

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, April 19, 1960.

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

QUESTIONS.**MEAT PRICES AND GRADING.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the advisability of restoring price control on meat and about the grading of meat?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A report is not yet to hand. To get a fair picture of the industry, an investigation must always take some considerable time, as the Prices Department usually likes to check over a wide section of the particular industry before issuing a report. If the investigations were limited to a few people it would be rather misleading. The Prices Department has only a limited staff, and other checks have to be made, but I will get a report as soon as I can.

SECOND UNIVERSITY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Last session I asked the Premier a question about the establishment of a second university in this State, and he replied to the effect that it looked as though the present University of Adelaide would be able to cope with student numbers until about 1967, but that a conference was to be called with representatives of the University, the Education Department, the School of Mines and the Treasury, and that he would advise me as to what transpired at that conference. I have not yet heard anything further from him on this matter, but I noticed a report in last Thursday's *Advertiser* of the remarks made by the Vice-Chancellor (Mr. Basten) at the second commemoration last Wednesday as follows:—

The University of Adelaide was close to the physical limit of expansion, and later this year it must, if it were not to fail in its duty some years hence, begin to make plans for University work on another site.

He also said that confusion and higher costs were the penalties for preparing plans too late. Will the Premier say whether any decision has been made on this matter generally and especially on whether the Government has a suitable site in mind?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As stated, a conference was called and held in my

room, at which representatives of the Education Department, the University of Adelaide, and the School of Mines were present. One or two decisions were made to which effect will be given. The first was that the School of Mines would drop some functions that were a duplication of the Education Department's functions, and that it would undertake a course of Bachelor of Technology to relieve the University of technological subjects which, incidentally, take many students under our present industrial conditions. The second was that the School of Mines, of course, would get some relief because it would not have to undertake so many of the functions already covered in other places by the Education Department. It was also decided that the University would have assigned to it the whole of the Exhibition Building block of which, as members may know, the University had been promised two-thirds and the School of Mines one-third. Additional land will probably have to be provided to the School of Mines for its functions. On the general question of a second university, I have looked at the position in New South Wales and Victoria, in both of which States two universities have been established almost side by side. I gathered from remarks I heard in both States that it was not a particularly happy arrangement to have two universities operating side by side. My own view is that, when the present Adelaide University site is filled and further expansion is not possible, we should establish another university, but not in the metropolitan area.

Mr. O'Halloran—They have that in New South Wales now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—They have two universities in the metropolitan area and a small university outside the metropolitan area. In my opinion, having two universities in the metropolitan area in that State has not been a happy arrangement, and I gathered from some remarks I heard that some difficulties arise in Victoria. In other countries there is not usually a duplication in universities; in fact, it is rare to find two universities operating side by side in a city, because that creates all sorts of problems with staff competition and jealousies. Although no Cabinet decision has been made, my own view is that when the time comes for an expansion outside the present grounds of the Adelaide University, that will be the time to establish another university that would be a new undertaking completely removed from the metropolitan area.

OIL EXPLORATION ON BEACHES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Much publicity has been given to likely oil exploration drilling work on metropolitan beaches. Can the Treasurer comment on the correctness of some of these statements and indicate the Government's intentions relating to oil exploration on metropolitan beaches?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Seismic examinations are being undertaken in all areas of any interest as far as oil-finding is concerned. As honourable members know, for a considerable period an area of St. Vincent Gulf has been of some interest in regard to oil exploration, and the Government put down two exploratory bores on Yorke Peninsula a couple of years ago. In both cases traces of oil were found. Seismic investigations are being made by trained crews in various places, particularly in the South-East and in the Great Artesian Basin. I notice that some work has also been done on metropolitan beaches, but whether drilling will follow will depend on the results of those examinations.

BROWN COAL BRIQUETTES.

