence, both for and against, almost balances itself out. In other words, the pros and cons seem to be equal. I have said before that the Government would be willing to consider adding fluorine to water supplies where water was apparently deficient in that requirement, if and when conclusive evidence could be produced which would indicate that it was of advantage. Some sources of water in South Australia provide what is supposed to be the ideal composition of fluorine. I refer to the Uley-Wanilla basin in my own electorate. I have felt that in due course observations as to the dental health of people living in that area, and drinking that water, particularly the children who were born there and have grown up in the area, would perhaps lend information that would be of value in time in determining the real merits or otherwise of adding fluorine to water which does not at present contain it. Probably the truth lies somewhere between the two extremes, namely, that fluorine in mild proportions may be advantageous, but that in excessive proportions it could be detrimental, as the article mentioned by the honourable member suggests. Until we know more about it I am not prepared to recommend to Cabinet that action be taken to add fluorine to water. It is one of those things which in time will probably provide the answer, and then we can consider the matter further, but the department has not yet made any firm recommendations as the evidence tends to be so conflicting.

BLACKWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—On August 21 last the Minister of Education wrote me concerning the present Blackwood primary school, and said:—

In the circumstances, and in accordance with my letter to the school committee of May 20, the Architect-in-Chief has been asked to attend to the request for improved toilet and ablution facilities at the existing school. A representative of this department visited the school yesterday morning, and approval will be sought to carry out the work requested, with a slight amendment, as soon as possible.

I have now received a letter from the school committee indicating that the work has not

been carried out and expressing perturbation at the delay. Can the Minister give me any information on this matter and, in particular, say when the work will be done?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—My colleague the Minister of Works has supplied me with the following report from the Architect-in-Chief:—

Approval has been obtained for the improved toilet and ablution facilities at the Blackwood primary school. A specification is being prepared and a contractor will be engaged to carry out the work as soon as possible.

I have not received any other information, but as soon as I obtain it I will advise the honourable member.

TELEVISION SALES BY VAN HOUTEN.

Mr. TAPPING—Recently, under the strangest circumstances, a firm known as Van Houten T.V. Sales ceased business, and as a result some customers have been left lamenting. Cases have been brought to my notice in Semaphore in which, while television sets have been bought for cash, the firm has, in addition, accepted money for a two-year contract for insurance and maintenance which does not now operate. Can the Premier ascertain whether Van Houten Sales have paid the manufacturer for the television sets, or whether the sets concerned can now be repossessed, and secondly, what redress have the buyers regarding the two-year contract for insurance and maintenance?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not seen the terms of the contracts or the conditions under which the sales have been made, so it would be impossible for me to give an opinion offhand on this matter. I suggest to the persons concerned that at least some of them should obtain a legal opinion in the matter, and at the same time display the terms of the agreement into which they have entered.

FARE CONCESSIONS TO PENSIONERS.

Mr. CLARK—Several pensioners in my town have spoken to me regarding the arrangements made for concession fares. Can the Premier obtain for me the actual times in Gawler, Salisbury and Elizabeth between which these concessions would be operative?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I did make a statement setting out those details in full, and I think they appear in full in *Hansard*.

Mr. Clark—I have looked for them, but I cannot find them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member will ask a further question on this matter I will obtain a report and see that the details are placed in *Hansard*.

PORT AUGUSTA TO WOOMERA ROAD.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the Port Augusta to Woomera Road?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that the funds made available to the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1959, are not subject to direction by the Commonwealth except that at least 40 per cent of such funds must be spent on rural roads. In the case of the Port Augusta to Woomera road the Commonwealth provides the State with specific funds for the work in addition to those provided under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. The Commonwealth provides all the funds for this project, and under these conditions the work is carried out as and when required by the Commonwealth. In respect of expenditure on this road approximately £16,000 was spent in 1957-58, £34,000 in 1958-59, and £40,000 is available for 1959-60.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Mr. HUGHES—At the annual conference of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce held recently, a Mr. Williams, of Adelaide, said that the only objection so far raised to eastern standard time in South Australia was that early workers and school children would start the day in darkness. He also said that although it had been stated in Parliament that primary producers were opposed to this form of daylight saving, most South Australian district councils canvassed on the question supported it. Will the Premier inform the House whether Cabinet has discussed daylight saving, and, if so, what was its decision? If not, would he say whether, in his opinion, daylight saving would be of advantage to this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Daylight saving is not new. It was introduced into South Australia during the war and proved most unpopular with primary producers; so much so that the Commonwealth Government, which was acting at that time under war emergency powers, decided to discontinue it. Since it was mentioned in the House on a couple of occasions several large and reputable primary producer organizations have carried resolutions opposing any suggested reintroduction of daylight saving. The main reason against it is that, in point of fact, South Australian time

is already based upon a longitude far east of this State in New South Wales. If any change is to be made to meet objections to a non-standard time the eastern States should rather conform to our time than we to theirs. The Government does not intend to attempt to introduce daylight saving, which it believes has no advantage to the community and would cause considerable hardship in certain primary industries, particularly dairying.

MAIN NORTH ROAD TRAFFIC PROBLEM.

Mr. COUMBE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on September 17 concerning a traffic problem on the Main North Road at Prospect and Nailsworth?

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

The Commissioner is aware of the sketch plan prepared by the R.A.A. and it is basically the same as the tentative design prepared by the department. The design assumes that traffic lights will be required at this junction and the councils concerned have been advised that the department is prepared to consider improvements to the corner, provided that the councils will undertake to install the traffic lights. In the interim, steps are being taken to acquire the land required for the installation of the completed scheme.

ACQUISITION OF LAND NEAR MURRAY BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—My question relates to the proposed compulsory acquisition of land by the Federal Government in my district. I think all members are aware that the reason for the acquisition of land from persons in the Burdett area adjacent to Murray Bridge is an unfortunate accident that happened about 2½ years ago when two men were severely injured through the explosion of a mortar bomb. Settlers adjacent to the block where that accident happened have received notice to treat. In many instances either the whole or a considerable part of their land is to be acquired. Some will lose a large percentage of their area: one man with an area of 1,200 acres will have his holding reduced to 800 acres, which is not a living area in that district. This matter is causing great concern and the people do not want to part with their land and have so intimated to the Federal authorities. As this is all Crown land, has the Minister of Lands power to refuse to transfer to the Federal authorities land that it wants to compulsorily acquire against the wishes of the settlers, and if he is obliged to comply with such transfers will he

see whether land adjacent thereto can be made available to the settlers to compensate them for the loss of land? I have in mind an area of 4,000 acres that is not being worked, not far from the particular area, which is held by a man who owns a considerable area over and above this.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have read the report referred to, but no approach has been made to me regarding this matter. However, I feel that under the defence laws of the country the Commonwealth probably has certain powers with which we could not interfere. However, I will examine the question and inform the honourable member of the result.

COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE ON STUART.

Mr. HEASLIP—I direct the attention of the Premier to a press report about the commutation of the death sentence on a man named Stuart to life imprisonment. I ask this question because of the utter confusion in the minds of the public as to just what this commutation means. Does it mean that this man, who has been proved guilty of murder, will at the end of 10 or 15 years be released and be in a position to murder some other innocent little girl?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The commutation of a death sentence to a life sentence means that the person is committed to prison with hard labour for life. It will depend upon the Government of the day what action it takes, after 10 or 15 years—whether it will see fit to release the person concerned or not. The practice in South Australia for many years has usually been to consider a petition for release probably after an effective sentence of about 12 years, provided the prison authorities are satisfied by his good conduct that the person concerned is unlikely to commit another crime and, in some instances, after certificates have been obtained from medical officers of the Crown about his mentality. It is a commutation to a life sentence with hard labour, but it could be a complete life sentence. It depends upon the action of the Executive of the day.

WARNING SIGNS AT GEORGE'S CORNER.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked earlier regarding warning signs at George's Corner?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has supplied me with

a report from the Commissioner of Highways, which reads as follows:—

The fatal accident referred to occurred on a 220ft. radius curve near the northern extremity of the Port Pirie by-pass. This curve is 100 yards north of an intersection with the Nelshaby main road and is immediately south of the junction with the Port Augusta Road. The Nelshaby road intersection has standard cross roads signs erected and the Port Augusta road junction also has standard signs in place. These signs are well situated, clear in their meaning, and well maintained, and therefore considered to be adequate, as any additional signs would not warn the motorist of any additional hazard. The curve was made small in an attempt to slow vehicles to a reasonable speed before entering the intersection of the Port Augusta Road. The most dangerous intersection is the one which permits motorists to enter it at high speed.

BOTTLE MENACE ON ROADS.

Mr. CORCORAN—I understand that the Minister of Works now has a reply to my question of September 17 last about the menace of bottles on roads?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have the following report from the Director of Local Government through my colleague, the Minister of Roads:—

Although the Road Traffic Act, the Police Offences Act and the Local Government Act each contain provisions designed to penalise persons detected depositing bottles, etc., in public places, it is extremely difficult to secure evidence leading to successful prosecution of offenders.

Each year there are millions of bottles of various types put into circulation. The actual percentage of these that are abandoned on roadsides, reserves and beaches, is infinitesimal. Any deposit on bottles would need to be sufficiently large to induce purchasers to retain the bottle instead of abandoning same. Thus the amount tied up in deposits on beer bottles alone would add up to many thousands of pounds.

The imposition of deposit would have little or no impression on the comparatively few of the State's population who toss empty bottles aside; and it would seem to be inequitable to burden the greater proportion of purchasers in this manner. The only practicable means of mitigating the evil of broken glass is to publicise the necessity for all users to exercise extreme care in disposing of empty bottles; and for Councils to encourage the public generally to voluntarily collect and dispose, in a safe place, of any glass observed on a beach or other public place.

BUSH FIRES.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Last week it was reported that the Minister of Agriculture had made an announcement about a big clean up to beat fires, presumably bush fires. He said it would begin a long campaign to eliminate fire

hazards in preparation for the summer, and that the committee's inquiry had shown there was now an overwhelmingly simple method which everyone could adopt—the cleaning up of inflammable materials around local buildings—but that the committee was up against a wall of indifference from people who thought “A bush fire will not happen to me.” Another aspect of this question is that throughout the Adelaide hills and travelling interstate are a considerable number of buses, on which (I am reliably informed), with few exceptions, no provision is made for receptacles for the placing of cigarette butts, matches, etc. Great danger can arise, particularly in the summer, from passengers throwing cigarette butts or matches out of the window. Will the Minister consider referring to Cabinet the compulsory provision on all public transport using roads in the Adelaide hills of receptacles for cigarette butts, matches, etc.?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—This matter has received attention by the Bush Fires Advisory Committee. I cannot recall the statements the committee made, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

TRANSPORT OF MAIL BY AIR.

Mr. RALSTON—Has the Treasurer obtained the report from the Railways Commissioner that he said he would in reply to a question I asked on September 17 about the effect of the transport of mail by air on the revenue of the South Australian Railways Department? Can he now inform the House what loss to railway revenue is being incurred by this change in Commonwealth policy?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have been able to obtain only an interim report from the Railways Commissioner. This states that unfortunately the department is not in a position to assess the effect on its revenues of the new postal policy without data from the Postmaster-General's Department. I understand that the Postmaster-General's Department is not yet in a position to supply the necessary information, but is carrying out tests to determine the proportion of mail matter which comes within the size and weight categories laid down for transport by air. The Postmaster-General's Department has been requested to supply the required information as early as possible. When this comes to hand I will report to the honourable member.

I point out that it would help me to be ready with reports if members would inform

me beforehand when they intend to ask questions concerning reports that they asked us for some time previously.

PORT PIRIE UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. McKEE—On September 30, under the heading “Where Will They Go?”, the following article appeared in the *Port Pirie Recorder*:—

The influx of more than 250 school-leavers on to Pirie’s labour market at the end of the year will more than aggravate what is becoming a serious unemployment problem. Already, many young people are being forced to leave the city and gain employment in Adelaide. The problem, which has gained momentum over the past few years, is gradually reaching a peak. Although the city is far from falling back, the rate of expansion is not sufficient to cope with the normal increase in population. Hardest hit are young people, especially girls. Two local stores which recently called applications for shop assistants received a total of 84 inquiries. Although some of the applicants were unemployable, many were considered suitable and quite competent. Unemployment among the youths in this city is also giving rise to juvenile delinquency. Many young lads, out of work, spend their day loitering round city streets. Although the position mainly concerns young people, a number of married couples have also been affected.

Pirie waterside workers are finding times harder, and figures released recently show an average of 80 men on unemployment money daily. Attendance pay is only £1 4s. a day. The position is also reflected in local people’s inability to pay instalments on goods purchased on hire purchase schemes. In July, Pirie Court handled 150 small debt matters, and on one day this month 60 cases came before the Bench. One Pirie man said yesterday that it was “heartbreaking” to see all the young people leaving the city on the Sunday afternoon train for Adelaide. “To see fathers and mothers waving goodbye to their young teen-age children each week end really gives me heartache,” he said.

Mr. Lawn—That is the Government’s decentralization policy!

Mr. McKEE—In view of this serious situation, will the Premier say whether he has anything in mind that will assist Port Pirie in this problem and enable it to retain its youth, which is essential for the welfare of the community?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government spent a large sum in introducing an industry into Port Pirie. It is one of the few towns where the Government, with its own money, has established an industry to assist in local development, so the suggestion made by the member for Adelaide that the Government is not concerned in this matter is not accurate so far as this town is concerned.

In addition, Port Pirie has a permanent water supply from the River Murray in place of the previous inadequate supply, and an electricity supply from the trust. When introducing the Budget, I said that a large number of children would be leaving school in due course and that, if we are to play our part, Parliament must give the closest attention to the establishment of industries, not necessarily in Port Pirie or any other particular place, but in the State as a whole.

Over the last 10 years this State has consistently had the lowest unemployment figures of any State. Those figures are particularly favourable compared with those of the more populous States of New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria, and I hope that position will continue. Some industries are at present negotiating to come here. I was privileged last week to be able to announce the coming of two industries, and there are several others that I believe we shall be able to secure. This matter will be very important for Parliament to consider, and I hope we shall have the support of all members in dealing with it.

PROPERTY ADJOINING THEBARTON SCHOOL.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Minister of Education any further report in reply to a question I asked recently concerning the property adjoining the Thebarton girls’ technical high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Negotiations that have been proceeding for some time have been concluded, and the Government has accepted the offer of the vendor for the purchase of that property. Although I know it is not solicited, I wish to thank the honourable member and the Mayor of Thebarton for assisting in this matter.

SCHOOL HOLIDAYS.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Education any information in reply to a question I asked on September 15 relating to an alteration in the school holiday period in September?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Following on the honourable member’s question on this matter in the House on September 15, I arranged for the Director of Education to have discussions with representatives of the independent schools. As a result, the independent schools have fixed the dates for their terms and vacations for 1960 so that the first day of each term is the same as for the schools of the Education Department. A maximum degree of overlap in the vacations will thus be obtained. The independent schools have advised:—

1. That they favour vacations of two weeks in May, three weeks in August-September, and seven weeks in the summer term.

2. That the three weeks' vacation in August-September is particularly desirable in the case of boarding schools.

3. That the seven weeks' vacation in the summer is desirable in view of the date on which the results of the Intermediate Examination of the Public Examinations Board are usually published, and also to allow for maintenance and repairs to school buildings.

In conclusion, let me assure the honourable member and all other interested parties that, in fixing the dates for terms and vacations in 1961, and subsequent years, there will be close consultation between the Education Department and the non-State schools to ensure that the highest possible degree of overlap in the vacations is obtained.

TARPAULINS ON SUPERPHOSPHATE TRUCKS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—On September 22 I quoted from a copy of the *Producer* which referred to a resolution carried by the members of the Australian Primary Producers Union, and I asked the Minister of Works whether it was the Government's policy to supply waterproof tarpaulins to cover superphosphate and, if it were established that damage had resulted from railway negligence, whether compensation was paid for such damage. I believe the Minister has a reply.

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

Tarpaulins are supplied as ordered by the superphosphate companies to cover trucks of superphosphate in transit. No effort is spared to ensure that all tarpaulins in use are in a sound and water proof condition. It is the responsibility of the superphosphate companies to sheet the trucks in such a manner that an effective ridge is maintained, and the Railways hold at Port Adelaide timber stanchions for use in trucks which are not fitted with built-in equipment for ridge sheeting. These stanchions are also supplied to the superphosphate companies on request. As superphosphate is carried under owner's risk conditions, the Railways do not pay claims for superphosphate damaged in transit. They do, however, provide free carriage of damaged superphosphate back to the factories for re-treatment and return to the destination station, except in cases in which it can be established that the damage occurred through negligence on the part of the consignee or carrier.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Works any information regarding the jamming of the Jervois Bridge yesterday, which delayed the Metropolitan Tramway Trust's transport system and dislocated traffic generally?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The honourable member was good enough to indicate that he desired some information on this matter and my colleague, the Minister of Roads, has furnished me with the following report of the Commissioner of Highways:—

The swing span of Jervois Bridge jammed because of a minor mechanical fault. A rubber ring in the hydraulic system broke and went through the delivery lines, jamming the control valve. This caused pressure leakage, as a result of which the hydraulic rams could not operate. The fault was rectified as soon as possible.

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. HARDING—A letter I received from the Director of Lands, dated July 30, refers to previous correspondence I have had with the Director regarding the estates known as Drury's, Botting's and Fairview, which it was hoped the Commonwealth authorities would accept for war service land settlement. Can the Minister of Lands say whether these holdings will be gazetted and allocated as anticipated or whether the allotments will be delayed owing to seasonal conditions in order to consider whether it may be necessary to find agistment for existing settlers? I ask the question because it has been brought to my notice that one settler in particular expects to have to dispose of at least 20 head of his dairy heifers unless fodder can be purchased or agistment found.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The areas referred to are now being prepared for allotment, and I feel that at the end of this month or very early next month they will be gazetted as open for application.

INCREASE OF RAILWAY FARES.

Mr. RYAN—Recently we were told that railway fares would be increased by about 14 per cent, and that the increases would operate from October 1 this year. When the increases were gazetted it was seen that the fare from Kilkenny to Adelaide, for example, was increased from 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d., which is a 12½ per cent increase, but the fare from Kilkenny to Port Adelaide, which is exactly the same mileage, was increased from 1s. 6d. to 2s., an increase of 33½ per cent. Generally, the increases in the fares away from the city are well above the average of 14 per

cent, although that is about the average of the increase of fares into the city. Can the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Railways why there is such a big discrepancy in the increase of fares away from the city compared with those into the city? Can he also ascertain whether the fares are on a competitive basis, or whether the increases will be to the detriment of people going away from, rather than into, the city?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) asked a question some days ago which, I think, bears somewhat upon this question. I suggest that when I answer the member for Semaphore's question the member for Port Adelaide can then decide whether he desires any further information and, if so, I will again refer the matter to my colleague.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked recently about the increase in suburban railway fares, operating from October 1?