Mr. LAUCKE—Over the week-end keen publicity has been given to the availability in this State of brown coal briquettes made in Victoria. Can the Premier say whether investigation has been made into the suitability of our brown coal deposits for making briquettes, and whether a briquette industry is expected to be established in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The brown coal deposits in South Australia have been investigated from time to time, but the cost of reclaiming the coal by open cut methods has been too high to give any hope of the success of any proposal that has been examined. The most interesting of the deposits was at Moorlands, and even there the overhead was so high that the German engineers, who had had great experience with open cut brown coal mining in Germany, could not recommend any proposition. I doubt very much indeed whether a brown coal briquetting proposition in South Australia could ever be economically justified.

PUBLIC EXAMINATION RETURNS.

Mr. RALSTON—Has the Premier a reply to my question of April 5 concerning public examination returns by headmasters?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In the absence of the Minister of Education, whom I am pleased to see back in the House this

afternoon, I obtained the following report from the Deputy Director of Education:—

Headmasters of secondary schools do submit unofficial returns to their respective superintendents, giving information concerning results obtained at the Public Examination Board examinations. These returns are for the information of superintendents and secondary inspectors only, and they must be interpreted against a great deal of background knowledge. There are many factors which make these lists unreliable as authentic records. They are not official statistics, and it would not be fair to individual schools to allow them to be published.

SHEET PILING AT MANNUM.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of April 5 concerning repairs to the sheet piling at Mannum?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The General Manager of the Harbors Board reports that arrangements were made for the Board's Engineer for Maintenance to visit Mannum during last week and to confer with the District Council of Mannum on the matter of repairs to the sheet piling at Mannum. A report and estimate of the cost of the work will be prepared and submitted for consideration.

MOUNT BURR COMMUNITY HALL.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister of Forests a reply to my recent question concerning the progress of work on the Mount Burr community hall?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The report from the South Australian Housing Trust states:—

This contract was let in the first instance at a fixed price without any rise and fall clause. Soon after commencing work the contractor was faced with a substantial rise in costs due to the margins case. He applied to the trust for a revision of his contract price and the trust decided that it would invite each of the original tenderers to submit a fresh price. Revised tenders close this week.

I think the report was dated last week. It continues:—

Some preliminary work on site preparation has already been completed by the original contractor and, if he is not successful in obtaining the revised contract, a price adjustment will be necessary.

"LEARN TO SWIM" CAMPAIGN.

Mr. TAPPING—Can the Minister of Education say how successful was the "Learn to Swim" Campaign conducted by his department during last Christmas holidays?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The campaign was an outstanding success and all records for this type of campaign were broken. We hope to do even better next season.

C.R.D. DISEASE.

Mr. LAUCKE—I am deeply concerned about a new respiratory disease in poultry which is taking heavy toll of flocks in this State. It is reported to me that one poultry farmer over the last four weeks has lost 800 birds through the disease known as C.R.D. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government is aware of the seriousness of this disease and of the serious toll it is taking of poultry in this State? If so, is it intended to give a high priority to the establishment of the proposed animal and poultry research centre at Northfield in order that a cheap and effective treatment may be sought for this and other devastating stock diseases?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will obtain a considered reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY TARIFFS.

Mr. NANKIVELL—I believe that power normally used in hospitals comes under the G tariff, which is the residential and cooking tariff. However, the new country tariffs which will apply to Karoonda and Pinnaroo extensions, and to any further country extensions do not provide for the G tariff, which means that these hospitals will pay for their power at commercial rates. Will the Premier ascertain whether this is an oversight on the part of the people fixing these new tariffs, and if not, whether the matter could be reviewed in order to bring the tariffs for the hospitals concerned into line with those that apply at other hospitals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have that matter examined and will report to the honourable member.

HOLBROOK ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I have on several occasions in the House referred to the Holbrook Road bridge and the danger to children who cross from the southern side of the river to attend the Flinders Park school. The bridge was badly constructed in the first place, and apparently the department has decided that it should be remade and that the road should be reconstructed. The latest information I had from the Minister of Roads came after the House rose last year, and he concluded by saying that the plans were not as yet completed and consequently, because of the cost of several jobs in the metropolitan area above the

estimated amount, it would be difficult to find funds to carry out the work during the current year. It was expected, however, that the plans would be ready and funds available to commence the work early in the next financial year. Can the Minister of Works tell me the position, and, if not, will he ascertain whether the work will be provided for in next year's Estimates?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will inquire for the honourable member.