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

It is not a fact that the suburban fares from Adelaide to those metropolitan stations where there is no competition have been subjected to a greater percentage increase than those to stations where there is such competition. It is inevitable that when a variation in suburban fares is made, the percentage increases will not be constant throughout the whole of the stations but it is interesting to note that the average increase in the daily return fare to stations without alternative transport is 11 per cent compared with an average increase of 13 per cent at those stations which are services with alternative transport.

COOBER PEDY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—This morning I received a letter from the President of the Coober Pedy Progress Association stating that the underground tank at Coober Pedy has about 2ft. of water left in it, the last 6in. of which would be unfit for human consumption because of the depth of mud and slush. I have earlier asked questions about this water supply and possible alternative supplies in the event of the tank's failing. Its present contents will probably not last more than six weeks. Has the Minister of Works anything to report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—This has been the subject of investigation by the Engineer-in-Chief in recent months. The last time I saw the docket the Engineer-in-Chief was proposing to take steps to clean out the tank if

and when it became dry. That would involve obtaining a water supply from another source. I will check to ascertain what the proposal actually entails.

FISH AND GAME SEASONS.

Mr. BYWATERS—According to the press last week the Minister of Agriculture and Mr. Rylah, the Victorian Attorney-General, met and discussed the possibility of securing uniform laws on certain matters. Can the Minister say what decision was arrived at concerning the close season on Murray Cod which, in South Australia, operates for three months each year as against two in Victoria, and whether they discussed the opening and closing days of the duck shooting season?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The close season on taking Murray Cod from the river was not specifically discussed at this meeting, but arrangements were made to enable further discussions on such matters, particularly on all-round fishing in the Murray. We will keep in touch with each other and the question of a uniform close season on Murray Cod may well be raised later. The position regarding duck shooting is as I announced some time ago. Under the Animal and Birds Protection Act the opening date for our duck shooting season is February 14, except when that falls on a Sunday and then it opens on the following Monday. The Victorian system is to proclaim the opening date for their season and that is usually a week after ours.

KINGSTON ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN—I have received the following letter from the District Clerk of the District Council of Lacepede, Kingston, South-East:—

I have been directed by the chairman of the above council to express satisfaction that according to the press Kingston is to be included in the trust's scheme to provide an increased electricity service in the South-East. The rapid growth of Kingston has placed a severe strain on the local suppliers and the service leaves much to be desired. Will you be good enough to press for the extension of the Electricity Trust supply service to this area at the earliest possible moment. I am writing in a similar vein to the Hon. L. H. Densley. Does the Premier know the trust's intentions and can he indicate whether there is any possibility of the trust's extending its services to Kingston soon?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—At present the trust is investigating the possibility of serving a number of coastal towns in the honourable member's district. The investigation is not completed, but the trust desires to

extend power services throughout the South-East in due course. As a matter of interest, the Government has accepted a tender for the power station at Nangwarry which will, of course, be the base for the additional power required in the South-East. There is not the slightest doubt that ultimately we will have to connect the South-East grid with the main State grid in order to secure sufficient power to meet the South-Eastern demand. The consumption from the supply provided by the trust in the South-East has doubled in the last three years and members will realize that we shall not be able to rely on wood waste from the sawmills for such an expanding demand. I will get a report for the honourable member on the trust's investigations.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

Mr. STOTT—Some time ago I asked the Minister of Works a question concerning the salinity of water in the River Murray and the Minister gave a reply from the Engineer-in-Chief to the effect that little could be done about freeing water from the bottom of the locks instead of over the top in order to reduce the salinity in the bottom of the river. I understand that private investigations have proved that the salinity is in the bottom of the river. I am not quite satisfied with the Engineer-in-Chief's reply that nothing can be done to reduce the salinity of the water in the upper reaches of the Murray. This is an ever-present problem, particularly in dry years, and it causes damage to citrus trees. Many settlers in the Upper Murray area are greatly concerned about citrus losses and damage to other trees because of the salinity. The Minister of Works is sufficiently alert to realize that this is not a problem that occurs and is soon forgotten, because it is likely to recur and worsen. Will the Minister consider appointing a committee to make a full investigation in an attempt to overcome the salinity problem to the benefit of settlers in the Upper Murray?

The Hon G. G. PEARSON—I am concerned that the honourable member in the course of his question should have suggested that nothing has been done. On the contrary, much has been done, and the Engineer-in-Chief is extremely concerned, as is the honourable member and other members in the area, about the salinity that occurs in the river in varying degrees from time to time. Long investigations have taken place and it is fair and correct to say that the causes of salinity are well known, but the remedies are not. I am sure that the Government would instruct the

engineer to take whatever action was practicable to eliminate salinity when it occurred in proportions that could adversely affect the irrigation settlements. After all, much is at stake and these settlements need a pure water supply. I have had discussions with the Engineer-in-Chief and his officers to satisfy myself that this matter has been fully investigated and, from whatever angle I have approached the subject, I have found that the officers, who have had a long experience of the moods and situations of the river, have investigated everything I could imagine. On every occasion this matter has been raised in the House since I have been Minister they have invariably discussed the matter with me to see whether anything new has been raised. Although we know what causes salinity we are not able to prescribe a remedy. When there is an ample flow in the river, and when freshets occur from time to time, the more saline water is swept out. That seems to be the only real remedy for the problem. I emphasize that we are not complacent about this matter and that we share the honourable member's concern, but I am afraid we have not been able to discover any practical means of overcoming the problem.

MORGAN-WHYALLA PIPELINE DUPLICATION.

Mr. RICHES—Residents in northern districts are greatly concerned about the possibility of water restrictions being imposed this year and they have been looking for some statement from the Government on the progress of plans for the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. Announcements in this connection have been made for several years. Can the Minister of Works indicate, firstly, the progress on the planning of this duplication; secondly, when the project might be referred to the Public Works Committee; and, thirdly, when the Government expects that this work will commence?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Government is heavily committed for various water schemes throughout the State and planning has to be considered in relation to the various pressing needs that arise. I think the best information I can give is that, as I stated a week or two ago, certain action is being taken at present to increase the throughput of water from the existing pipeline and that a booster station will be installed at Hanson to increase the flow of water reticulated from that point. Additional booster stations will be added further along the line as requirements

demand. The position is that the rising main from Morgan to Hanson is at present able to deliver more water to Hanson than the existing grade lines from Hanson can carry forward. The purpose of the booster station at Hanson is to take up from Hanson the water which the pumps at Morgan can deliver from the rising main at that point. The question refers also to what new areas may be served by the pipeline. Although tentative plans have been formulated and the hydraulics of some routes have been considered, the Engineer-in-Chief has not as yet reached the point where he is prepared to refer a firm proposal to the Government for the consideration of the Public Works Committee. We are well aware of the necessity for this project and, as soon as we can give it the necessary priority, further steps will be taken to bring down a further proposition.

APHIS INFESTATION OF CITRUS TREES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked about aphis on citrus trees?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Director of Agriculture reports:—

Black citrus aphis has been prevalent on citrus trees both in the metropolitan and irrigation areas this autumn and winter. Many inquiries have been received at the Department of Agriculture from householders and by district horticultural advisers from commercial growers for advice on control measures. The pest is easily controlled with the insecticide malathion. This material should be sprayed on the trees as soon as an infestation is noted at a strength of 0.1 per cent.

I assure the honourable member that it works because I sprayed my own trees this morning and it did the job.

SALT FOR JAPAN.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Premier say whether there have been any direct inquiries recently from Japan for supplies of salt from South Australia? If this Government has had any such inquiries, is it able in any way to satisfy them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government has had considerable correspondence with Japan on this matter over a period of, I suppose, six to nine months. Recently, two large firms in Japan visited us to discuss the possibility of trade in salt to Japan from South Australia. Japan is by no means self-supporting in salt. In fact, it imports annually about 2,000,000 tons of salt. Normally, some used to come from the Chinese mainland, some from the Philippines, some from the United States of America, and some from as far afield as Palestine

and Egypt, although I understand that recently supplies from China have no longer been available. High-grade salt has been imported into Japan. Of course, in the world market there are generally ample supplies of salt. It is a competitive trade. The Japanese firms were interested in getting down to whether we could supply the grade of salt required in competition with world prices. I believe that we can, but that has yet to be resolved. At present, we are negotiating, trying to work out what sort of f.o.b. price they can offer while we are providing them with an analysis of the salt we are producing and the facts connected with its loading and export. I cannot take the matter further at present, except to say that it is being investigated.

ROAD TRANSPORT OF DAMAGED VEHICLES:

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to amend the Road and Railway Transport Act, 1930-1957, to permit crash repairers' vehicles to transport damaged vehicles by road without a permit from the Transport Control Board being first obtained?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Transport Control Board reports that there is no need for amendment of the Road and Railway Transport Act, 1930-1957, to allow unlimited road movement of damaged vehicles by "crash repairers' vehicles." Quite recently the board discussed with the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia the question of moving from the roadside, vehicles immobilized through accident or mechanical breakdown. The movement of such vehicles from the roadside with the greatest expedition was considered essential and the board agreed there should be no restriction whatsoever in shifting these vehicles by any available means to a garage or some place of security. To obviate any doubt it was decided to issue an "exemption order," and in connection therewith the matter was referred to the Crown Solicitor last month and is still in his hands. However, once the vehicle has reached a place of safety, any subsequent movement by road would be subject either to permit from the board or conveyance by licensed carrier as applies to other freight. Where available, rail should be utilized, as the Railways Department handles thousands of motor vehicles annually, including costly new motor cars and trucks from the Adelaide plants of Chrysler Australia Limited and General Motors-Holden's Limited.

ELECTRIFICATION OF SUBURBAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Did the Public Works Standing Committee, to which the project had been referred for inquiry and report, furnish any interim report in 1952 recommending that the existing Adelaide suburban passenger train services be electrified at an estimated cost to the State of £2,506,677?

2. Has this project been abandoned by the Government?

3. If so, what alternative scheme has been adopted by the Government?

4. What is the cost of such scheme?

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

1. Yes. The estimated cost of £2,506,677 was based on prices at May, 1950, and was made up of an estimated total expenditure of £4,743,912 less an amount of £2,237,235 which it was anticipated at that time would be contributed by the Commonwealth under the terms of the 1949 Railways Standardization Agreement.

2. Proposals to electrify the suburban passenger train services have not been abandoned, but have been deferred for the time being.

3. Multiple unit diesel rail cars, the first of which were introduced in 1955, are replacing steam trains.

4. The Railways Commissioner recommended the introduction of multiple unit diesel rail cars in a report to the Minister dated February 5, 1954. At that time the estimated cost of electrification of suburban lines, excluding Belair to Bridgewater and Dry Creek to North Gawler, was £7,008,000, and the estimated cost of the dieselization of all suburban lines, including Belair to Bridgewater and Dry Creek to North Gawler, was £4,877,000. It was also estimated at that time that the annual savings from dieselization would exceed the annual savings from electrification by £282,000.

MILK SUPPLIES.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. Are milk vendors in the Metropolitan area directed by the Metropolitan Milk Board to obtain their supplies from wholesale treatment plants nominated by the Board?

2. Is Mr. N. Cox the holder of a wholesale milk delivery licence?

3. Has Mr. Cox applied to the Metropolitan Milk Board for an order on the S.A. Farmers' Union to grant him a supply?

4. Did Mr. Cox have a round of approximately 1,000 gallons a day in 1958?

5. Is it a fact that in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of deliveries an arrangement was entered into between Cox and the Farmers' Union under

which the Farmers' Union undertook some of the cartage to Cox's customers at his expense?

6. Has the Farmers' Union now compulsorily taken over the supply to most of Cox's customers with the knowledge of the board?

7. Has Mr. Cox been paid any compensation?

8. Has Mr. Cox been offered a "royalty" of 5d. a gallon on 800 gallons a day without handling the milk at all?

9. Has Mr. Cox refused this offer?

10. Did Mr. Cox serve notice of his intention to resume supply to his former customers?

11. Is it a fact that letters from milk vendors were submitted to the board in support of this notice of intention?

12. Did the Farmers' Union refuse to supply Mr. Cox with more than 200 gallons of the 1,000 quota?

13. Have other treatment plants similarly been refused supply by arrangement?

14. Has the Milk Board considered issuing an order to supply?

15. If so, what was the decision of the board?

16. If no order was made, what reason was given by the board for its refusal to make an order?

17. Has an application been made to the board to fix a price for services rendered by wholesale deliverymen?

18. If so, what was the price determined?

19. If not, why has the board refused to fix a price?

20. Is the Government taking any action to prevent the setting up of a monopoly or cartel within the industry?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Metropolitan Milk Board reports as follows:—

1. No.

2. The Milk Board does not issue wholesale milk delivery licences.

3. Yes.

4. Mr. Cox told the board he was selling 131 gallons retail and 820 gallons wholesale daily.

5. No. He may have entered into an arrangement with Messrs. J. Schofield and Sons, but details are not known.

6. There is a dispute between Mr. Cox and S.A. Farmers' Co-op. Union as to the right to serve certain retail vendors.

7. Not known.

8. It is believed that negotiations took place between the legal representatives of S.A. Farmers' Co-op. Union and Mr. Cox but the details of these discussions are a matter for the parties themselves.

9. See No. 8 above.

10. No notice has been served on the Milk Board.

11. Letters were submitted with the application for an order (see Question No. 3.) but

letters from the same vendors were subsequently submitted by S.A. Farmers' Co-op. Union stating that the vendors desired to continue to obtain their supplies from S.A. Farmers' Co-op. Union.

12. The board is not aware that supplies which Mr. Cox was receiving direct from S.A. Farmers' Co-op. Union were cut in any way.

13. Question not understood. Treatment plants obtain their supplies direct from producers.

14. If the order is the one referred to in Question 3.—Yes.

15. The order was refused.

16. The board was satisfied that consumers in the area were receiving satisfactory service.

17. Yes—but no details were given of the "wholesale deliverymen" on whose behalf the request was made.

18. No margin was fixed.

19. To recognize additional "middlemen" would add to price structure. Board considers three-price margins only are necessary—producers, treatment plants, and retail vendors.

20. The Government replies that it has administered the distribution of milk in the metropolitan area as provided by Parliament in the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1957.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Auditor-General for the year ended June 30, 1959.

Ordered to be printed.

FLOODWATER DRAINAGE OF SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on Floodwater Drainage of South-Western Suburbs, together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that report be printed.

EXCHANGE OF LAND (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the Bill.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I wish to inform members that the Select Committee recommends that the Bill be passed without amendment.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment and Committee's report adopted.

THE BUDGET.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 24. Page 876.)

Grand Total, £80,323,000.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—There is at least one section of the Budget speech with which I agree entirely, namely, the appropriate valedictory references made by the Treasurer to two excellent public servants who, because of effluxion of time, are leaving the Public Service, and this is the last Budget proposal with which either will be associated. In Mr. Drew and Mr. Bishop the State had two worthy officers who served it well and long in various capacities. I also congratulate others associated with the preparation of the Budget speech. It is one of the best prepared that I can remember; briefer than many in recent years, but sufficiently explanatory to enable members to understand its broad general principles.

I desire to refer to two or three points early in my remarks because they have a bearing on the Budget as a whole and upon what may occur in the financial set-up of this State in future Budgets. When some months ago the Treasurer returned from Canberra after the Premier's Conference and was able to announce that South Australia had ceased to be a claimant State, there was a loud chorus of "hurrahs" in the tame press in this State as if something wonderful had been achieved. Early in the piece I asked him what was this new formula that had been devised in Canberra and what its effect on the future financial position of South Australia was likely to be.

Mr. Jennings—Have you found out yet?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have not. The Treasurer said he would give a full explanation when introducing the Budget. I listened to the Budget but found no new formula at all in what the Treasurer said. He simply said that there had been a revision of the figures

applicable to all States regarding reimbursements made by the Commonwealth Government out of the proceeds of income tax. What South Australia got is what it would have got anyhow, after making due allowance for the fact that we have been running into deficits in recent years. So we reach the position that our first Budget as a non-claimant State postulates an estimated deficit of £791,000. Then, of course, there is a further £1,027,000, last year's deficit, which has not been provided for, but the Treasurer hopes—and I agree with his aspiration—that the Grants Commission will reimburse the State to that extent. The Grants Commission has recommended a grant of £399,000 in respect of the 1957-58 deficiency, so the Treasurer has anticipated the acceptance of last year's deficit and has made provision in his Budget for a receipt of £1,426,000 in all. Of course, this does not mean that we shall have any more money to spend as revenue expenditure; it simply means that the Loan Fund, which had to provide for these two deficiencies, will be reimbursed to that extent. I hope the Treasurer's anticipations will be realized as far as the £1,027,000 is concerned because, if the whole or any part is disallowed by the Grants Commission, it will mean a severe inroad into the Loan Fund, which is required so urgently for works. The Treasurer made a point of the fact that we are a non-claimant State and, so as not to do him any injustice, I will quote him fully. He said:—

From the point of view of South Australia, the most revolutionary proposal of course was that this State should be given a grant outright sufficient to cover any recommendation which might otherwise have been made by the Commonwealth Grants Commission and should become a "non-claimant" State. In future the State would be expected to manage its financial affairs with the grant as determined by the new formula, agreeing to go to the Commonwealth Grants Commission with an application for special assistance only in exceptional circumstances. Western Australia and Tasmania, it was proposed, should remain "claimant" States for, whilst their new grants would considerably reduce their dependence upon the Commonwealth Grants Commission, they would not become entirely independent of the Commission.

As I see it, the plain fact is that we are not in any different position now from last year, when we were discussing Budget proposals while still a claimant State, but I draw attention to the significance of the Treasurer's reference to "exceptional circumstances." He also said:—

We have agreed not to go to the Commission for special assistance except in exceptional circumstances.

There is nothing new in that. Ever since the Commonwealth Constitution was enacted any State has had the right to appeal to the Commonwealth for financial assistance under section 96, which provides something like this:—

For a period of 10 years, and thereafter until Parliament otherwise provides, States may make an application to the Commonwealth for financial assistance.

We are not in any different position, now that we have become a non-claimant State, from any other States that have never been claimant States. In this section of the Budget speech the Treasurer made one or two observations of peculiar significance. He said:—

I would like to make one point quite clear to members at this stage. It has been suggested in some quarters that had the State expanded its social services far more and consequently shown a much larger deficit it would have been able to get a further grant to cover that larger deficit. That is not so.

Of course, the people who had been referring to this were members on this side of the House who in recent years pointed out vigorously that South Australia was losing because its expenditure on social services was below the average of the non-claimant States. However, the Treasurer assured us that we would not have obtained a larger amount if we had spent more on social services, but if honourable members turn to the first page of his Budget Speech they will find this gem:—

Members are aware that the standards of services deemed reasonable for "claimant" States are based on the standards enjoyed by the "non-claimant" States . . .

This is a contradiction of what he said on the second page of his statement and shows conclusively that what we have said has been correct all along and that we have been losing out. There is another point in association with this to which I think we might devote a little attention. The Treasurer went on to say:—

South Australia has undoubtedly conducted its finances more economically and with a greater sense of responsibility than other States, and the Commission's calculations confirm this. This State has operated its social services with a greater measure of local community responsibility than elsewhere, and due credit has been given by the Commission for this.

The community suffers as a result of this action, including those who are denied the hospital and other social services to which they are

entitled and which are enjoyed by people similarly situated in non-claimant States where their Parliaments had to take the full responsibility for their action. The Treasurer also went on to say that due credit had been given by the Commission to South Australia for not endeavouring to bring its average social services up to the standard of the non-claimant States. I have read the Commission's reports down the years, but I have never seen where due credit had been given to South Australia for any economy of this nature. I have seen where there has been the balancing of accounts one way and the other, but I have never learned from the Commission's reports that we have been specially rewarded because we did not expend as much on social services as the non-claimant States. The Treasurer also had this to say:—

On the other side the State has consciously kept its taxes and charges well below the average level of other States, and abstained from such taxes as amusement tax, hire-purchase tax, and the operation of lotteries and poker machines.

That has a familiar ring. I remember a statement almost word for word made by the Treasurer when he introduced his 1958 Budget. If honourable members wish to confirm that, they can find the statement on page 826 of *Hansard* of September 23, 1958. It is true that we have not lotteries in South Australia and it is also true that very large sums are invested by South Australians in lotteries conducted in other States, out of which those States derive considerable benefits. Some people have qualms about what might be termed gambling and for that reason will not agree to a lottery, but I point out that in this State we have a form of taxation which is imposed upon those who frequent the racecourses and have the temerity to invest either in the totalizator or with the bookmakers. We have a racing tax which is very steep indeed and which carries with it the injustice of taxing the punter's own stake—something that would not be imposed by any Parliament actuated by just principles. It will be remembered that members on this side protested against this at the time as being unjust, and have protested against it since; and our protest is supported by what has happened in the last two years. What we said would happen right from the commencement, namely, that the law of diminishing returns would set in, has actually happened. We find that for the year 1957-58 an amount of £712,000 was collected from racing taxation and that in the following year the amount had dropped to

£673,000. For the present financial year the Treasurer estimates that there will be a further reduction to £640,000. So, we find that if the Estimates for this year prove to be correct, the amount derived from racing taxation will have fallen by £72,000 compared with 1957-58; and this at a time when our population is increasing. If I am any judge, the numbers attending the racecourses are increasing. I have not yet seen the report of the Betting Control Board showing the average of betting last year, but in the previous year the individual bets increased, whereas the volume decreased, showing that the people were becoming more discriminating. I venture the opinion that the discrimination is traceable to the fact that under our present system of taxation punters are taxed on their stake as well as on their winnings.

There is only one other point I wish to raise regarding this great honour conferred upon us—a doubtful honour—of becoming a non-claimant State. I have not heard of any loud hurrahs in the press regarding the anticipated deficit of £791,000 which heralds the first Budget under our non-claimant status. It simply demonstrates what the acting Prime Minister (Mr. McEwen) said at the conference of Premiers when there was a discussion regarding the extra £1,000,000 that our Treasurer wanted. He said, "I may as well let Tom have it now because he will get it from the Grants Commission anyhow." Summed up, it means that our position has not changed in any substantial respect from what it was during that period of years when we were able to get assistance from the Grants Commission. There is the possibility that if we do require assistance from the Commission in the future in the exceptional circumstances mentioned, it could become very difficult for us to establish a case. I will now refer to the Treasurer's encomium of the Grants Commission. He told us how well he got on with it and what a wonderful effort it had put forward and all the rest of it, but I remind the House that this is somewhat different from what he said in 1956 when the Commission rejected a claim for £620,000 for roads which had been included in the application for a special grant. On that occasion he did not throw bouquets at the Commission, but made some caustic references to the fact that if States were to be subjected to that kind of treatment they would lose their independence and what not. During the last few years we have heard much about

the progress and prosperity of South Australia and at election time we have seen advertisements in the press urging the people to go forward with Playford—to support Playford to obtain prosperity.

Mr. Lawn—That is the three P's instead of the three bears.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I do not know whether there is anything associated with the three P's and the three bears, but I have often wondered what the association of the Treasurer was with his Party because he was "it," and that is what mattered. No allowance has ever been made for the long term of good seasons and high prices which this State has enjoyed during the Treasurer's regime. We have had the longest period of good seasons and high prices in the history of white settlement in South Australia. When something broke our way we were told that the Treasurer was responsible, and it was only in small print that the Government was responsible.

Mr. Lawn—He even put the coal up at Leigh Creek!

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I was there and saw him do it with a square-mouthed shovel, and there was a picture of it somewhere in the press. This is by no means a drought year yet. I say that those who are talking about drought conditions and circulating furbies such as were circulated about sheep being driven over a cliff into the sea are doing a dis-service to South Australia; and they are not Labour people. I have consistently expressed my hope about the prospects of this year and am pleased that those little rains that we frequently used to despise have become indeed grand. In the last fortnight or so conditions in much of the State have substantially improved. With one more good soaking down-pour throughout South Australia we can have what we used to consider in the old days a good average year.

Mr. Hall—No, you haven't been around.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I know that honourable members opposite are so obsessed with the "Progress with Playford" idea that they want the bountiful conditions to continue all the time. I have been in primary production for a long time and have seen long periods of lean years, and I have never seen a period of good years such as we have recently enjoyed. Let us get the subject in the right perspective; let us forget what happened between, say, 1948 and 1959, and go back to the 1924-32 period, when most primary producers would have welcomed the type of year that this can become with a

good soaking rain throughout the State soon. Government members say that our present position is not due to any fault of the Government. Of course, that could not be admitted; our position is all due to this terrible drought!

I will now deal with one item which I think shows that the Government has not been as assiduous in its conservation of the bounty of past years as it might have been, and that it has not planned for the future with complete success. I regret that comparison of the financial results of certain Government activities is difficult in the absence of the Auditor-General's report. Unfortunately, that report was laid on the table only this afternoon, and I have not had an opportunity of considering it. My remarks, therefore, are directed at figures which may on perusal of that report be found to be out of date, although if they are out of date I am afraid they will only show a worse sign than the figures that I will use this afternoon. I have protested in season and out of season against our being asked to even begin the Budget debate without the Auditor-General's report. We have always been told that it will be available before we start to discuss the lines, but I think it should be available earlier so that members may get an overall picture of the financial position of the State and discuss it point by point before they come to the very restricted discussion on the lines.

I go further and say that we should have the Auditor-General's report before we are asked to pass the Loan Estimates, because the Loan Estimates are most vital when we consider the amounts being spent annually and the way the public debt is increasing. I hope that next year steps will be taken to present the Auditor-General's report to Parliament prior to the discussion of either the Loan Estimates or the Budget. In saying that, I do not reflect on the retiring Auditor-General or his department. We know that department has a mighty job to assemble the great mass of figures following the end of the financial year on June 30, and then the printing is no inconsequential matter. The Government, and probably the Treasurer, is responsible for the business of Parliament, and therefore I maintain that the debates on the Loan Estimates and the Budget could be postponed a short time to enable the Auditor-General's report to be available.

Dealing with railways, the Treasurer said:—

Payments for Railways Department were £609,000 below the forecast and receipts £212,000 less than expected. The reduced revenues followed from the loss of general

merchandise traffic, due partly to the poor seasonal outlook and partly to road competition.

Is that not what the Opposition has been saying for years: that the railways have been subjected to unfair road competition, particularly on interstate lines, but also to a lesser extent on intrastate lines? The interstate hauliers are subject to no tax and contribute nothing to roads that have cost us millions of pounds to construct. In addition, they are creating losses in freight to the South Australian and Victorian railways, and to a lesser extent to the New South Wales railways on the goods that go from here to New South Wales. We also have the intrastate competition with the primary producer, who carries his wool—the main commodity carried—to Adelaide on the vehicle on which he receives a 50 per cent registration concession. I submit that that concession should be looked upon as a concession to enable him to carry his goods and other things around the district where those goods are produced, and, if his commodity is wool, to the nearest railway station to consign it to Adelaide by rail. I was not here when that concession was first granted, but I understand from those that were that it was not intended that those vehicles should be used for commercial purposes; but they are being used for commercial purposes today, carrying produce to Adelaide which could be brought, I suggest more economically, by train.

It is a remarkable thing that in my electorate, where there are many large sheep stations with wool production running into hundreds of bales and, in one or two cases, more than a thousand bales, the producers do not send their wool by road to Adelaide. One would have thought they would be the ones who would be out to save money, because of their efficiency of management and so on, but they use the railways. When I go north, as I frequently do during the wool season, I see many little trucks making the pilgrimage to Adelaide with a few bales of wool. I am sure that cannot be economical, and we may do the producers a good turn if we stop it. I do not say that the 50 per cent concession rate should be eliminated altogether, but there should be a limit to the radius in which the vehicle registered at the concession figure should operate. That is something that could be done to protect the railways, and I trust the Government will take effective action in this matter soon. The Treasurer went on to say:—

Receipts from the carriage of passengers, freight and livestock, are estimated to total £13,100,000 this year, an increase of £224,000

over 1958-59. An increase in suburban and country passenger fares, averaging closely 14 per cent, is to operate from October 1, and will mean additional revenues of £100,000 this year and £135,000 in a full year. Higher revenues are estimated from the carriage of ores and concentrates from Broken Hill to Port Pirie, but with the present seasonal outlook a decline in earnings from the carriage of grain is expected.

I hope the Treasurer's optimism is realized, but it seems peculiar that we should expect to earn £224,000 more during this year than we earned last year from our railways, even considering the extra revenue of £135,000 to be derived in a full year from passengers travelling on the railway. I object to that, the same as I have objected in the past to the increase in fares on other forms of public transport, because the people who are hit when fares on public transport are increased are the people who cannot afford alternative means of transport. The higher we raise fares on public transport the more we cause people to consider whether they should use alternative means of transport, so it becomes another vicious example of the law of diminishing returns operating.

I want to briefly refer to a few other points in the Budget speech and papers, because they are germane to the fact that with good seasons and high prices we have been inclined to become a little extravagant in our thinking. Our Government has become extravagant, to a very considerable degree, in its planning and spending. I have worked out approximate figures for the anticipated working expenses of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for 1959-60. On the figures supplied by the Treasurer, an average bed availability of about 350 beds for 1959-60 is expected. Applying to this the average bed utilization for the hospitals in the metropolitan area of 77 per cent, and calculating from the estimated running expenses for 1959-60 of £792,000, the cost for each patient will be about £56 a week, while the estimated revenue from each patient will be about £12 10s. a week.

I think that is a choice example of the fact that our planning has been altogether too generous. I know it is a magnificent building, but we could have built several smaller hospitals that would have served the community much more efficiently. I advocated years ago that we should have one hospital in the north of Adelaide, one in the east, one in the south and one in the west to provide for the local hospitalization of the people living in those suburbs, and that there should be a complete remodelling of the Royal Adelaide Hospital in order to make it an up-to-date teaching and

research institution, to which patients requiring specialist treatment could be sent from the country and from the other hospitals to which I have referred, but we have put the cart before the horse. The Royal Adelaide Hospital is now to be remodelled, as it should have been years ago, and people, in the eastern, southern and northern suburbs are still to be left without any public hospitalization.

I point out, too, that my reference to costs makes no allowance for debt charges which must be most embarrassing for the Government on this project. The running expenses for the treatment of a patient will be about £56 a week, but surely a hospital built on most modern design can operate more economically than this. If economies are impossible, then the present Government made a gross error of judgment in embarking on a hospital of this type in the first place. This hospital, which was originally estimated to cost under £2,000,000, has cost nearly £8,000,000 and it is not completed or paid for yet.

The second matter I wish to refer to is the Municipal Tramways Trust. The Treasurer in his speech gave a fairly detailed explanation of the remarkable improvement in the financial position of the M.T.T. I, like the Treasurer, commend the chairman of the trust for the work he has done, but I still maintain that there is plenty of room for improvement. The Treasurer quoted a schedule of figures to support his statement that "the contribution of £161,000 compares with the following contributions made during the last five years." He gave the following table of contributions:—

	£
1954-55	600,000
1955-56	570,000
1956-57	510,000
1957-58	490,000
1958-59	440,000

I looked at those figures and, like the Treasurer, thought that it looked as if that project would eventually pay its own way. "Looked as if" are the key words, because no mention was made of the remission of debt which was also made by the Government to the M.T.T. since 1955-56. The Auditor-General's report of that year stated, in relation to the remission of debt:—

During the year 1955-56 the Treasurer, pursuant to section 27 (5) of the Public Finance Act, reduced the trust's debt to the Government by appropriating to its Loan Account £350,000 out of reserves created from the National Debt Sinking Fund.

They were reserves not provided by the M.T.T., but created by the National Debt Sinking Fund. The report continued:—

The Treasurer has advised the trust that he proposes to allocate annually an amount in reduction of the trust debt based on the extent to which the cash grant is estimated to fall short of meeting the full cost of operations, including depreciation. Further, an attempt will be made to cover in like manner the expenditure of unprovided depreciation during the three years to June 30, 1955.

When you apply these remissions of debt to the other grants made, the total annual grant made to the Municipal Tramways Trust becomes:—

	£
1954-55	600,000
1955-56	920,000
1956-57	750,000
1957-58	730,000
1958-59	680,000

That is a different picture altogether from that given by the Treasurer the week before last. When I find that the Government paid £80,000 more in 1958-59 than it did in 1954-55, I cannot subscribe to the Treasurer's view when he says that he is very pleased to be able to report a consistent downward movement in the amount of Government assistance required.

In order that I might consider the present proposed grant to the Municipal Tramways Trust of £219,000 for 1959-60 in its right perspective, I should like to know what remission of debt the Government intends to give the trust this financial year. I point out again that this remission of debt is not due to present earnings of the trust; it is not due to past earnings; and it is not due to any sinking fund to amortize the trust's debt, or to any depreciation account: it is due to the use of moneys paid into the general account to liquidate the public debt of South Australia on all Government activities.

Mr. Quirke—That is not allowed.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is allowed under section 27 (5) of the Public Finance Act. A number of things that may be done under that Act would not get by in ordinary business concerns, but that is the responsibility of Parliament. I am not blaming the Treasurer or any past Premier or Treasurer for that. Parliament has passed this legislation and it is time Parliament examined our Public Finance Act to see that money voted for a particular purpose is, within reasonable limits, spent for that purpose. Some latitude has to be allowed, but the latitude allowable today means there is no real control, under that

Act, over the disposal of money by the Treasurer of the day. I shall soon be producing evidence in favour of a Public Accounts Committee.

My other two points regarding the M.T.T. are, firstly, that I cannot understand why the fleet of modern motor buses procured during the last few years are so high above the ground that it is difficult for aged people or people suffering some physical disability to climb into them. I could understand it if these buses were going to travel over the roads in my electorate, for they are surely some of the most neglected roads in South Australia.

Mr. Hutchens—Or were the buses bought in anticipation of reduced fares for pensioners?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Possibly, but pensioners must find extreme difficulty in boarding those vehicles. I hope that when these buses are being replaced lower slung vehicles will be provided to obviate that difficulty. The second matter is the persistent request by the Adelaide City Council and other bodies for destination signs on the buses. Such signs are essential on this type of transport. If a persons sees a bus standing and there is no rear destination sign he does not know whether it is going to Snake Gully, Timbuktoo or down to the hoop-la place, therefore he may let it go only to find, when he asks somebody when the next bus for the hoop-la place will come along, that one has just departed and it will be half an hour before another arrives.

Mr. Hutchens—It could be fatal to a heart case.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—As the honourable member for Hindmarsh reminds me, a heart patient urged on by a sense of doubt and hurrying to a bus, on finding it is not the one he thought it was, could collapse and die. Surely some simple scheme could be devised. At least the old trams had this to be said for them: whether they were coming or going you knew where they were destined for, and I see no reason why the buses could not provide the same service.

Another point that intrigues me is this proposal to collect a subsidy of 1s. a ton royalty on coal mined for the Electricity Trust at Leigh Creek. I mention briefly the present position of the Loan funds associated with the Leigh Creek coalfield. There is still employed in the undertaking a matter of £3,827,215. The proposed Loan programme for 1959-60 includes an estimated payment of £125,000 and this estimated payment is to be made up as

follows:—Mine area buildings, £2,000; township buildings, £102,000; roads and railways, £5,000. I can understand the roads, but not the railways, because I thought the railways were provided by the Commonwealth Railways Department, unless, of course, we are to provide a telephone service for the Telford railway station. I do not know if honourable members are familiar with the existing position, but on the new railway the uniform gauge line by-passes the town of Leigh Creek by about 1½ miles to 2 miles from the nearest part of the town and there is no telephone connection between the station and the town, so a passenger desiring to join the train on the Leigh Creek siding has to go across and wait until a train comes. Some trains arrive before the scheduled time, but some arrive considerably later. The same comment applies to trades people procuring goods from the Commonwealth railways: instead of being able to ring the station master to see whether the goods have arrived they have to visit the station to see for themselves. It is the first railway station serving a town of importance—and Leigh Creek is a town of importance—anywhere in the world that I know of that has not a telephone connection to the town. The estimated payments continue:—

	£
Water supply and sewerage	8,000
Electricity supply	155,000
General machinery	139,000
Coal handling and treatment plant	53,000
General plant, loose plant and tools	11,000
Transport	25,000
	<hr/>
	£500,000
Deduct funds to be found outside of State Loan Funds	375,000
	<hr/>
Total State Loan Funds provision .	£125,000

I am not objecting to any of those items, because they are essential for the development of the field, but I am working up to the point that I am concerned with, namely, this 1s. a ton royalty. The Treasurer said in his Budget Speech that the territorial receipts for 1959-60 were expected to increase by £27,000 over the receipts for last year. He then said:—

An additional £65,000 in receipts for mining activities is expected to be offset by a decline of £41,000 in revenues from land sales. Of the increase from mining activities £40,000 will come from a royalty of 1s. per ton which has been imposed on Leigh Creek coal pursuant to the Mining Act.