STREAKY BAY SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Following on my question regarding the purchase of property for extensions at the Streaky Bay school, can the Premier say whether anything has been done about the purchase of the property?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received the following report:—

There has been some delay in considering the purchase of this land because it contains certain buildings which would have to be demolished. On April 6, 1960, the Public Buildings Department was asked to inspect the site as to its suitability for departmental requirements. This is in accordance with the usual policy. Should a favourable report be received the proposal will be submitted to the Land Board for valuation, after which immediate consideration will be given to the possibility of purchasing this additional land.

LOXTON DRAINAGE SCHEME.

Mr. STOTT—The recommendations by the Land Settlement Committee, which inquired into a comprehensive drainage scheme for the Loxton Irrigation Area, were:—

1. The installation of a comprehensive drainage scheme for the Loxton Irrigation Area in accordance with plans submitted at an estimated cost of £1,325,000.

2. That favourable consideration be given to the inclusion in the scheme of the canneries (existing and proposed) and the packing house for the purpose of enabling them to discharge effluents into the scheme.

The position at Loxton is urgent and it is causing trouble and anxiety amongst the settlers. Many trees are going out because of the rising water table. Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered the favourable report of the Land Settlement Committee and does it propose to place the scheme on the Estimates for the next financial year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As I understand it, under the Land Settlement Agreement between the Commonwealth and the States the drainage of the Loxton Irrigation Area would be a Commonwealth obligation. In pursuance of the agreement, and in accordance with the report quoted by the

honourable member, the Minister of Lands took up the matter with the Commonwealth, which has given a favourable reply. The work has been approved and now the Engineering and Water Supply Department is preparing the plans for the work to be carried out.

COUNTRY ROADS.

Mr. QUIRKE—My question relates to the main roads from Burra to Hallett and Gulnare to Morgan. Now that Burra has a direct bitumen road to Adelaide, which northern and Broken Hill traffic uses, the upkeep of the unsealed portion between Hallett and Burra is costly and wasteful of maintenance money. Can the Minister of Works say when it is proposed to seal this length of road? The Burra to Morgan road is the logical river connection for the Gulnare, Spalding, Booborowie, Hanson and Burra route. Can the Minister say what the future programme is in connection with this lateral road, particularly between Morgan and Spalding, and more particularly between Burra and Morgan?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will direct the question to my colleague, the Minister of Roads.

MOUNT GAMBIER SEWERAGE.

Mr. RALSTON—We have been informed that on the completion of the Naracoorte sewerage scheme the Engineering and Water Supply Department will commence the scheme for the sewerage of Mount Gambier. Can the Minister of Works say whether the plans for the proposed sewerage system at Mount Gambier have been completed and, if so, whether copies have been forwarded to the Mount Gambier City Council? If not, can the Minister say when they will be completed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—As I previously indicated, and as the honourable member now sets out, the department intends, on the completion of the Naracoorte scheme, to transfer its activities to Mount Gambier. Towards that end preparatory work has been done in and around Mount Gambier on the scheme itself, the disposal of effluent and other ancillary matters. I have not discussed the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief recently, and therefore cannot at the moment say what stage the planning has reached, but I will inquire and bring down a report.

ELECTRICITY TRUST: DAMAGES.

Mr. BYWATERS—On April 5 I referred to the matter of an accident to a young lady at Murray Bridge following on a collision with an Electricity Trust vehicle, and to the visit

by insurance officers to the hospital, which caused her some inconvenience. Has the Premier any further information on the matter?