I am particularly interested in the figure relating to Leigh Creek coal because, in my opinion, it is purely a book entry. If it is not, then it could be a means of forcing the

Electricity Trust to increase its charges to consumers.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—It is neither. For some years the electricity undertaking at Leigh Creek has been paying off past deficits that are now paid off and it is now able to make a contribution to the State Treasury whilst still making a handsome profit on last year's figures.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—If the Treasurer had said that in introducing his Budget I would not have been drawn into making the mistake I have made. However, one matter intrigues me: I always thought royalties were imposed on leases issued under the Mining Act. Has the Electricity Trust any leases at Leigh Creek?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The entire field at Leigh Creek has been assigned to the Electricity Trust.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—And is therefore not subject to the Mining Act? That is what I wanted to know. I am particularly concerned with the dead-weight charges on the State public debt. As at June 1949, the public debt was £125,000,000 whereas as at June this year it was £318,000,000—an increase of approximately 155 per cent in the last ten years. This is worrying in itself, but when we consider that the interest and repayments are not being met by the current earnings of the public works on which these funds were used the matter becomes very serious indeed. The Auditor-General compiled a very informative table in this respect when he drew attention to the quickly increasing dead-weight charges of the public debt. The dead-weight of the public debt is the amount by which the annual earnings of the public works fall short of the total working expenses plus debt charges. On long term borrowing, if the public works are paying their way, or even holding the earnings of their original year, there should be no increase in the dead-weight charges of the public debt. Yet we see the dead-weight charges have increased by 32 per cent in the four years 1953-54 to 1957-58.

This means that we are embarking on public works that are not paying their way. Before embarking on these grandiose schemes, of which the Treasurer is so fond, surely the Government should consider the financial return from these ventures. I can only speak on the figures that are available to me, and for the four-year period from 1953-54 to 1957-58 the dead-weight charges of the public debt increased by 32 per cent. Government money has been spent on schemes that do not pay and apparently never will pay. What can we do about it? For many years I have been

advocating the decentralization of industry in order to correct the persistent and deplorable flow of country people to the metropolitan area. This afternoon the member for Port Pirie, Mr. McKee, indicated that many young folk who were reared and educated in his town have had to travel to the metropolitan area for employment. That situation applies to any sizeable country town, including Peterborough, and also Port Augusta where there has been some rather spectacular development in recent years. I could enumerate many towns that have a smaller population now than they had 20 years ago. Much of this money, which has resulted in the dead-weight of interest increasing, has been spent in providing water, sewerage and other amenities in this fast-growing well known as the metropolitan area. When we suggest establishing industries in the country to enable people to continue to live where they have been reared we are told it is not economic. Is it economic that we should continually increase the dead-weight of interest on our public debt? Is it economic to drive people from the environment in which they were reared, and, in the case of teenagers, expose them to dangers they must face when they are sent from their homes, to obtain employment?

The Treasurer said that Parliament would have to tackle this problem. Two years ago the Opposition provided the opportunity when we moved for the appointment of a committee to investigate proper steps for the decentralization of industry in South Australia, but every Government member followed the Treasurer's lead and defeated the motion. Those who sometimes complain about the decay of country towns were not game enough to reveal independence: they were afraid to develop a conscience and to speak for the districts they represent. I trust that, following the Treasurer's lead this afternoon, we will have some real policy to spread industry and to retain populations in country towns. I know that the Treasurer is actuated by grandiose schemes that have to cost a million or more pounds before they can be considered, but I am concerned with smaller towns and their inhabitants. I am sure that small industries could be established in those places to the economic advantage of the State.

In addition to water and sewerage, in our growing metropolitan area we have to provide transport, roads and schools and, apart from Government services, churches and community halls must be established. All of these services exist in Port Pirie, Peterborough, Port Augusta, Kapunda and many other towns I

could mention. Why not entice people to where those amenities exist rather than force them to come to the metropolitan area thus forcing new expenditure on those amenities?

Mr. King—Are you going to force industries to go to those areas?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have not mentioned the word "force" in that sense.

Mr. Jenkins—You did say it.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—With respect to the oracle from Victor Harbour, I did not. I said that we should provide for the establishment of small industries in those towns and that we should encourage them to go there. Hasn't a measure of force been used in the establishment of Elizabeth? We are certainly spending a lot of money there and I do not know what the result will be, nor, I suggest, does the member for Stirling. That is another instance of putting the cart before the horse. There is now a proposal to develop the land between Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour. That is where development should first have taken place because there industrial sites are located close to transport and to a power house. That area could have been developed at an infinitesimal portion of the cost of Elizabeth. When it is developed I suggest that many of the people in industries at Elizabeth will migrate there. Members opposite are continually harping that we want to force people to do this and that. Who is forcing people to live in Elizabeth when they require homes near their jobs in Adelaide? Isn't it the Government? If they want shelter they cannot, under the aegis of this Government, get it nearer than Elizabeth.

Mr. King—Where else could they go?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Kapunda, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Orroroo, Moonta.

Mr. King—They would have a long way to travel to work.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Members opposite know that I am right but they are still loudly vociferating the viewpoint they were told to vociferate last year. Apparently they did not hear the Treasurer say today that we will have to do something about it. It is time we did start to do something about it and it is time we had some regard for the people in small country towns. We should encourage some of the small industries that are being established in the

metropolitan area to go to these country towns. In all other countries industrial plants are scattered. If other countries can do it, surely it is not an insuperable problem for this Parliament to solve.

Mr. McKee—Other States are doing it.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes.

Mr. Ryan—Of course, the other States have not a gerrymander.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is one of our great difficulties. Security tends to cause people not to think, and political security has a deadening effect upon what ought to be the desire of members opposite to promote the interests of the whole State. In referring to housing the Treasurer said that housing activities are proceeding most satisfactorily and have substantially overcome the war-time lag as well as dealing with new demands. I have examined the Housing Trust figures, which give a good indication about the progress of housing in South Australia, and the following table illustrates the position:—

HOUSING STATISTICS.

Review of the Five Years 1953-54 to 1957-58.

Year.	No. of Applicants.	No. of Units Built.*
1953-54	9,807	3,555
1954-55	10,806	3,268
1955-56	11,751	3,238
1956-57	9,684	3,140
1957-58	9,516	3,033
Totals	51,564	16,234

* Units built represent about 31 per cent. of the applicants.

I point out that the actual number of homes completed last year was considerably fewer than in 1952-53, when 4,126 units were completed. I do not think that is anything to crow about. I suggest we have to do better than that if we are ever going to take people out of those wretched emergency homes where so many are compelled to live today.

Turning to expenditure—which is, after all, germane to the argument, as this is supposed to be a Budget speech, and even has some relation to decentralization of population—in the following table I am taking the figures of expenditure from Revenue and Loan for a five-year period:—

TOTAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE.

For the Five Years 1954-55 to 1958-59.

(In millions of £'s.)

Year.	1954-55.	1955-56.	1956-57.	1957-58.	1958-59.
Revenue Expenditure	54	61	66	71	74
Loan Expenditure (Gross)	27	29	27	25	28
Total Expenditure	81	90	93	96	102

The total Revenue and Loan expenditure over the last five years was £462,000,000, and the Estimate for 1959-60 is £109,000,000. Those are astronomical figures in anybody's language, and, as the great bulk of this expenditure is on big projects in the metropolitan area, one can appreciate why it is so difficult to get something done for the little people in the little towns in the country areas.

However, some things can be done. As regards rural production, honourable members well know that there are 3,000 fewer individual holders getting their living from the land today in South Australia than there were 20 years ago. When one realizes the potential that still exists, much of which has been created by the use of trace elements, the benefit of superphosphates and induced pastures in the wetter but formerly unproductive areas of the South-East, instead of there being 3,000 fewer landholders there should be at least 3,000 more. But what is happening today? When a block of land goes on the market, it is purchased by some landowner adjacent to it because he is usually the only one who has the money to pay the extraordinary prices being asked for land today.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—The Leader should talk about the country to the south, not just that in his own electorate.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I think I travel further and more widely in South Australia than the Minister does.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—I would not dispute that, but the Leader always, on this subject, talks of what he sees in his particular part of the country.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—What has that to do with the price of eggs? I know that quite a number of dude ranches have been established in the honourable member's electorate and in other quarters, all fairly close to Adelaide where people already earning big incomes in other walks of life think they are being clever in seeking to carry out improvements, thus securing taxation remissions. I think they are making a mistake, but am pleased to see them doing it. I am not criticizing them at all. One of these days no doubt these places will come on the market and some genuine fellows will want to work the land. Are these men going out to milk cows, crutch sheep, or treat foot-worm?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—If they are not, they are employing somebody to do that.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, under an Industrial Code that gives no basic rate for rural workers. I repeat that despite the use of

trace elements, superphosphates, and all the rest of it, there are 3,000 fewer individual landholders in South Australia at present than there were 20 years ago. All this migration from the land has not taken place in the dry areas, but even in the drier areas the aggregation of land into large holdings has become a menace in some respects. When the rabbit beats myxomatosis, as it is showing signs of doing, trouble will arise in those areas. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) knows that, if the good seasons continued, many of these holdings would be a good living area at the present time.

Mr. Heaslip—They do not always continue.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I found that some of the men who did not do well were the people with the large holdings because they were too greedy or mean to employ somebody to kill their rabbits.

Mr. Heaslip—And they lost their holdings.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Not always. That did not apply to all. There were other large holders who were good landowners, and there were small holders who did comparatively well. There should have been a redistribution of country in the far north many years ago, but now they have gone from one extreme to the other. I refer now to land further in that could carry more people than it is carrying today, but unfortunately it is carrying fewer than it used to carry.

One of the difficulties with rural production, especially that about which I know something—namely, sheep—is stock numbers. We were proudly told in the Governor's Speech by the Government, who were the architects of the speech, that we topped the 15,000,000 mark in sheep population. That would be quite all right if we could foresee what we were going to use to feed those 15,000,000 sheep, but there has been considerable difficulty since His Excellency's Speech was delivered.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—I thought the Leader was not going to talk much about the drought.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I am not. The Minister is so anxious to get his views in *Hansard* that he interposes in the middle of a sentence! I was going to say that we should have been in a worse difficulty in the early part of this year had it not been for the programme of fodder conservation carried out generally by landowners last year. That was a good thing and is something to be encouraged in the future. But we have to go further than conserving baled hay or lucerne: we must evolve some system of storing concentrates. Frankly, I do

not know the answer to the problem but it should be possible to devise a concentrate that will provide all the vitamins necessary. I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he might get some of his experts, together with the C.S.I.R.O., to carry out investigations, if they are not already doing so, to see whether a concentrate can be evolved which will carry, which will store, and which will live in storage.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—It is being done.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I am pleased to have the Minister's assurance that it is being done. Honourable members know quite well that I have been advocating for some years that meat works should be established in the country areas where the stock are produced. It is an economic waste and cruelty to animals to drag them long distances by road and rail to be slaughtered at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. It ought to be possible to develop an economic unit that would treat a certain number of livestock annually and still prove a profitable proposition. I have been particularly concerned with my own area, which has a very large sheep population and railways radiating from Peterborough that can be used to bring the livestock into that town for slaughter and treatment. Of course, the Treasurer has said it would not be economic. Earlier in the year somebody had the temerity to send me a copy of the *Financial Times*. I hope other honourable members got it and read it. Wading through it, I have discovered this remarkable thing, that New South Wales has no less than 20 meat works in the country and metropolitan areas, all equipped for handling meat for local consumption and export. All save three are in the country.

Mr. Hutchens—It is different from here.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—We have two here—one in the metropolitan area and one at Port Lincoln because it was not worth while trying to bridge the gulf to bring the lambs over. In New South Wales, there is an abattoirs at Bourke, which is well to the west; then Tenterfield, which is to the north; Grafton, also well to the north; Macksville, well to the north; Maitland, to the north; Blayney, well west again; Goulburn, to the south-west; Gunnedah, north-west; Wingham, to the north; Aberdeen, to the north; Dubbo, to the west; and Newcastle, 100 miles from Sydney. At Sydney there are three works. Then there are abattoirs at Cootamundra, Daroobalgie and Wagga to the south-west; and Orange to the west. So that, of the 20 meat works in New South Wales with full killing facilities for local consumption and export trade, only three are in the metro-

politan area. Our Government should look at this. I am not saying that all these are Government owned or Government inspired. The works at Tenterfield and Dubbo were established by private enterprise, but several have been established by shires with financial assistance from the Government. The proceeding is to lend a shire the capital cost of establishing the works free of interest for 10 years, after which the works are on their feet and paying their way. It is time we considered doing something like this in South Australia.

Mr. Hutchens—The member for Rocky River could consider this too.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, because he has a number of the bigger farms in his area.

Mr. Heaslip—They could produce cheaper food, too.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Of course they could. Gladstone is a centre that lends itself to the establishment of a small treatment plant for the stock roaming up to 100 miles away to the north. I now wish to refer to the Railways Appeal Board. Members who were here at the time know what a great fight we put up to get the then Railways Commissioner to agree to the establishment of the present board. Mr. Richards (former Leader of the Opposition), after much negotiation with the then Minister of Railways (Sir Malcolm McIntosh), eventually obtained an agreement under which no man was to be dismissed without a trial. That agreement is not being fully honoured by the railways administration today and I hope in the not far distant future the House will have an opportunity to consider amendments in which the proper procedure in relation to dismissals will be set out. In a career industry such as the railways, dismissal is a severe punishment because sometimes the person dismissed is too old to start learning another job. I hope members opposite and the Government will consider this matter and right an injustice.

I do not want to be considered a carping Jeremiah. I am not unmindful of the fact that this State has made some progress because of the good seasons and the high prices that have ruled in recent years. I trust that this progress will continue, but I believe that with a little more consideration by the Government for the little people, the little industries, and the little towns, greater progress still could be achieved.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I congratulate the Treasurer on this, his twenty-first Budget, which he and his Treasury officials have

designed to carry on public utilities and maintain full employment. I think it would have been a difficult job to compile the Budget this year because of the drought and, amongst other things, the high cost of power and pumping to provide water for the city and country towns. Action taken in past years has probably ensured an adequate supply of water in what is one of the driest years in our history, and had not the Government been far sighted this State, and particularly the metropolitan area, could have been in dire difficulties now. However, with a normal amount of rain between now and the Christmas period, we should be able to carry on with few restrictions, if any.

I take this opportunity to refer to the retirement of two top-ranking public servants—the Under Treasurer (Mr. Drew) and the Auditor-General (Mr. Bishop). I am sure all members join with me in extending best wishes to them in their retirement. These men have undertaken a number of activities apart from their official duties. For instance, Mr. Bishop has been interested in such institutions as the Soldiers Home at Myrtle Bank. He has taken an interest in this institution for several years, and I am proud to be associated with him. I congratulate Mr. Jeffery, who succeeds Mr. Bishop as Auditor-General. He will fill this position with distinction and, as he comes from Victor Harbour, the people in that town are proud of him because of his advancement.

This year £100 is provided for the Bush Fires Advisory Committee and to meet the expenses of bush fire prevention publicity. I commend the Minister and the advisory committee for drawing up what is considered to be a very good letter that has been circulated amongst district councils throughout the State referring to a "clear up week" from October 18 to 25. Although my corporation has not received a letter, the Minister informed me that letters would be sent to corporations as well as to district councils. My corporation has agreed to co-operate in this matter and I believe it has some suggestion about cleaning up inflammable materials during the period, which is better than trying to fight bush fires when they occur. This is a very good move indeed. My corporation, like many others, has boundaries adjoining district councils. The boundaries of my corporation about on those of two district councils, and the outside boundary is more or less in the bush, where there is a great deal of inflammable material, so what concerns the adjoining district councils concerns us too. I

am pleased that the Minister has considered this matter, and I am sure district councils will co-operate fully because they believe, like I, that prevention is better than cure.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Judge Paine on the administration of the Bushfire Relief Fund and the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund. I have never heard any complaints about that administration; everyone who has received bushfire relief has been happy about it. There was a bad fire last year in the Port Elliot district that ravaged many acres of good pasture, fences and homes. Probably this year will be one of the driest in this State's history, so the danger will not be as great as previously in many districts but, with the rains we have had in the last few weeks and those we hope to get in the next few weeks, my district will probably have a good season for hay and pasture, so we must take care to see that there is not a recurrence of last year's fire. I pay a tribute to the chairman of the committee (Mr. H. B. Basham) and secretary (Mr. K. Dodd), who did a tremendous job in accepting and distributing food, fodder, fencing and posts, and who must be congratulated on the unselfish way they gave their time in organizing work parties and in carrying out other work.

I wish to refer briefly to the Leader's remarks on decentralization, a subject that has been discussed in this House at great length from time to time. He said we should look after the small industries and small towns, and I fully agree with this. Members have mentioned Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta, and probably Wallaroo is in their thoughts. The Government has undertaken the terrific task of helping these towns by the industries that have been established there, mainly through taking power and water to them. The Morgan-Whyalla pipeline has made it possible to develop Whyalla, which is one of our fast developing towns. The power stations at Port Augusta have had a big influence on maintaining employment there, and Port Pirie has not done so badly after all. When an industry is established in any town, a number of families come there to settle. When the children grow up there is often a surplus of labour, so the children must go elsewhere. They go either to other towns or to the metropolitan area. I do not think anything can be done about that, because the more industries there are the bigger the population; there is a snowballing effect.

The Leader also referred to Elizabeth, and said that the town should have been established at Port Adelaide, where it is proposed to have a new industrial area. We cannot

have it both ways. Elizabeth is some miles out of the city and industries are being established there. The new area will really be in the metropolitan area. The Leader said he thought this should have been first, and possibly that is so, but it would still have been centralization, so I do not know what the answer is. I do know, however, that the Government has done a terrific amount in establishing industries in some towns. Radium Hill is an example of Government activity; there was no town there before, but now 2,000 people live there. Leigh Creek is another town entirely the result of Government activity. I think we are prone to lose sight of the fact that this State cannot be compared with New South Wales and Victoria because 80 to 90 per cent of South Australia has only a light rainfall. If we had a rainfall as good as in New South Wales and Victoria we would probably have meat works throughout the State as those States have, but there are not sufficient stock to warrant killing works all over South Australia.

The Leader also mentioned the new farm-lets in the district represented by the Minister of Agriculture. My district adjoins that of the Minister and, although I cannot say that I like the idea of having "Rundle Street farmers," a great deal of that land is heavily timbered, it is steep and difficult to develop and, unless the owners have a great deal of money, it is not possible to develop it. I do not think that any man without a reasonable amount of money could develop this land economically and get on his feet in 20 years; he would certainly have a terrific struggle. Mr. O'Halloran referred to this type of farm being overrun with rabbits. This is not so, because most of this land is held by people living in Adelaide who employ managers not on, as he said, a very low wage; mainly they are on a salary and also a share basis. Most of them do very well indeed. Generally they are conducting excellent properties, which are producing the highest quality sheep and cattle, and I think the properties are an asset to those districts. Mr. O'Halloran also said that they had taken up these properties in order to avoid taxation, but I might say that they are doing a mighty good job.