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

The allegations by the honourable member, Mr. Bywaters, are not in accordance with fact. A copy of the original signed statement by the injured party, Miss A. J. Rawlins, aged 21 years, which was obtained by a representative of a firm of insurance loss assessors, Messrs. Garrood, Wark & Co., acting for the Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society Ltd., Act Insurers of the trust, is attached hereto. The statement is solely Miss Rawlins' version of the incident. The Assistant Insurance Officer of the trust, Mr. J. D. Henderson, was present at the interview, but took no part in the interview. The facts are set out hereunder:—

On March 16, 1960, a collision occurred at the intersection of McHenry and Elizabeth Streets, Murray Bridge, between a trust Holden utility driven by a trust employee, H. F. Slade, electrical inspector, and a mechanically propelled cycle, owned and driven by Miss A. J. Rawlins, age 21 years, clerk, of Murray Bridge. As Miss Rawlins had sustained bodily injury, the trust notified its Act Insurers, Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society, in accordance with policy conditions. The Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society instructed Messrs. Garrood, Wark & Co., insurance assessors, to investigate the accident on their behalf, and in accordance with the requirements of Garrood, Wark & Co., that interviews with trust personnel be conducted in the presence of a responsible officer of the Insurance Branch of the trust, Mr. J. D. Henderson, assistant insurance officer of the trust, accompanied Mr. J. O'Callaghan of Garrood, Wark & Co. to Murray Bridge on March 18, 1960, for the purpose of taking the trust driver's statement at the scene of the accident, and to obtain full details of the circumstances of the collision. The circumstances indicated that responsibility for the collision rested with the rider of the mechanical cycle. The damaged trust vehicle was then inspected at a local garage and repairs estimated at approximately £30. Later in the afternoon, Mr. O'Callaghan saw fit to interview the injured party, Miss Rawlins, in the Murray Bridge hospital. We understand that her injuries were concussion, shock, burns and lacerations. Permission was obtained by Mr. O'Callaghan from the matron to conduct the interview. Although bodily injury was a matter solely for the attention of the Norwich Union Insurance, at Mr. O'Callaghan's request, Mr. Henderson attended the interview but apart from the customary acknowledgment on introduction, Mr. Henderson took no part in the conversation.

After discussing the accident briefly, Mr. O'Callaghan then wrote down in his note book the statement, a copy of which is now attached to these documents, and handed the statement

to Miss Rawlins to read and sign if she found it to be correct. Just before the statement was signed, Mr. O'Callaghan asked Miss Rawlins if her cycle was comprehensively insured and on being informed that it was not, he then said to Miss Rawlins, "In all probability you will be charged with the cost of repairs to the trust vehicle, which are estimated at £30." At this stage Miss Rawlins, who had been lighthearted and jovial throughout, suddenly burst into tears. She signed the statement and shortly afterwards, O'Callaghan and Henderson left the hospital. The whole interview was conducted in 20 minutes. The reference by O'Callaghan to trust repairs was entirely his own comment and was not instigated in any way by the trust officer, Mr. Henderson. The trust has given no official indication at this state to Miss Rawlins that she is liable for damages to the trust vehicle.

JABUK-GERANIUM AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Can the Minister of Education say whether his department is still considering the possibility of constructing a rural area school in the Jabuk-Geranium area and, if so, what stage the planning has reached?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The department is still considering the question of an area school in the locality mentioned, but I cannot say what stage the planning has reached. When the matter is further investigated I will let the honourable member know.

PORT AUGUSTA HIGH SCHOOL GROUNDS.

Mr. RICHES—On April 6 the Minister of Works undertook to inquire into the lowering of the Morgan-Whyalla main through the Port Augusta high school grounds. Has he examined the matter and can he say when the work is likely to be done?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have discussed this matter with officers of my department and it has also been discussed with officers of the Education Department and there is reason to hope the work will be carried out in the forthcoming winter as was indicated to the honourable member when we visited Port Augusta and discussed it with him. However, the matter rests at that point at the moment. The department has not given me any firm undertaking when it can do the work but I hope it will be this winter.