Mr. O'Halloran added that the number of farms in the State had been reduced by about 3,000 in the last few years because of aggregation. That is not altogether because of the purchase of adjoining lands by wealthy people, but partly because many of the marginal areas were not payable propositions. After the war

many farms of 1,200 acres outside Goyder's line of rainfall had to be aggregated because they did not provide a living, and therefore two or three farms were made into one. This had the result of reducing the number of properties.

Drainage in the western division of the South-East has almost been completed and this area will be occupied by people who will have the benefit of excellent productive land. Drainage work on the eastern division will be commenced shortly at a cost of about £3,250,000, and production is expected to amount to more than £2,000,000 a year. However, these things take time. I understand that the drainage development is expected to be completed within the next five or six years. If that is so, many people will be allocated farms. I should say that some of the land that has already been occupied in these areas and is comprised of rich peat, black land will be subdivided two or three times when markets improve and the worth of this land is realized, because it is capable of carrying much stock and producing vegetables and so on. I think that this will answer some of the problems and keep our agricultural production in line with our industrial development. I support the Estimates.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—As Mr. Jenkins congratulated the Treasurer on being in a position to present another Budget, I think I can also congratulate Mr. O'Halloran on having served 10 years as Leader of the Opposition. Without an Opposition Parliament would not function. It plays an important part in Parliamentary affairs. Members on this side would rather see Mr. O'Halloran have a chance to be Premier, because there is no doubt he is worthy of that high office. His contribution to this debate bears that out. When Bills are brought before the House, in the Address in Reply debate and debates on the Estimates and Budget, Mr. O'Halloran bears the whole brunt of the attack by the Opposition. It is expected of him and it is a very big task, and at all times he offers a worthy contribution. Over the years he has gathered great knowledge, not only in this Parliament, but also in the Federal sphere, and members on this side are fully appreciative of his leadership over the past years. There should be an opportunity for him to be on the Government side.

Mr. Jenkins—He is on our side most of the time.

Mr. BYWATERS—The fact is that the Government often steals the Opposition's policy

and therefore the Government is on this side when it comes to certain legislation. However, when legislation is introduced by members on this side, no matter how worthy it is, it is rejected by the Government until such time as it sees fit to introduce a similar Bill and claim full credit for it. That has been very noticeable since I have been a member.

I am particularly interested in the National Fitness Council, on which the Speaker and I are representatives of this Parliament. This is a Commonwealth-wide organization and was instituted by the Commonwealth Government during the war. It has now operated for 17 years and has done a remarkably good job in fostering the welfare of youth. There is no doubt that its efforts have been covered with glory in that it has made a big contribution in reducing child delinquency. We appreciate the work of its officers. I am particularly pleased that on this occasion the Government grant to it is to be increased. The Minister of Education at one time represented this House on the council and I feel that he is very sympathetic towards its activities. He knows something of its value, and on many occasions has put himself out to assist it. It is pleasing that on this occasion the Government grant has been increased by £975, bringing the total to £8,000. Although the Commonwealth Government was responsible for inaugurating the council, it has fallen well behind in its grant as it is still contributing the same amount as it did 17 years ago. We all know how costs have increased since, but it contributes only about £5,750 to this worthy project. Numerous approaches have been made to it by Commonwealth members on both sides seeking an increase in the grant, but without success, and I urge the Minister of Education to see whether the Commonwealth grant could be increased. The Prime Minister has often stated that when the opportunity occurred he would increase the grant, but apparently this opportunity has not yet occurred. If something could be done along these lines, the National Fitness Council could go on to bigger and better things. It plays an important part in training youth leaders. There is a great need for increased leadership training. Only recently the council had a request from a distant country town to assist in meeting its juvenile delinquency problem. It asked that a fully-paid leader should be sent to assist, but that is out of the question, because it would cost about £1,000 a year to supply a man, and as there is a population of only about 1,000, the expenditure would be excessive in the circumstances.

The council has facilities available for leadership training. It has often co-operated with church organizations, girl guides and boy scouts, and these bodies have met regularly and conferred on ways of improving their organization. By pooling their knowledge they gain considerably in their aim to defeat the growth of delinquency. It is pleasing to see, both in the country and in the metropolitan area, youths taking part in various sports. We then know that they are living an active, normal life. There are other activities in which they are engaged, such as camping and bushwalking, whereby they are taken off the streets and kept away from serious trouble. We find that in most places where children have been brought before a court it has been because they were not associated with some form of youth work. The council is doing a fine job in this regard, but would like to do even more. It could undertake more in youth training and youth leadership training if additional money were available. The fact that its activities are expanding makes it necessary that the grant should be increased. It appreciates the sympathetic hearing it has received from the Minister of Education whenever an appeal has been made to him.

Our population is growing rapidly and consequently the number of children of school-going age is also increasing. Members were not told in the Treasurer's speech about the increasing birth rate. Babies are being born at the rate of 18,000 a year, compared with 10,000 in 1940. There are now 51,000 children in the age group of 14 to 19 years and in six years it is expected that the number will be increased to more than 90,000. During the next six years the position will be accentuated and the need will be for the council to increase rather than decrease its activities. We realize there is a challenge to be met. The National Fitness Council is going out of its way to provide added facilities in order that the children of tomorrow will not be neglected when it comes to keeping them in a healthy and active sporting life which is so necessary to our way of life. The National Fitness Council at South Terrace has some excellent films available for people who are interested in obtaining them for youth work. These films give quite a good coverage, and the Director (Mr. Simpson) will be only too anxious to help people in that regard.

Apart from that there is a very fine library to which the public has access, and here again we find that the Director and his staff are

only too anxious to help. One problem that is becoming very acute is the lack of recreation areas, which we find are becoming fewer as the population grows. Only recently the Birkalla polo ground has been taken over, and this has reduced the playing facilities for a section of the people. In the new subdivisions it is necessary that one-tenth of the area be allocated to sporting and recreation areas, but some of those areas are very small indeed, therefore one-tenth does not amount to very much. We are told that in some of the heavily built-up areas it is practically impossible to purchase land for recreational facilities. Considerable areas surrounding the metropolitan area could perhaps be available, but because councils have not sufficient money they cannot purchase those areas for this use.

Metropolitan councils have been alive to this problem of the lack of recreation areas, and the problem is becoming more and more acute. The position is not quite so serious in country areas, because larger tracts are available. Only this year a deputation to the Treasurer asked that the Government try to do something about it, and it was pointed out that the Government already provides a pound-for-pound subsidy in this respect. There is a need for the corporations to get together on this matter and amalgamate their strength in an effort to purchase land. After all, it does not matter much if the recreation area happens to be in one corporation area or another, because with transport it is not difficult for people to get from other corporation areas. If some joint effort were made by the various corporations, I feel they could possibly obtain more land for recreation areas.

We realize that to maintain the true perspective—and, indeed, it is required under the plan that has been formulated and adopted in Victoria—it is necessary to have 12½ acres for every thousand people. I quoted figures a moment ago showing that it is expected that in six years' time 90,000 children will be coming into their teens and will need these playing facilities. It is therefore necessary to think seriously about this problem of recreation areas. The Government and the Opposition, all members of corporations, and all the youth leaders, whether associated with churches or outside organizations, who are interested in the welfare of youth are concerned about the shortage of recreation areas, and it is therefore to be hoped that some plan will be evolved whereby we can arrive at a policy to ensure that this matter will not be left until too late. With the increase in population in the metropolitan

area, land is not only becoming scarcer but much more expensive.

I am interested in a hospital that is soon to be built in my electorate to serve not only my electorate but also that of the member for Albert, who is also interested in this project. The people in our electorates have put in much valuable work in an effort to see this project accomplished. A hospital is a very expensive item today. Those country towns that have been served with hospitals in the past and have them freehold are indeed fortunate, because where country hospitals are being built today they are costing much money. The committees that are endeavouring to raise the money for the hospital I have mentioned were very pleased to hear that the subsidy was to be increased this year from a pound-for-pound subsidy to a £2 for £1 subsidy, which will help to relieve the burden. Even then, when talking of £70,000 for a hospital, much has still to come out of the pockets of a few people. Nevertheless, this Lower Murray Districts Hospital, which will serve a large area, is being proceeded with, and much money has been raised toward it.

Next week a "Back to Tailem Bend Week" is being held to cover all the areas to be served by the hospital, and many festivities have been planned in the hope of raising a large amount of money. The rains which have come over the last few days have been very cheering to those people in the district, because they rely to a great extent on the support of the rural people, who have contributed very largely to the amount already raised by their generosity in providing proceeds of their crops for the last two years to foster this worthy project. I am very pleased that the people of Tailem Bend are so wholeheartedly behind the scheme. That country town is mainly supported by the railways. It is recognized as a railway terminal, where most of the people derive their income either directly or indirectly from the railway workshops and rolling stock in that area.

I am also very pleased that Labour Day celebrations will take place in the area next Monday. It has not been the practice to hold Labour Day celebrations there in the past, but I feel sure that next Monday will be the commencement of celebrations to recognize the fight that the men of industry put up for the better conditions which most people are enjoying today. A well known trade unionist from Adelaide is coming to Tailem Bend to represent the Australian Council of Trade Unions. I shall be happy to take part in that procession, which I feel will be well

worthy of the representative of the district. It is very fitting that some of the people of the area should be recognized, and I am sure that those who have been instrumental in doing so much to augment the funds required for the hospital will be suitably recognized when the time comes. They have put in much work to raise the money that is so urgently needed.

The Treasurer in his speech referred to the Electricity Trust. The trust is a socialistic undertaking which has been a great benefit to country people. We know that it has also benefited the metropolitan area, but to people in the country, particularly those who had no opportunity whatever of getting power under the previous set-up, it has been of particular benefit, because if they have not already received power they are now mainly within the scope of the trust's activities. The Electricity Trust has done a remarkable job, but there are still some difficulties encountered by country people. One difficulty is the standing charge, previously known as a surcharge, which in some instances is particularly high. The single wire earth return system has resulted in these standing charges being substantially reduced, with considerable savings to country people.

The Monarto South district is a small farming area that has a railway settlement with a few railway cottages. The railway employees who occupy such cottages, not only at Monarto South but throughout the State, have been placed on the standing charge. Those at Monarto are paying exactly the same standing charge as the producers and land owners in that area, namely, £10 a year. Although this is only a very small amount for the landholders to pay, it is a hardship to railway employees who are obliged to pay for something that they will never own, because they are tenants. I feel that the Railways Commissioner could review the position and perhaps take over this obligation, even if it meant a slight increase in the rental of those cottages, because, after all, electricity will be there for many years more than the 10 years that is required under the present system. If the Railways Commissioner were to take this matter up with the trust and agree to pay the standing charge and so relieve the railway employees of that amount, it would be an act of justice on his part. These tenants will probably be paying for someone else to reap the benefit in later years. They may be transferred somewhere else in a few years' time, and somebody else may be asked to transfer there, and when the question of the standing charge comes up they will probably forgo that appointment

in consequence. However, it could be pointed out that with a slight increase in the rent everyone would pay for the standing charge for many years to come; it would relieve the burden of those at present concerned and would be fairer for those people and those that follow in future years. I put that proposition forward, hoping that some notice will be taken of it.

Another scheme to be introduced between Mannum and Swan Reach will involve very high standing charges. I know that other members in the House are interested in this scheme. As it will be necessary to cross the river several times it will naturally boost up the percentage of the cost, and as a result someone will have to foot the bill. Many people will be embarrassed by the consequent standing charges. The trust requires a guarantee from consumers that they will install a range and a hot water service. This involves the consumers in a considerable initial outlay because, whilst once these articles could be hired from the trust, people must now buy them. It could cost a man £100 to wire his house, apart from the possible expenditure of £100 on a range and £200 on a hot water service.

Mr. Quirke—Does the trust demand that a consumer have those articles before a service is provided?

Mr. BYWATERS—The consumer must guarantee that he will install a range and a hot water service.

Mr. Quirke—Does the trust refuse to make the connection if the consumer does not immediately have those things?

Mr. BYWATERS—No, but when the consumer signs the agreement he is expected to install them as soon as possible. The standing charges are reviewed annually and if the consumers did not honour their agreement the charge could be increased. This requirement is particularly hard on wage-earners, of whom there are many in this area. Some landowners in the marginal areas of the district will appreciate the provision of electricity, but because they cannot afford it they may withhold their support for the scheme to the detriment of others. I understand that a deputation recently waited on the Treasurer and suggested that the standing charge be not imposed for a few years to enable people to get established. They do not want the charge waived, but suggest that it be deferred until three years after the scheme commences. Much river land is at present irrigated by diesel plant and the producers want to change over to

electricity but, as the standing charge to them will be as much as £300 or £400 annually, they want to be able to get their new equipment before they pay the charge; therefore, they seek its temporary suspension. Its deferment for only two years would be of great assistance.

It has been suggested that the recent railway fare increases do not conform with the announced formula. According to the press there was to be an average increase of 14 per cent in fares—an average of 12 per cent in the metropolitan area and 17 per cent in the country. I have not checked the percentage increases, but if that announcement is correct the increase is not fair. After all, country people who travel long distances have to pay more. It has always been recognized that the country resident pays more for each mile he travels than the city dweller. This is an injustice and the greater increase to country people is an added burden. As a result many country people will band together and travel by car rather than use rail facilities and, consequently, railway revenue will decrease and not increase. Country people are getting hit to leg all along the line. We have been told that this Government represents country people, but the country people pay far more than city residents and I protest on behalf of my constituents at the recent increases in rail fares.

I was interested to hear the Treasurer say that the cost of pumping water through the Mannum pipeline to the metropolitan area would add to this year's deficit. I do not know what the metropolitan area residents would do without the pipeline, which has been their salvation. Without it they would have to rely mainly on bore water and they would then have additional expenses, because I remember that when I lived in the metropolitan area bore water caused frequent blowing of fuses. I shall be surprised if water restrictions are not imposed in the metropolitan area this summer. The constant building up of the metropolitan area aggravates the position, and the satellite town of Elizabeth is imposing an added strain on the reticulated metropolitan water supply. A further strain will be placed on it when the Christies Beach area develops and soon the Mannum pipeline may have to be duplicated. I think it would be in the public's best interests if the population were taken to the river rather than that river water were brought to the city.

It has been suggested by members opposite that Labor's policy is to force people away from the metropolitan area, but that is not so. We would encourage people to migrate from

the metropolitan area. Instead of spending £12,000,000 to construct a pipeline from the river, would it not be wiser to spend that money in encouraging industries and people to go to country areas? There has been a gradual building up of Murray Bridge over the years and industries have been established there. Recently Oliver J. Nilsen opened a new factory in the town and that is helping decentralize industry. A broiler fowl industry has started in a small way in the district and many subsidiary industries could be associated with it. For instance, Noske's flour mill has begun producing poultry feed. These, and similar industries, should be encouraged in country areas. We do not seek large industries, although they would be welcome, but we seek small industries that help to maintain a happy community life. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) expressed concern about the drift of school children from his district to the metropolitan area. He was told that from an employment point of view we were better off than people in other States. Perhaps we are, but that does not alter the fact that children are leaving country areas and coming to the city. In large country towns 300 or 400 students leave high school annually and they must seek employment in industry. It would be to the Government's advantage if the Treasurer were to encourage those industries interested in coming to South Australia to establish in country areas and to give those areas the opportunity of conferring with the industrialists. It is essential to encourage people to go to certain areas.

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

Mr. BYWATERS—Just before the adjournment I was appealing to the Government to consider taking industries to the water rather than bringing water to the industries and to the people of the metropolitan area. I repeat that because I think it is very important in view of future developments that will take place in this State. It is necessary for us to plan along these lines for the future.

It was interesting last Wednesday to be at Murray Bridge when the Governor and certain members of the Chamber of Manufactures were in that area. They visited Murray Bridge, Mypolonga, and other outlying places. They have all assured me how interested they were in the progress of Murray Bridge and district. The President of the Chamber of Manufactures (Mr. Gibb), the secretary (Mr. Branson), His Excellency Sir Robert George, Lady George, the aide-de-camp and the lady-in-waiting were there. They all maintained that they had a

very interesting day looking round the various industries of the area. We had lunch at one of the hotels in Murray Bridge, and references were made to various items of their tour. Whereas Murray Bridge and its relative area were concerned mostly with primary production, His Excellency mentioned the fast-expanding dairying industry and pointed out the advantages of dairying along the reclaimed Murray swamps. He went on to say that Murray Bridge was strategically placed for industries, especially as regards roads, water and other amenities of that kind. Everyone, of course, was in perfect accord with what he had to say. It was pleasing to me to hear him echoing some of the sentiments I had often expressed both here and in the other places when I had said practically the same thing, because Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend are so strategically placed on the river and on the main road between Melbourne and Adelaide. Because of this the area lends itself to development, and certain industrialists have seen the wisdom of setting up there. I think others will too, as time goes on. They can be assisted greatly with some support and encouragement from the Government in this respect.

Turning to education, I should like to commend the Department of Adult Education on its wise attitude towards adult education. Here is a way in which it is really developing for the future not only of students of school-going age, but of people who have left school and are enjoying some measure of entertainment or leisure by using the various facilities made available to them at the adult education centres. Only this year a full-time principal was appointed to the large area that extends from Victor Harbour, through Murray Bridge and the Lower Mallee, almost down to the Victorian border. Previously, the total enrolments each quarter were about 300 but, when a full-time man was appointed to the area, we had an enrolment of 1,100, quite a big improvement.

This is not the only place. The same applies to Gawler and district, to Mount Gambier, and now at Murray Bridge and area; and I believe that the same will apply to Renmark and district. I assure the member for Chaffey (Mr. King) that he will notice a big improvement when that takes place. These enlargements and increases, however, bring problems. We look forward to the day when we shall have an established administration block and centre there worthy of the work being done. At the moment we are in one of the old Loveday blocks, which has served a useful purpose over the years, but

now I feel it would be wise if the department went in for something more permanent. I know that it is in the minds of the officers of the department, when they intend to carry out this work to a greater extent than at present, to provide better facilities. But these things will all take time.

One thing I have stressed here before by way of question, and by reference in speeches, is that it is necessary for an assistant to the full-time principal to be appointed, someone of a clerical nature to take messages and do the ordinary office work, thus relieving the full-time principal so that he can get about more to encourage even further development along these lines. At the moment the Public Service Commissioner has not seen eye to eye with us, but I do not think it will be very long before that comes about.