ELIZABETH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK—I have been somewhat concerned to find that the Salisbury high school—a particularly fine and modern building, which has only been opened a short time—is reaching saturation point with students. I

understand that a new high school is to be built at Elizabeth and I urge that it be ready for opening in the 1961 school year. Has the Minister of Education any information as to the proposed date of such opening?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have some ideas but I have given up issuing prophecies because they are not always realized. However, I will get a considered reply and let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

RECRUITMENT OF TEACHERS.

Mr. STOTT—On April 6 I asked the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Education, why the Education Department had advertised in the Waikerie local paper for a high school teacher. Has the Minister of Education a reply?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—What the Premier stated was correct, and what I say now is merely an amplification of his reply. The Education Department has not been able to secure sufficient secondary teachers to meet its requirements in secondary schools, and particularly in high schools this year. Resignations received in March have further accentuated the difficult staffing problem. Advertisements for qualified secondary teachers have been inserted in the metropolitan press, and also in any country centre where an emergency has arisen.

An advertisement in the local press sometimes has the fortunate result of securing the services of a local qualified secondary teacher, who is able and willing to assist in the local school, but is not able to teach elsewhere. On the Education Department's instructions, the head master of the Waikerie high school advertised in the *River News*. As a result of this advertisement, we were fortunate in securing a suitable applicant who has been appointed to the Waikerie high school.

BEETALOO VALLEY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Premier any further information concerning test boring for water in the Beetaloo Valley?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Director of Mines reports as follows:—

Some misunderstandings had arisen in regard to this situation between the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The position is that a hydrological survey has been carried out by the Mines Department, and the prospects of obtaining underground water supplies suitable for irrigation are considered good in certain portions of Beetaloo Valley. It is normal practice when carrying out such exploratory drilling for water to locate a trial bore on suitable

Crown land, but in this instance all likely sites are restricted to private lands. The Government is prepared to sink a trial bore to demonstrate the possibilities of obtaining useful underground water supplies in portions of Beetaloo Valley but considers that in the event of the bore proving successful, all costs directly related to the drilling of the bore should be paid by the landholder on whose property the test drilling takes place. Negotiations on this basis are proceeding.

NEW RESERVOIR FOR LITTLE PARA RIVER.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on April 5 concerning the possibility of constructing a reservoir on the Little Para River at Golden Grove?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have a report from the Engineer-in-Chief as follows:—

Geological investigations are at present being carried out for a proposed reservoir on the Little Para River. Provided the geological investigation indicates that the foundations and basin are sound for a reservoir, it will be some considerable time before the department is in a position to put forward a concrete proposal.

TRANSFERS OF TEACHERS.

Mr. CLARK—Will the Minister of Education obtain for me the numbers of teachers who have, in the last three years, transferred from primary schools to secondary schools in this State?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to do so. I could give the approximate numbers now but I would rather have the exact numbers.

BEACHPORT PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister of Education a report on the progress of plans for the new primary school at Beachport?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The current building programme is at present under consideration and as soon as I am able to do so I will let the honourable member have a report on the proposed Beachport school.

MURRAY BRIDGE TO MANNUM ROAD.

Mr. BYWATERS—Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, why work has ceased on the sealing of the Murray Bridge to Mannum road and ascertain whether the work could be hurried along? This work was commenced and some progress made, but work has now ceased altogether and the road is in a shocking condition.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes.

PRICE OF EGGS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question concerning a reduction in the price of first quality eggs about two weeks ago, at a time when, through decreased production, there is usually a firming of prices?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports:—

I have to advise that the Minister's reply covered the principal reasons concerning a reduction in price of eggs at a time of the year when the market is generally expected to be firm, and a possibility of increase in price.