I have referred earlier today to pensioners in relation to hospitals. Another point is the concession that has recently been granted to pensioners to travel on a minor's ticket during the off-peak periods in the metropolitan area. We have been told that the metropolitan area extends as far as Gawler to the north, to Bridgewater to the south-east and, I believe, to Christies Beach in the south. The concession, of course, should not stop there. We know that pensioners in the metropolitan area are entitled to these things that have been granted in other States, but the time has come for this privilege to be extended to pensioners in the country areas as well. Railway trains are coming down from country areas with only partly filled carriages. If pensioners could travel half fare they, too, would get the benefits enjoyed by city pensioners and so enjoy something they are not enjoying at the moment. The Government should consider extending the privileges now being enjoyed by pensioners in the metropolitan area to pensioners in the country as well.

At the moment country pensioners travelling under a doctor's order to get specialist treatment at the Adelaide Hospital can, by producing the return half of their ticket, have the fare refunded by applying to the outpatients' department of the Adelaide Hospital. Of course, this is quite an advantage to pensioners who have to come down regularly for treatment at the outpatients' department. This concession is really appreciated, but I was sorry to hear only recently of a case in Palmer (in my electorate) where a man going for treatment at the Adelaide Hospital went to the outpatients' department where they

handle these things only to be told that he did not qualify. That was a great disappointment to him because he had to have several treatments and thought that he would be reimbursed. As he was a pensioner and his wife was receiving only a wife's allowance, not a great deal was coming into the home and he found the going very hard. He expected to have that money refunded and was disappointed when told that that would not happen. I brought this matter to the notice of the Treasurer and he asked me to put it on notice. I did that and was told that it did not apply to people in that area because they did not use public transport: they were using private transport. I do not see why they should be penalized when there is no public transport to serve that area because there is no railway connecting either Palmer or Mannum with Adelaide, and I daresay this applies to other areas in the State as well. Although the Government does not see fit at this stage to provide them with any facility, it could take this matter up with the private bus operators to see if they could not get some concession to allow pensioners to travel down for hospital treatment when urgently required. They are told they must come down for specialist treatment under a doctor's order and yet, because they live where there is no public transport available and have to rely entirely on private transport, they are excluded from the privileges that other people enjoy. It is an anomaly and, because of that, the matter should be investigated so as to allow these people to enjoy benefits similar to those enjoyed by their neighbors.

Turning to succession duties, I know that honourable members on the other side of the House have already this session touched on this means of taxation so important to the State Government. They have complained because of various cases they have put forward, and in some cases they have been justified in so doing.

Mr. Lawn—Yes, but they are not sincere.

Mr. BYWATERS—This is a case that has been brought to me only recently. Last Sunday I was visited by a gentleman and his mother. He was a man about 50 years of age and a bachelor; his mother was an age pensioner. Both the husband and the wife were getting a full pension prior to his death, so one can imagine that the value of their property was not considered high. Because of the diligent work of the son, who was using the land as much as possible, making improvements by

fencing and building other sheds there to protect his interests, thinking that eventually the property would come to him—as it doubtless would—the property is valued at £8,900 for probate or succession duty purposes. He has sought the advice of a solicitor who has worked out approximately what succession duties will cost his mother, because she owns the land and is the pensioner. Because the son thought the property was going to become his eventually, he has cleared the land and “supered” it and done much work on it. He is now starting to reap the benefit, but his mother will be obliged, according to the solicitor's advice, to find about £1,500, which is impossible.

Here is a man who has worked the land, improved it and done everything to what is now the detriment of his mother. He is not in a position to pay the money: he is still working under a slight mortgage. He has been to the bank to borrow money on the property but, because it is in his mother's name now through the will of her late husband, he has no right to borrow from the bank. So he is in the invidious position that he cannot raise money. He has worked hard to bring the property to its present position, and now it looks as though his mother will have to sell that property for what she can get to pay the succession duty. This will fall hard on those people.

The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said that although members opposite have put up similar cases, though not quite as bad as this, they are not sincere. Their test of sincerity comes with the support of the policy they accept, and the policy which they accept is something like this: that where property is left entirely to the widow, the first £3,500 is exempt; but where it is left to the son or another party, the first £1,500 is exempt. That is the present position. The Australian Labor Party has realized that values and prices have risen over the years and has maintained that succession duties should not be paid until a value of £6,000 is reached, which is not much these days.

Mr. Lawn—We have progressed, but the Government has not.

Mr. BYWATERS—We have, as we have raised values to today's levels. This property was worth £2,000 a few years ago but, because it has been developed, it is now worth £8,000, and the widow will be penalized by having to pay high succession duties, whereas if the limit were £6,000 she would pay far less. A farm of this value is not a big property, yet the widow will have to pay about £1,500. I suggest that members opposite bring this up

at their Party meeting, because it is time to amend this legislation so that people who have worked hard to develop properties are not penalized.

Mr. Quirke—Is there any virtue in succession duties?

Mr. BYWATERS—I cannot see any actual virtue.

Mr. Hambour—It is a painless tax.

Mr. BYWATERS—Whether that is so or not, it is in the hands of the Government to do something about it. Wage-earners who in the past have developed scrub land by their efforts are now being penalized by the high duties. I ask members opposite to do something about this. I support the Estimates.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I congratulate the Treasurer in presenting his 21st, and possibly most difficult, Budget. It is a record in the amount of revenue, which will be £79,532,000, and in expenditure, which will amount to £80,323,000, leaving a deficit of £791,000. In his Budget Speech the Treasurer said he had budgeted for a deficit because of the adverse season. If the season had been normal there would have been a surplus, not a deficit. Although the State received another £4,800,000 from the Commonwealth, £1,600,000 will be absorbed in additional interest charges, which are unavoidable, £1,300,000 for pumping water because of the dry season, and probably £1,000,000 will be used in payment of increased salaries. Apart from these items, there will be an increase in the cost of services.

Much has been said, particularly by the Leader of the Opposition, about South Australia's not being a claimant State. This settles once and for all the argument that if we had spent more money on social services we would have had a greater amount from the Commonwealth. On this subject, the Treasurer said:—

It has been suggested in some quarters that had the State expanded its social services far more and consequently shown a much larger deficit it would have been able to get a further grant to cover that larger deficit. That is not so.

Later, he said:—

It would not have been possible to spend more lavishly and recover the extra amount.

I am prepared to accept his statement, as I am sure it was made on the advice of Treasury officials who are competent to know whether it was possible to spend more. Budgeting for a deficit is due mainly to poor seasonal conditions, and chiefly to the supply of water for the metropolitan area. I do not wish to pit the metropolitan area against the

country, but I ask metropolitan members not to quibble about services for the country. I ask metropolitan members, when I ask for benefits for my constituents, that they give sympathetic support.

Mr. Coumbe—As long as you reciprocate.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am showing my generosity by applauding the Government for bringing water to the metropolitan area and not charging extra for it. Unfortunately, deficits must be financed from Loan funds, so that some money is taken that would otherwise be used for developmental purposes. The Treasurer has given an assurance that all waste will be eliminated, so I hope we will get the highest efficiency for the people in this State. There will be some increases in charges, although they will not be very great. The rail charges for the country will be slightly higher than those for the metropolitan area, and there will be additional revenue from water supply. I ask that something be done to make the charge for water uniform throughout the State so that there will not be any select portion of the community as there is at present. If the member for Adelaide wants an enlargement on that, I will give it.

The member for Murray said that pensioners who own their homes and have to go into hospital are liable on their demise to have their equity in the house taken over by the hospital, for hospital charges, and that is perfectly true. He suggested that their homes be left to their sons free of encumbrance, but as some of these people have been treated in hospital for months or even years, who is more entitled to the money—the hospital that has given the service, or the son? After all, the son can battle for himself and, when he is old, the State will take care of him. I believe this practice is sound. I know of a woman who will be in hospital for the rest of her life and who has a lovely home worth about £4,000.

Mr. Lawn—Without denying that the hospital gives a service and is entitled to something, it does not say much for our society—

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Adelaide cannot find anything that pleases him in our society. It is a wonder he wants to live, yet he is probably better off now than he has ever been.

Mr. Lawn—You wouldn't know. I would be a lot better off if we had had 20 years of Labour Government.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Murray mentioned a son who developed a property and whose mother, on the death of his father, had to pay succession duties on the improved value.

If that son can establish a claim, he is entitled to have a deduction made from the estate for the value of his work, because that is a liability against the estate. I cannot see any great anomaly there. I agree that the matter of probate is an unhappy one; nobody likes it and, particularly in primary industry, succession duties fall heavily on those who carry on. I thought the Leader of the Opposition, in his criticism, complimented the Treasurer, because he found so little fault with the Budget that it must be a good one. However, he made one point that I cannot reconcile with Opposition policy, when he referred to dead-weight debt charges. We all know that £6,300,000 will be used in interest on assets that cannot produce any revenue, but let us examine what those assets are, because I am sure the Leader would not suggest that they should not exist. These assets consist of railways, schools, hospitals, police stations, River Murray weirs, temporary and emergency housing and several other items too numerous to mention. In every case it will be found that it is money spent in the development of South Australia and mostly in the development of rural areas. I should like to hear a sound suggestion from the Opposition as to how we can deal with them. We could write the capital off, but how does the Opposition propose to eliminate them? Let us be a little sensible about this proposition.

As a rule I listen with interest to the criticism of the Leader of the Opposition, because usually it is sound, but this afternoon I could not follow his reasoning on how we would eliminate these debt charges. He went on to say how we could develop the rural areas and encourage decentralization without increasing further the dead weight debt charges. He mentioned meat works, which would not show a return for some years, although they might in the distant future. Let us consider the meat works at Port Lincoln. I suggest that honourable members opposite spend a little time in studying the Loan Estimates and the Budget and work out where profitable propositions could be established from the Government's point of view. I am afraid I cannot understand how we can establish anything without money; it must come from somewhere. No doubt in due course Mr. Lawn will give us a lengthy dissertation on finance. Much has been said about young people who cannot find employment in their own areas. I am prepared to admit that that can be due to certain situations, but I think that honourable members opposite will admit that it applies only in isolated places. Where we have industrializa-

tion in rural areas the position becomes aggravated. I venture to say that in any medium sized rural town with a population of 1,000 to 1,500 employment could be found for young people. I think it is beyond denial that any young person with initiative and vision can find in South Australia employment in two professions particularly—teaching and nursing, suitable for both males and females. They could do their training in the city and many could go to the country and serve not only themselves but also the State. I challenge any honourable member to deny that such an opportunity does not exist.

I notice that the State will receive £40,000 from the Leigh Creek coalfield. To say that that is just a bookkeeping entry is not correct, because it will come from the Electricity Trust's finances to the State. I am sorry about that, because I was hopeful that because of its profits it could provide a little alleviation to people in remote areas paying excessive charges. The Government should ask the trust to consider this point further because I believe that the trust has established an all-time record profit of about £400,000. It should consider those who are penalized most. I am sure that if the average annual charge in rural areas applied to these other people everyone would be happy, and it would cost the trust very little.

I am delighted that £27,000 is to be provided to the Cadell Training Centre, as I believe that in four or five years it will prove to be a profitable institution both to the Government and to the State. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned figures regarding the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which I have no reason to question, and said that each bed was costing £56 a week and all that the Government was getting in return was £12. That position cannot be allowed to continue. Many people may wonder why I am so concerned with hospitals and perhaps why I have not approached the Government on the question. I have discussed it at length over a long period, but I am afraid that I have not got very far. I may be accused of being responsible for the charge of 36s. a week for Government hospitals which was introduced two years ago. I advocated that in my Address in Reply speech and suggested that the charge should be increased by a further 10s. I will further press that claim for a reason that I think is justified. There are many institutions in the State receiving varying amounts from the Government. Members will admit that self-help is to be applauded. We have our

community hospitals in the metropolitan area, of which I am sure honourable members are proud. I consider that everyone should make his contribution, thus helping himself and resulting in a hospital getting a little help from the State. The average contribution to country subsidized hospitals by local councils under direction of the Director-General of Medical Services is 6 per cent. On the latest figures available metropolitan councils pay £83,043 and country councils pay to Government hospitals £6,800. I am not suggesting at this stage that all this revenue shall go to Government hospitals, but that portion should go to community hospitals which are built and maintained by the people themselves. If the 6 per cent were contributed by all councils in South Australia, as is contributed in the country to subsidize hospitals, it would mean that in the metropolitan area the amount would increase from £83,000 to £171,348 and the increase in the country would be from £6,800 to £16,726, making a total of £188,074. In other words, there would be £98,000 more which could be distributed amongst the community hospitals and other hospitals trying to help themselves. The Government could retain some of that amount for reducing its deficit.

Government hospitals charge 36s. a day, whereas other hospitals charge 50s. or more. If the Government fee were increased to 46s. a day with daily averages as anticipated, those people served by Government hospitals would still be better off than their fellows in other hospitals. The daily average of patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital would be 963, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital about 200, and for Government country hospitals 291, a total daily average of 1,454. An additional charge of 10s. a day would yield £727. However, I am not so foolish as to think that everyone would pay, but working on the assumption that half would—and I think that is about the recognized proportion that pay to Government hospitals, deplorable as it may be—the total would be £265,355, and even if only half of that were received, namely, £132,000, the Government could write off the other £132,000. So, in actual fact, the Government would gain by some £232,000 by bringing the people a little closer together in what they have to contribute to social services. The areas served by Government hospitals would still be better off, in that their fees would be lower. The other people have to find £1 for every £2, whereas the Government finds all the cost, so in that regard they would be better off, and as regards fees they would also be better off. Government

hospitals have an average daily cost of £5 13s. a day for each occupied bed, against £3 for other hospitals. If costs mean anything, the patients would get much better treatment.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Are they not entitled to better treatment?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Everyone is entitled to better treatment.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You should compare the position with some of the private hospitals.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I have left out private hospitals because they are a business proposition and I do not think that they should come into this reckoning, although it is reasonable to consider subsidized hospitals and community or non-profit making hospitals. I have only one serious complaint with the Budget and that concerns the Hamley Bridge Hospital. The Hamley Bridge people suffer a disability.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Who is their member?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The disability does not arise from the member. They are wedged in between two hospitals, and the district council rating paid by the people that tend, care for and support the Hamley Bridge Hospital goes to other hospitals. I dealt with this matter in the Address in Reply debate. The Hutchinson Hospital, the Riverton Hospital and the Balaklava Hospital each get a share. The Balaklava Hospital is far removed, the Riverton Hospital has a range cutting it off from Hamley Bridge, and the people could go either to Gawler (which they do not do) or their own hospital. They claim they are entitled to the district council rating that they pay under direction to the Owen district council and to the Mudla Wirra district council who in turn pay to the Riverton and Hutchinson Hospitals respectively. It may be said that £250 is not a very big amount when we are dealing with £250,000 odd. I am not asking for £250 in particular, but last year the Government saw fit to give that hospital a maintenance grant of £250, the same as was given the year before. Those were the only two occasions when maintenance grants were given. When I opened the Estimates this year I looked to see what they were being given this year, but I drew a blank. I have already told the Minister responsible, and I want the Government to know, that I am not very happy with this position. I have been assured that this whole question is being investigated.

Mr. Lawn—Look out, the Treasurer will crown you!

Mr. HAMBOUR—The only crown the member for Adelaide knows of is on the

top of a bottle. It has been argued, I think quite rightly, that there is no authorization for giving maintenance grants, or that it is not Government policy to give maintenance grants, to hospitals that are not subsidized. However, I have found a few oddities that I want recorded in *Hansard* so that the department can examine the position. I would like the department to explain to me how it would classify the Uraidla and District Hospital, which receives a maintenance grant of £300. The Whyalla Hospital gets £14,000. I did not know that the member for Whyalla was such a good member.

Mr. Lawn—We knew it.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Cook Hospital receives a grant of £150; LeHunte District Hospital receives £500, and Tailem Bend also receives a grant.

Mr. Lawn—They have not the same disability as Hamley Bridge.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Possibly they cannot manage their affairs so well. Those are maintenance grants; I am not denying that those hospitals should receive those grants, and in fact I wish they were doubled. I think every hospital that can carry on with the small grants they are getting should be helped, because they are following the right policy. Let us help them all.

Mr. Riches—You are helping those places now.

Mr. HAMBOUR—My word I am, at the expense of the people that have not paid so much in the past.

Mr. Riches—You are the most damaging speaker in the House for those people.

Mr. HAMBOUR—If my speech is damaging it is too bad. I think there is some justice in it, and the people who will suffer, if there is any damage, have enjoyed privileges in the past which I hope will be clipped off them in the future. I have a sense of justice to all the people in the State. The member for Stuart did not like it when I said in the Address in Reply debate that the Port Augusta Corporation—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member cannot refer to an earlier debate.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am not referring to an earlier debate, Mr. Chairman. Port Augusta, with a revenue of £36,000, made a contribution of only £800 until it was increased recently, and that is what hurts the member for Stuart's feelings.

Mr. Riches—No, it is your attitude.

Mr. HAMBOUR—My attitude does not mean a thing. I point out that the corporation of Strathalbyn, in the member for Stirling's district, contributes something like £1,400 or £1,500. I want the Government to analyse the whole position with a view to formulating a policy that will give everybody some assistance.

Mr. Lawn—You said you would like to see these amounts doubled, and later on you said you would like to see them clipped. What do you mean?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I did not say I wanted to see those amounts clipped. I was referring to maintenance grants. Hamley Bridge was cut out because the department said it was not justified in giving it a maintenance grant. I am not particularly concerned with what the member for Adelaide is saying. I congratulate the Hospitals Department on increasing the maintenance grants to subsidized hospitals by another £8,000. I applaud that act, because these people are helping themselves, and the Government is only making a partial contribution to the conduct of the hospitals. That is what I want to see all over the State. If anyone can find fault with what I am advocating, he will have his opportunity in this debate to castigate me for what I say.

I have no fault to find with the £77,000 for concession fares for pensioners. It is unfortunate that these concessions are not State-wide, but I venture to say that at some future date the Government may see fit to bring in some scheme whereby all pensioners who have to go to the metropolitan area for treatment will receive a concession fare. I think the people in the metropolitan area should be grateful for this first gesture in this direction, because it should prove most valuable to the people who will benefit by it. The £26,000 for the Bush Fire Research Committee will be something that I know will be welcomed by the people in the country who have suffered from bush fires in the past, and I hope that success will be far-reaching in this direction. The £23,000 for underground water investigations will also be a great thing for the people of this State.

One small shining light in railway administration is that the support the Department is to receive from the Government this year drops by some £400,000 to £4,200,000. I am not concerned with the platitudes uttered about what should be done with the railways, how they could step up their revenue, and whether or not the primary producer should send his goods by rail. In my opinion, the whole question

revolves around value, and if the railways can cart wool at a better rate than the wool-grower can cart it himself, they will get the wool. I urge this House to support the railways in an attempt to commandeer this trade. In my home town it costs approximately 11s. a bale to bring wool to Adelaide by rail, but the woolgrowers can bring it down themselves, and they claim it is more profitable for them to do so. I suggest that the freight in this particular case be brought down to 7s. a bale, which would make it uneconomical for the woolgrowers to cart their own wool.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It would be uneconomical for the railways to cart it, too.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I urge the Government to stand behind the railways, for although they will possibly face a bigger deficit in the first year they should make a concerted drive to get this freight, because once they get it I think they can hold it.

Mr. Fred Walsh—They had it before and lost it.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Let us get it again. I will leave the question of the railway refreshment rooms to the member for Burnside, who I feel is dealing very well with this matter. I now turn to the question of veterinary surgeons. Part IIIa, section 28a (1) of the Veterinary Surgeons Act, is as follows:—

The board in its discretion may issue a permit to treat animals for disease and injury to any person who proves to the satisfaction of the board that he has attained the age of 21 years and is of good fame and character and is competent to treat animals for disease and injury.

It goes on to say what they can and cannot do, but it does not say why the board should issue a permit or why it should not. I know from my experience that applications for permits have been rejected on the ground that the area concerned has been adequately served. The Veterinary Surgeons Board is comprised of a member of the legal profession, three veterinary surgeons, and a layman. I am quite sympathetic with the professional point of view, for I believe it is proper to protect these professions. I know that each profession has its ethics, and that it tries to maintain its standards. I know also that the Government grants money for a scholarship in the hope of building up the numbers of veterinary surgeons, but I have tried to point out—and I do so again—that we have insufficient numbers to serve the State. Thanks to the Minister of Agriculture, I have been able to compile a list of veterinary surgeons, and I find that the numbers are insufficient. I believe there are

about 60 altogether, including surgeons, practitioners, and permit holders. Of that 60, there are 18 north of Adelaide; the rest are either in the metropolitan area or south of Adelaide. I am afraid I cannot deal with the question fully because I do not know the disposition of the forces, but anyone who studies the list can arrive at the answer. Kadina has one registered veterinary surgeon, Gawler two registered veterinary surgeons and a veterinary practitioner, Tumby Bay a registered veterinary surgeon, Maitland a registered veterinary surgeon, Gladstone a practitioner, Loxton a practitioner, Minlaton a practitioner, Mintaro a practitioner, Balaklava a practitioner and a permit holder, Cleve a permit holder, Peterborough a permit holder, Barmera a permit holder, Whyalla a permit holder with a 15 mile radius, Calcanina Station a permit holder with an eight mile radius, and Cungiengena a permit holder with a 100 mile radius.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Practitioners and veterinary surgeons can work where they please.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes. Those I have enumerated are all north of Adelaide.

Mr. Quirke—There is one at Clare.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I checked on him, but he is new and I did not include him. However, I will do so now. The list reveals that north of Adelaide there are six registered veterinary surgeons, six practitioners and seven permit holders. In the electoral district of Light there are none and I am not satisfied. My constituents are entitled to a service. In fairness to the Minister I admit that applications for permits go before the board, but the board has stated that my district is adequately served. How can it be served if there are no veterinary surgeons there?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—You realize that the board is considering an application now?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes. The board should consider the geographic situation as well as personnel. It is possible the board will refer the application to the registered veterinary surgeons, but that would be wrong in practice. The board should look at a map to find out where these fellows live. Permits are issued annually and districts cannot be adequately served when a man is required to cater for a big area, because if the radius is too great people will not pay the cost of bringing him to attend to their animals. Stock today is not at a high price and many animals are left to die because of the cost of securing veterinary aid.

During the Address in Reply debate I dealt extensively with milk distribution. I realized

that there was no legal means of correcting the situation to which I referred, but I made a plea for my constituents. However, I believe my appeal has been rejected because the reply was that what the Milk Equalization Committee has done it was justified in doing and was entitled to do. Nobody disputes its entitlement. I did make an error in my earlier remarks when I said that it costs producers for the metropolitan area one-eighth of a penny, whereas it costs them seven-sixteenths of a penny. I apologize for that mistake. I also said that they abused their powers and privileges and that they had territory prescribed for them. That has been contradicted and the committee says they have no powers and privileges nor have they any territories. Recently four situations were included in the metropolitan milk area by Government regulation. I consider that a privilege, particularly as the Milk Equalization Committee is a limited company with the sole rights of supply in that area, and as it gets that right by legislation. If that is not a privilege I do not know what is! To justify their actions as business men the committee has an agreement with producers which I should like to read to the House because it might interest some of the producers in the inside area who, in their heart of hearts, would feel for the people outside the area and would not wish action such as has occurred to happen again. The agreement reads:—

If the board of directors is of opinion that (with a view to securing or retaining a market for their milk outside the metropolitan area, as defined by the Act or for any other reason) it will be in the interests of the producers so to do, the board of directors may, in its discretion, from time to time reduce the levy to be paid by merchants (for the purpose of lowering the wholesale or retail price).

That is the very thing I object to. I know the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) is interested in this and I am sorry that he is leaving the Chamber because I had hoped he would use his influence in the organization with which he is concerned—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

Mr. HAMBOUR—If the Minister could get to the producers without going through the merchants I am sure my producers would get some satisfaction but if the merchants dominate the Milk Equalization Committee I am afraid my cause is lost. I should like to see a conference arranged between the parties concerned, the producers in particular setting out their case, to try to reach some agreement.

Last year one company increased its wholemilk sales by 3.6 per cent and another company by an almost similar percentage, which reveals that the enclosed area is developing and that they are getting bigger markets. All I ask the committee to do is to gradually concede small areas from time to time in the north to those producers who have no access to the metropolitan area. I ask the Minister to try to further that end and bring about a feasible solution. I support the Estimates.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—This afternoon we heard an excellent speech from the Leader of the Opposition and when the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) spoke he commended the Leader for his services to the State, for his powers of oratory, and for his leadership of the Opposition. I endorse those sentiments with pleasure because we all realize the important part the Leader of the Opposition plays in Parliament, particularly in South Australia where the one Premier has occupied that important position for 21 years. In addition to being attacking and courageous, our Leader of the Opposition has had to have great tolerance. Government members have congratulated the Treasurer on his services in the last 21 years. I agree that his record is good, even considering the present method of selecting the Government. It is a remarkable physical effort and a great achievement for one man to occupy that position for so long.

When I was Whip of my Party for some years I made overtures to various members in authority to have the Leader of the Opposition recognized by having the prefix "honourable" applied to him. I understand that after much deliberation and delay it was decided that that could not be done because it required approaches being made to Her Majesty the Queen. In view of the importance of the position I appeal to the Treasurer to arrange for that recognition of the Leader of the Opposition. It would not only be a tribute to him, but it would be a recognition of the office irrespective of the Party in Opposition.

In his Budget speech the Treasurer said that because of adverse seasonal conditions we should be bound as Parliamentarians to be economic in our outlook for the next 12 months or so. One way by which we could save much money would be by abolishing the Legislative Council. Much money is provided in this Budget to feed that House, and I say that advisedly and respectfully because that Chamber is not worth twopence-halfpenny. It

must be admitted that other States have abolished their Upper Houses. Queensland abolished its Legislative Council many years ago, but with the advent of the Liberal Government in that State no attempt has been made to restore it. It has been realized in Queensland that the Legislative Council was a waste of good public money. Our Legislative Council is a House of repetition and tries to do the same as the House of Assembly. It is entirely wrong to suggest that it is a House of review because it is a Party House. New South Wales is already planning a referendum to ask the people whether they agree to the abolition of their Upper House and I forecast that they will overwhelmingly favour its abolition. Recently a Gallup poll in Victoria revealed that 51 per cent of those approached supported a one-House Parliament. With Gallup polls there is always 22 to 24 per cent who have no opinion, so it is reasonable to assume that a further 10 per cent would favour abolition. A similar feeling persists in South Australia and people would express that opinion if given an opportunity. The Legislative Council has many defects because of its restricted franchise and it is a waste of public money. If the Government does not abolish it soon the people will seize the opportunity of putting this Government out of office because economies are important in any State or in any business.

The Opposition has frequently advocated a reduction in the polling hours for State elections. At present the hours are from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., but I suggest that the Government consider closing the polls at 7 p.m. That would not place a burden on any person whether he resides in the country or in the metropolitan area. Speaking of the Labor Party in Australia—and this applies to England too—those who give their services on Saturdays on election day do so entirely freely. That cannot be said for all Parties. My Party can get enough men and women to serve at the polling booths from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., but it can be conceded that the last hour is difficult because the men give their services freely whilst they adhere to their Party policy, and perhaps it is unfair to burden them when it can be avoided. The argument for this was not so strong years ago in the country because of lack of transport, but it may be conceded today that the transport problem no longer exists. Many people have motor cars, and they are quite happy to take people desiring to vote to the polling booth before 7 o'clock. The present hours are wrong from the point of

view also of the polling clerk. He is paid for services rendered, but is there from before 8 o'clock in the morning, and the poll does not close until 8 p.m. Then the polling clerk has to take part in the counting of the votes. It is a burdensome day, which could be shortened, thus reducing the work of those voluntarily helping at the polling booth and also making the lot of the polling clerk much easier.

Turning to the Magill Reformatory, as a member of the Public Works Committee I do not desire to refer to evidence already taken by the committee on this important matter. Much money, however, is being expended for the purpose of reformation without getting to the real causes. Like other honourable members, I have studied this matter, particularly in the industrial areas, and I find it behoves the Government to consider appointing a special committee of experts to take evidence from people representing churches and district councils and those connected with youth organizations to try to get to the core of this problem and not wait until a person has been domiciled at Magill before trying to effect reformation. It is regrettably true that most of the cases that go to Magill emanate from the poorer or industrial areas, because of unfortunate circumstances. Some of the present-day trouble of children going astray is caused by mothers going out to work. We hear from time to time condemnation of women going to work and neglecting their children. But we must remember that so many men are working for the basic wage or just over and have so many commitments that the women are in some cases bound to seek employment. When that situation occurs we find, too, that the home life is neglected and so this type of offence to which I have already referred takes place.

We know, too, that such a situation may be caused by the misconduct of the husband in some respect, the wife being kept short of money so that she is bound to look for work. It may be that she ought to stay at home in spite of such circumstances, but women of today, whether living in a rich or poor home, should be accorded every facility for making their work easier. This involves the purchase of washing machines and refrigerators, which are costly, thus causing women to resort to working in industry; and so the home life suffers. If this committee was appointed by the Government, it would receive wonderful co-operation from the people I have referred to. I hasten to say that already the councils of the various districts, the churches and the youth clubs are all doing wonderful work but,

if they could be co-ordinated and if an approach could be made to the home to find out the defects so that they could be remedied, crime would subside considerably. This is important because so much money is involved in public expenditure which could be reduced if we tackled the matter properly.

Housing is discussed by almost every honourable member when possible in debate. Today, like other honourable members, I received a pamphlet from the *Advertiser* known as *Stability*, the September issue, in which reference is made to the waste land and sandy swamp on LeFevre Peninsula. It is claimed that there is enough land between Outer Harbour and the Grange area to build about 6,000 homes for about 25,000 people. It behoves the Government to face up to this long-range plan as soon as possible because this is one area available to house people.

Mr. Dunstan—It was first announced 10 years ago.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes, but it was dropped and has been revived. As the Government is already carrying out a sewerage scheme in part of the area, I feel that this plan must proceed. The Education Department, through the good graces of the Minister of Education, has agreed to build a high school on the Lady Gowrie Drive to house hundreds of scholars. So this plan, first mentioned some 10 or 12 years ago, will materialize in the years to come. From the point of view of economics, the scheme in the Draper area is good because the area owned by the Harbours Board (which is owned by the people) could progress. The Government, of course, from time to time is buying land for educational purposes, and so is the Housing Trust. Whilst we do not know the exact money involved, we know it is considerable. At Taperoo land can be reclaimed. As land is becoming hard to procure, particularly in the metropolitan area, this scheme must go ahead.

Furthermore, many people living at Elizabeth are working about 20 to 25 miles away from their homes. In view of the industrial development on LeFevre Peninsula and in Port Adelaide, homes at Osborne and Outer Harbour would be ideal for these people because many would be living near their places of employment. So the scheme is a "must." I believe I read in the Budget speech by the Treasurer that we are gradually catching up on the housing lag from the war period, but our figures do not conform with the opinion of the Treasurer. I, like other honourable members, am inundated with requests from

people living under shocking conditions who want to improve their living conditions. Some are being evicted, and some live in overcrowded homes. In some cases, colossal rents are being charged; so we cannot agree that the housing lag in South Australia is being overcome. It could be said that about seven or eight years ago approximately 14,000 families were waiting for homes in the metropolitan area; today the number may be 7,000, but at the same time, the lag is not being overcome. I appeal to the Government to expedite this scheme at Outer Harbour and on LeFevre Peninsula, not only for the reasons I have given but because of the tourist aspect. Those who travel along Lady Gowrie Drive to Outer Harbour must have a good idea of what the tourists visiting this State think when coming from Outer Harbour by road transport along Lady Gowrie Drive when they see some of the substandard homes and shacks. What a poor advertisement for South Australia! This scheme would serve the dual purpose of assisting to promote our tourist trade and making a very sound impression and, above all, providing homes for our people.

We have listened recently to replies by the Treasurer to questions asked by honourable members about the rating powers of the municipal councils and corporations. The Labor Party for a number of years has advocated in this House that councils have the power to grant rate concessions to pensioners, but I do not think any move has been made by the Government to bring this about. This matter was considered by the Municipal Association two years ago and the voting was equal. Therefore, no move was made to approach the Government on this important matter. Some relief should be provided to a pensioner paying about £22 a year for council and water rates and land tax. I know that the Port Adelaide Council is eager to grant concessions to pensioners because it knows that they cannot afford to carry the burden, but so far the Government has done nothing about it. I appeal to the Government to do something in this regard because each year we find, because of the restricted powers of the councils, that the rates are increasing and the burden becomes greater. In my own corporation in the last six years the rates have gone up about 180 to 190 per cent, so the burden is becoming greater. When the Treasurer replied to me some weeks ago, he said he considered that the council might have some powers to defer the payment of these rates, that whilst the pensioner was alive no rates would be

collected, but, when he passed on, the rates would be deducted from his estate. It is not a very nice thing to confront a pensioner with "You need not pay rates but, when you pass on, we shall be recompensed."

Mr. Hambour—They do not say that.

Mr. TAPPING—It is most obvious that that is the position.

Mr. Hambour—I have never heard that.

Mr. TAPPING—The Treasurer said they could defer payment and, when the pensioner passed on, they would be recompensed from his estate.

Mr. Hambour—The pensioner is not tied. They do not say "We will wait for your dead body."

Mr. TAPPING—The honourable member is trying to carry my thoughts a little too far. The council would say, "We will defer your rates, but will collect them from your estate later." Even if it was not said, the pensioner would know just what the council meant. It is time the Government or the Minister made some inquiries about the manner in which some councils are not carrying out the provisions of the Local Government Act. I have had a complaint from Woodville from a councillor pointing out the discrimination that takes place not only in one ward, but in regard to two adjoining shops, and it is obvious from opinions I have sought that this is illegal. I think it is the duty of councils to abide by the Local Government Act as closely as possible but, if the Government takes no action, the councils will get more power to extract more money from the people.

Mr. Dunstan—We find that some councils are assessing the properties individually.

Mr. TAPPING—I know of people in the Port Adelaide council area paying 1s. 8d. in the pound whereas their neighbours are paying 2s. I believe the councils are taking too much on themselves in this matter. I do not ridicule them, because I know they are composed of men who give their services voluntarily and who, in many cases, are abused for what they do.

Mr. Riches—They were invited to do that, you know.

Mr. TAPPING—That is so. This matter was raised by the former member for Port Pirie (the late Mr. Charlie Davis), and there has always been some contention about it. The actions of councils often conflict with the Act and its principles. Whilst I am prepared to concede that the Government has made a start in providing homes for the aged, less than 20 per cent of the aged of this State are

accommodated. The homes that have been built are fine homes, the rent is nominal, and there is no complaint about them, but old people are often not wanted, particularly when they have no relatives. It is really a shame to get old and suffer that sort of adversity, and, to help these people, the Government should build more homes. LeFevre Peninsula would be an ideal location for building hundreds of homes for the aged, because it has train and bus transport. Members on this side have been mentioning this matter for years, and I believe it is our duty to emphasize the need for these homes for people who have done so much to build up South Australia. I support the Estimates.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—I join with the member for Semaphore in congratulating the Premier on presenting his 21st Budget and, although I have not been in this House for long, I feel that he is to be supported in his remarks regarding the Leader of the Opposition who, in my short experience, has been a very fair Leader of his Party. However, my agreement with the member for Semaphore ends there. I do not see that his recommendation that the Legislative Council should be abolished has any merit. I cannot understand the revulsion of members opposite against the Legislative Council's existence. Regardless of what they say, it has a wide franchise in its field. The head of every house or flat is eligible to vote, so a House composed of the representatives of these heads of households must be a responsible House. How could it be otherwise? If these people are not on the Legislative Council rolls, it is just too bad. After all, if they think they are ill-treated in the affairs of the State they should see that they are put on the rolls. What is the objection to the Legislative Council? If the wage earner in every house has a vote, it is a responsible vote.

Mr. Balston—Do you think that should apply to this House, too?

Mr. HALL—I do not see why it should apply to this House.

Mr. Hambour—If it did the honourable member who interjected would not be here.

Mr. HALL—I cannot see that the Legislative Council is not elected on a very good and just franchise for the progress of the State. The cost of running that Chamber has been mentioned, but I cannot see how it could cost more than £45,000 a year which, after all, is the cost of only 18 days pumping from the Murray, and who could equate that against having 20 members in the Legislative Council?

I do not agree that there should be a reduction in polling hours. Although I have not made many trips to the polling booths, I have noticed that the hour after seven is popular with country voters, and there could not be a big variation between districts. Perhaps the customer should be right in this case, and we should retain 8 o'clock closing.

As a country representative I am concerned about the poor season, but I want to make it clear to members opposite that there is not a general outcry on monetary grounds throughout the country. People in the country have had 10 good years, and those who are not in a position to face this year are those who have just started out and the foolish ones. However, the bad season will be reflected in Government finances: it will have repercussions on the railway revenue. I cannot understand the Leader's assertion that a good rain would bring about an average season. This afternoon he said that he had travelled widely; if that is so, I cannot see how he could say that. I am pleased that some farmers have had a reasonably good season, but that is not widespread; a good general season is out of the question.