The present position has been largely brought about by the greatly increased quantities of eggs received by the South Australian Egg Board as compared with those of last year. From the commencement of the pool year, *i.e.*, July 1, 1959, to January 2, 1960, the fall in production, as compared with the previous year, was 7.01 per cent, or an equivalent of 372,756 dozen, but from then onwards the production has shown a heavy increase over that of last year. For the period July 1, 1959, to the end of February, 1960, the decrease in South Australia was only 1.480 per cent, but during the month of March this decrease almost completely disappeared, and during the month of March the receipts averaged over 30 per cent higher than those of last year. The general indications in the industry are that this pattern will be followed until the end of the pool year, *i.e.*, June 30, 1960. It is also interesting to know that the production on an Australian basis from July 1, 1959, to the end of February, 1960, has been as follows:—

South Queensland, 9.902 per cent increase equivalent to 501,994 dozen.

New South Wales, 13.171 per cent increase equivalent to 4,135,936 dozen.

Victoria, 7.364 per cent increase equivalent to 1,183,124 dozen.

Another difficulty associated particularly with the export side of surplus eggs is the gradual closing of the United Kingdom market as an outlet for Australian surplus production. The full weight of this is now being felt, particularly in the frozen egg trade, as the United Kingdom is now producing almost two-thirds of its total requirements of frozen egg. This is a position that has never occurred previously in the history of the industry, and Australia is having great difficulty, at the present, in disposing of available surplus Australian frozen egg in the United Kingdom market.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from April 13. Page 180.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I join with other members in their remarks

about paragraphs one to five of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, and particularly in expressing my regret at the death of Mr. George Hambour. As I have already conveyed my sympathy and condolences to his widow and family, I will leave the matter at that. I am concerned particularly about portion of paragraph 17, in which His Excellency said:—

The loss in working time caused by industrial accidents now exceeds by far that caused by industrial disputes and efforts to reduce accidents have met with encouraging results, employers and trade unions generally co-operating with governmental activities in this field.

I should like to have had a further explanation of this matter. Is the incidence of accidents a result of the use of existing machinery? Is the work becoming monotonous or can these accidents be attributed to the excessive hours worked in industry? The workers of this country have been granted a 40-hour working week. If the industry is organized to provide for a 40-hour week and these accidents are the result of exceeding 40 hours, it is time for a further review. I think this would be one of the major contributing factors towards the incidence of accidents and I believe that an investigation might be made along those lines.

I was interested to hear the remarks of the member for Unley about home building. He made no constructive contribution towards solving the problems associated with this matter. He said:

One builder I know has been building hundreds of houses in Unley, Mitcham and St. Mary's, and, although prices are going up and up, he is still building.

I should be surprised if any homes were being built in Unley. I believe that the number of those built recently could be counted on one hand, because Unley is a settled area. The only Housing Trust building in that area in latter years concerned the flats on the Fullarton Road, and those have been occupied for some years. Regarding his comments on St. Mary's, I am sure that the building of homes there was not done by any one builder. When the Peak Construction Company came to Adelaide it was given a contract for the erection of timber frame homes in that district, and most of those homes are now paid for, or nearly so, and have been occupied for some years. I therefore cannot understand the statement of the member for Unley.

Mr. Jennings—It is like castles in the air.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Yes. I will leave the question of the building activity in Mitcham to the member for that district, who may be

able to back up his colleague. Where all the hundreds of homes are being built in Unley, Mitcham and St. Mary's I do not know. Homes were certainly built in Unley many years before the present member for the district took his seat in Parliament, and most of the houses in St. Mary's were built in a group some years ago. A group of houses is being built in the Mitcham Corporation area, east of Goodwood Road, and if that builder is the one mentioned by the member for Unley I assure the honourable member that that builder has also built many other homes under contract to the Housing Trust and the War Service Homes Division.

Mr. Millhouse—Would you care to comment on the future of the temporary homes at Springbank?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I assure the honourable member that I will not overlook that matter. The member for Unley wonders how many young people will ever be able to buy homes. At the time most of the homes at St. Mary's were built we had a different type of Government in the Federal Parliament and purchasers were paying about 4½ per cent interest for finance. Purchasers of war service homes paid a little less. Today purchasers are paying considerably more with a different type of Federal Government in office. I maintain that the interest rates should be reduced considerably in the interests of home builders.