Country people appreciate the move by the abattoirs in accepting old stock at 2s. 6d. a head and not charging for slaughter. Many inquiries have been made by people in my district about this, and I think country people appreciate it because it is one way to dispose of old stock that otherwise would be an embarrassment. There has been much talk, some of it uninformed, about barley. I congratulate the Barley Board on the way it has handled the crops. The fact that we have run out of feed barley is not its fault. It is not the board's job to subsidize graziers by providing barley. I believe it had kept reasonable amounts available and it is unfortunate that all its stock has now disappeared. If it had sold all the crop in the first three months growers would have been happy, but because some had been left unsold until it was urgently needed there has been talk of the board's mismanagement.

Mr. Heaslip—It is the board's job to find markets.

Mr. HALL—Yes, on the best terms to the growers and to sell the barley as quickly as possible. If the crop had been sold in the first month, every grower would have been jubilant.

Mr. Ralston—Would it be wise to sell all the barley in the first three months without knowing future requirements?

Mr. HALL—I congratulate the two companies which bought a parcel of barley that had been sold overseas and on their being prepared to sell it locally at a figure that will no more than cover costs.

Mr. Hambour—That is not right.

Mr. HALL—It was sold overseas and was then bought back.

Mr. Hambour—It never left here.

Mr. HALL—And they are handling it with little profit. People in my district are grateful for their action. I know one man who bought £700 worth.

Mr. Bywaters—Farmers should conserve their own feed requirements.

Mr. HALL—Fodder conservation last year was a record, resulting in carrying the State through a most difficult period, and when the opportunity presents itself I believe that farmers will again show just as much good sense.

There has been much speculation regarding wool plans and different methods of stabilizing wool prices. Every thinking woolgrower is worried about variations in prices. There are charges regarding manipulation of the market and all kinds of dark deeds behind closed doors at wool auctions. I do not know whether they are true or not. What makes the price of wool fall? Perhaps the biggest factor is the slackening in demand. Nothing is wrong in buyers forming associations to bid at auctions. The auction system is free to all-comers. Such a practice is adopted by farmers themselves at auctions, so they cannot complain if others do it when farmers sell their goods. Another factor is the "pipeline." So many months' supply comes through the trade and then they all stop buying, which results in a clogging effect. This has a marked effect on auction prices. Really there is no fall in demand. Sometimes the question of the availability of finance arises and this has a bearish effect on the wool market. Another factor affecting wool prices is competition by synthetics. An article appears in the *Current Affairs Bulletin* for December, 1953, on the competition of synthetics with wool and it illustrates the organization of the synthetic companies for the production and promotion of their articles. It has this to say:—

The fabric development group devote their energies to developing the best properties of a fibre for a given end use, after which the sales development group takes over and follows this fabric to the particular field of interest. After this the advertising and promotion group promote and create consumer demand for the product.

It is easy to see that it is an integrated industry, unlike the wool industry which produces the article and then hands it over for sale, the growers forgetting that they have any further responsibility in it. The article further states:—

A recent survey covering 40 of the larger chemical corporations in the U.S.A. showed that such concerns devoted 2 to 3 per cent of their net sales returns to research and development work. This represents about 25 per cent of their profits.

Australia exports more than 90 per cent of its wool production. There is a call from some quarters to have the price of wool fixed on the basis of the cost of production. Are the overseas buyers concerned with our cost of production, and are the manufacturers of synthetics going to consider those costs? They are not concerned with them and it is utterly futile for any protagonist of any wool support plan to think of fixing a price on the cost of production. We have some who say that no plan will ever work. That depends on what we are trying to achieve. The following figures on commodity prices show the variations that took place from June, 1953, for each six-monthly period to December, 1957, and refer to 64 quality wool:—44 per cent above, 34 per cent above, 35 per cent above, 6 per cent above, 4 per cent above, 8 per cent below, 8 per cent above, 9 per cent above, 22 per cent above and 9 per cent below. It goes on and remains below until June, 1958. That is the percentage above and below world commodity prices that wool was at that time. The table for 1956 for wool is not so complicated, but it has the same variation above and below. On those figures we cannot fix a reserve price on the cost of production, but we could remove the fluctuations around those commodity prices.

We could perhaps have a promotion scheme based on a reserve price fixed on these commodity prices which would enable the wool grower to forecast to some extent his wool price, which today he has no idea of other than by trying to guess at the buyers' inclinations.

Mr. Bywaters—What would you consider a fair average price?

Mr. HALL—I do not think we can fix a fair average price, but at least we can fix a price in accordance with the rest of the commodity prices. It need not be below the world commodity prices; I think possibly it might be about as it is now, and it would certainly be higher than it was last year.

Mr. Bywaters—It is not bad now.

Mr. HALL—No, but if we had had a scheme fixed on these prices we would have eliminated the drastic fall last year, and I think every grower would have admitted that it was a service to him and to the country. I deplore the grower's attitude in growing his wool, going to much trouble over it, and then delivering it to his agent's hands and forgetting about it.

Mr. Bywaters—Are you in favour of stabilization?

Mr. HALL—I am in favour of a sensible reserve plan based on those commodity prices and not on the cost of production. I think I have made that point.

Mr. Jennings—You have made it both ways, so you can't lose.

Mr. HALL—I have not.

Mr. Jennings—You have tried to.

Mr. HALL—I will leave it to the honourable member's colleagues to explain the suggestion to him. One point that is vital to any plan, and certainly vital in the long run to the wool industry, is promotion. We have heard it said by a very well known growers' representative that a plan must come before promotion, but I say that that is wrong and that we should have promotion before a plan. It seems to me to be utterly silly for wool growers to contribute 4s. a bale toward research and promotion, when the synthetic industries are contributing up to 25 per cent of their profits. It seems a very poor situation that wool growers should be calling for a super subsidy when they are not doing anywhere near what they could to promote their own product. I think that at least a 5 per cent deduction would be a decent one, and I am sure that 5 per cent wisely invested in promotion would itself bring the price up to a higher level than before the 5 per cent was deducted.

Mr. Ralston—Do you suggest it should be voluntary or compulsory?

Mr. HALL—I suggest that the growers get together and work out such a scheme. I am not a party to compulsion, but I think that every chance we get we should bring these facts before growers and show them that an investment in advertising is not a dead loss.

Mr. Ralston—Don't you think that would be better advocated before the Stockowners Association?

Mr. HALL—It has value here, too. Wool is a national product that has a great bearing on any budget. There are two ways of advertising, one being to let the price fall to such an attractive level to the buyer that he will

purchase, and the other is to go out, promote the goods, and sell them to a buyer.

Mr. Bywaters—What if three-quarters contributed to this scheme and the others did not; what would be your reaction?

Mr. HALL—I have not got the details of a full plan; if I did I would give the honourable members those details. I suggest that the growers get together and really consider something worthwhile, instead of merely spending the fraction they are spending at present.

Mr. Bywaters—You will always find under the voluntary system that some people will cash in on the advantages of others.

Mr. HALL—I did not go into the details of how this plan would come about. I have merely recommended that we make some effort to increase the promotion and bring before the buyer the qualities that we think wool has.

Mr. Quirke—Usually a poll is taken, and if the majority is in favour it becomes a compulsory scheme.

Mr. HALL—Quite so. I think we are being very foolish indeed in this respect. In growers' publications I have seen on one page an article saying that wool is sound, and on another page that wool is threatened with dire results in the forthcoming season. I think we have had enough of this dickering around. Growers must get together and really have a decent organization. It has been suggested to me that we could go further towards the consumer by perhaps subsidising the advertising of articles of the firms that sell the actual goods, but whether or not that has any merit I do not know. Perhaps some sort of bounty could be given to every advertisement that features the word "wool." It could be done in other ways, rather than by having mass spreads. We have all seen full page advertisements in the press headed "Buy wool," but it is no good appealing generally to the public; we must appeal to them personally, and if we can subsidize the advertisement of the very article we are selling it may get further home to the consumer. I stress that a group of producers would like to see a far greater contribution to the promotion of wool. I support the Estimates.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—I think the object of this debate is really to discuss the general finances of the State as revealed by the Budget, and I will endeavour to make a few general observations about that as they have occurred to me after listening to the Premier and subsequently reading his remarks. We are at some disadvantage because we have

not been able to examine the Auditor-General's report, but nevertheless what we have received enables us to form a general picture of the State's finances.

I think it is rather remarkable that we are budgeting for a very considerable deficit after a long run of exceptionally good years, which have been alleged to be years of unprecedented prosperity and progress, and also despite a considerable increase in the Commonwealth Grant. The Treasurer has described our anticipated deficit as a direct result of a very poor seasonal outlook. He has ascribed the deficit in the main to two factors: firstly, the cost to the Budget of pumping water in a dry season and, secondly, the effect on public utility revenues. The latter, of course, refers in the main to the fact that the railways will carry much less grain and general merchandise, and applies entirely to railway revenue. There is not the slightest doubt that railway revenue looms largely in our Budget affairs. I have been struck lately by the fact that we, as members, have received much propaganda from private road transport organizations decrying our railway enterprise and, in fact, much of it can be classed as particularly mischievous and malicious propaganda suggesting that our railways are virtually obsolete and accusing them of receiving favoured treatment. As a matter of fact I believe the reverse is the case. This matter requires serious attention at present and will require it more in the future. The Australian economy is probably affected by road transport costs more than any country in the world. The official estimate of costs given for 1955-56 was £1,500,000,000, or approximately 30 per cent of our national expenditure, whereas in most other countries transport costs do not exceed 10 per cent of national expenditure. I think that clearly indicates the significance of transport costs in our economy.

This afternoon the Leader of the Opposition referred to the losses of freight by our railways, both interstate and intrastate, and he mentioned the unfair competition of the interstate hauliers and the misuse of carrying vehicles by primary producers who got certain concessions on those vehicles. I want to refer particularly to interstate hauliers and other forms of unfair competition to which the railways are subjected. Virtually no revenue is obtained from these interstate hauliers who are using and damaging our roads to such a tremendous extent and I am quite satisfied that given fair competition and modern equipment our railways could obtain an enormous quantity of freight they are at present

losing. From the economic aspect it is interesting to compare railway traction with road transport. On our railways one pair of wheels will carry 20 tons, whereas it requires eight wheels to carry the same load on a road. Even on a good bitumen surface road the resistance of a rubber tyre is four times as great as a steel tyre on a steel rail carrying a similar load. The manpower savings for bulk traffic conveyed by rail over long distances are considerable. A modern goods train of up to 5,000 gross tons requires only two men on the locomotive and one in the brakevan. We can easily compare the situation with an equivalent loading for road transport and visualize the additional manpower required by road transport to handle it.

The cost confronting Australia for maintenance and construction of roads during the next 10 years has been recently estimated at £1,643,000,000 and there is not the slightest doubt that the interstate hauliers who are working under such favoured treatment are doing prodigious damage to our roads year in and year out. Instead of placing a further burden on railway passengers through increased fares, this question should be examined and dealt with at its source. In fact, this burden of increased fares on passengers is falling most heavily on country people and the greatest efforts should be made to ensure that the railways should be put in a position to compete equitably with road transport. I feel that this is the key to tremendous savings in the State Budget and, apart from other considerations, is a matter that is not receiving the attention it merits. The Treasurer has admitted that the question of railway revenue is probably one of the most serious aspects of his Budget deficit. The whole matter requires considerable and immediate treatment.

This evening the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) made one or two statements that I was unable to follow. I must mention them because I do not want the House to be under any illusions about two hospital matters he referred to. He said that the Whyalla hospital was receiving a maintenance grant of £14,000, an increase of £3,500 this year. I presume he made that reference because he felt that was some form of unfair treatment. I cannot imagine any other reason, but I draw his attention to the fact that that hospital was built mainly with money from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and local subscriptions from residents. Over the years the South Australian Government has got off lightly in respect of its financial contributions to that institution. In view of the expansion that is taking place and

will take place there, there is little doubt that this increased maintenance grant is quite justified. In fact, the Hospital Board at Whyalla has just announced that it has to face an expansion programme costing about £500,000.

The member for Light also referred to the Cook Hospital maintenance grant of £150. There has been no increase in that grant for a number of years. He does not seem to realize that that hospital serves a remote community almost on the West Australian border—people who need good services possibly more than many others because of their isolated position. That hospital is under the auspices of the Bush Church Aid Society and the flying doctor from Ceduna goes there regularly. The two sisters there have devoted much of their lives and much of their savings to the good conduct and maintenance of that hospital. In fact, the people involved in the Bush Church Aid Society's operations in South Australia—the pilots of the planes and the sisters working at the Cook and Tarcoola Hospitals—are all receiving much less for their services than they would if they were engaged through the ordinary channels. They have all made personal sacrifices in order to keep these services open to the public and the South Australian Government has benefited financially as a result. I was rather puzzled that the member for Light should have selected these particular examples for reference. I consider that he was not properly seized on the position in either place. While on the question of comparisons I must draw his attention to the fact that the Bush Church Aid Society is to receive an increase of £250 this year—from £750 to £1,000. That has only been provided as a result of continual reiteration of the good claims of that organization in this House during past years. The Royal Flying Doctor Service of Australia (South Australian section) is getting an increase of £2,000—from £1,000 to £3,000—and receives a large subsidy from the Commonwealth Government, whereas the Bush Church Aid Society receives precisely nothing from the Commonwealth Government. I mention these facts so that the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) can be a little better informed on these things.

Some reference was made today in this debate to unemployment in country towns. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) referred to the position of youth unemployed at Port Pirie. Some other members have also dealt with this question. The member for Light said that this was really a problem only in the industrial towns. I cannot agree with

him there: the problem is more marked in industrial towns in the country, and does, from the very nature of these industrial towns, receive more publicity than, say, unemployment in a small country town. But, apart from the unemployment problem of youth at Port Pirie, industrial towns in the country also have a problem of the unemployment of female labour. The member for Light said that two avenues of work were available for unemployed young people in industrial towns in the country: the teaching and nursing professions were open to both sexes and provided the right avenues of employment for young men and women in the industrial towns in the country. But I think the honourable member forgets those two professions are exacting and it is not everybody who can make a success of either teaching or nursing. I do not think the subject can be dismissed so airily as that.

In fact, many young people are not suited for either of those professions, and particularly on the female labour side many young girls who are not specially trained as typistes or stenographers find great difficulty in getting employment in the industrial country towns. It does not end there because, as a rule, parents are reluctant to allow their daughter or daughters to go to the city to find employment. It frequently ends up with the family migrating from the country town to the city in order that they may be with the daughter or daughters to look after their welfare in the city. So that, from the point of view of maintaining the employment of people generally in industrial country towns, the question of getting small complementary industries that can absorb particularly female labour which has not been specifically trained in professional services is important. I should like to see some efforts made in that direction, and all honourable members concerned with this problem would appreciate Government action along these lines.

It has been suggested many times in this House that industries cannot be induced to go to the country because it is not an economic proposition for them to go there and that it would be wrong to give them some sort of subsidy or economic assistance whereby they might establish themselves in country towns, but it seems to be overlooked that we are in effect subsidizing indirectly most of the big industries in this city since we are running so many public facilities at an increasing loss, public facilities without which these industries could not exist. Because we have to run these public facilities, we are in effect sub-

dizing private industry, which is congregating around one point in this State. The larger the city becomes the greater the problem to provide all these services—transport, schools, sewerage and so forth. The problems are all increasing as the city spreads outwards.

We are subsidizing industry in this way, and that is accepted; yet, when we discuss the question of endeavouring to decentralize industry, we are told it is not economic to do so because it means some special form of assistance to induce industry to go out to the country. It would be hard to analyse the exact amount that this assistance represents, but one has only to glance over these many facilities the Government has to provide in order to realize that the assistance given indirectly to private industry amounts to a great sum each year, assistance without which private industry could not function.

On housing, the Treasurer seemed very optimistic. He mentioned that housing activities were proceeding most satisfactorily and had substantially overcome the war-time lag as well as dealing with new demands, but I could not agree with that statement. I will not weary honourable members by going over the figures quoted by the Leader of the Opposition earlier today but, briefly, they represent this fact, that over recent years for every house that has been built by the Housing Trust there have been three unsatisfied applicants; and that position exists today as it did years ago. As far as I know, from the figures the number of houses being built by the Housing Trust is not increasing. As the Treasurer admitted, the lifting of rent controls from new houses has not brought about the building of more houses by private enterprise. In other words, if we hope to house our people adequately, we have to step up the production of houses by the State housing authority.

I was very interested to note the closing remarks of the Treasurer in his Budget Speech when he drew our attention to the fact that:—

There is a new phase approaching in the employment situation in Australia, which is likely to be particularly marked in South Australia.

He pointed out that there would be a tremendous increase in population and in the number of children, which could place pressure upon the State's primary school facilities in the next few years. He said:—

The working population, instead of increasing less rapidly than the overall population, will during the next decade at least increase even more rapidly than the recent three per cent per annum increase in population. This will present

us with a challenge and a problem for which the State must be prepared.

If, after 10 unprecedented good seasons and with extra assistance from Commonwealth grants to the extent that has been mentioned here in this debate, we are faced with a deficit of over £750,000 in those circumstances and we cannot meet our housing demands, notwithstanding all the alleged prosperity of those years, how are we going to deal with this approaching situation in the next decade? I suggest that we have to do some radical thinking if we are to cope with this situation and provide the facilities that the people will not only need but demand. The Treasurer posed the problem when he said:

There must be no slackening in housing activity, but preparation for the anticipated increased demand.

Surely, if we have been unable to meet the situation during these good years of prosperity, have we not to do some radical thinking if we are going to meet the position that will arise in this next decade in the unprecedented demand that the Treasurer forecast? The Premier pointed out in the closing paragraph that this pressure will be placed on all public facilities, and I think we all appreciate that. I have spoken in these terms in this House on

several occasions, particularly in the debate on the Loan Estimates, and once again I say that we must depart from some of the conventional ideas regarding finance and the conventional approaches made in the past if we are to deal adequately with what will happen in the next decade.

It is remarkable that, although private industry, and particularly the larger concerns, is showing profits year after year it is the community undertakings that are struggling to pay their way and, as a rule, are failing to do so. After all, why should members of the Government always have to face the problem of trying to make a shilling do the work of two shillings when private enterprise is having it so good? It seems to me to be a completely topsy-turvy state of affairs, particularly as private industry depends on the existence of public utilities for it to operate, as it has admitted in public statements. We should give new thought to these methods of finance. I support the Estimates.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 7, at 2 p.m.