The member for Unley mentioned the Ashford Community Hospital, but I have never heard him mention favourably the foundation members—those who were responsible for putting that hospital on the map. Those members were the present Minister of Education (in his capacity as the member for the Glenelg electorate which adjoins mine), two well-known doctors, and myself. When Unley was asked what it would do I recall the very flat refusal to co-operate and the remark that Unley had plenty of hospitals to look after; so it would be just as well for the member for Unley to pay a tribute to the people who were responsible from the outset.

A report in the *News* of March 1 of this year under the heading "Youth, 19, canes brother," caused me great concern. The article stated that following a hearing in the Adelaide Juvenile Court a 19-year old youth gave his 12-year old brother nine strokes of the cane. The matter came before the magistrate of that court. I think it is entirely wrong to ask a boy of that age to cane a younger brother for some misdemeanour. I can only assume that in this case those boys had no father, or at

least none who had any control over the boy. I point out that only seven years separated the ages of the two boys, and I believe that this could cause repercussions in future years when the younger brother would still remember the caning he received. I do not condemn the Children's Welfare Department or the chairman of the board, but I believe that this question must be reviewed and the general administration of the department in some cases drastically altered. There should be other ways and means of overcoming the type of difficulty that existed in this case, and I hope we will not hear of such an occurrence again.

I am interested in another family of a husband, wife and three children. The husband is concerned in police court action because of a misdemeanour, but I will not deal further with that matter. The eldest of the three children is about six years of age. Because the family has a television set on hire-purchase it is not considered destitute under the Act and consequently it cannot get the relief that should be given to it. Because of this, the children are punished in two ways. First, they are punished because of the father's misdemeanour and, secondly, because they are denied a reasonable food standard. This matter needs special consideration. I can recall the time when the department considered a family not destitute if it possessed a wireless set, a refrigerator or a washing machine, but today these articles are regarded as essentials. In addition to that, we should see that families are provided with a reasonable food standard. The Government should not permit this drastically harsh treatment of the family I mentioned earlier. Now, if the department says that a family is not destitute when it possesses a television set or a motor car on hire-purchase that family has no chance of getting further relief.

I want to mention matters associated with children committed to the care and custody of the Welfare Department. I recall a case where a lad drove a motor car without permission and where, because of fancy driving, the car overturned near the West Beach airport and one of the passengers was killed. The driver was under the care and custody of the Welfare Department. He had been given leave from Struan Farm to be with his parents over the Christmas vacation period. Several weeks after the accident his parents received an account from the department for the upkeep of the lad. Who was responsible for paying the funeral

expenses of the dead passenger, as the driver was still under the care and custody of the department? When lads are placed under the supervision of the department and welfare officers have to visit them, how many times must they make that visit, weekly or monthly? Are there sufficient trained officers to do the work? Are the present officers overworked? After a lad goes to work and then for some reason finds himself under the supervision of the Welfare Department, is anyone responsible to see that he is retained in employment? Is it the responsibility of a welfare officer? It cannot be the responsibility of the parents because in most cases the lads placed under the care of the department have ignored the parents' advice. If that advice were noted, in 99 cases out of a hundred lads would not be placed under the supervision of the department. Boys of this type can get into much trouble, but if they were kept in continuous work it would be better for all concerned. The Government should review this matter.

Earlier today Mr. Millhouse wanted to know what is to become of the Springbank camp area. I have been told that the Government owns the land, about 80 acres; consequently, it must own the accommodation provided on the land. The Housing Trust periodically inspects the camp area, which indicates that it is a Government responsibility. About 12 months ago last January I wrote to the Treasurer about the eventual position of the accommodation in the camp area. Since that time some of the Air Force galvanized iron hutments, which have been converted into living accommodation for elderly people, have been demolished, but some are still occupied. The single units, built as emergency accommodation, are still being used. I regard the galvanized iron hutments as temporary and the others as more or less permanent. The land, where there is no accommodation, should be bulldozed and cleaned up. An attempt should be made to recondition the roads in the camp area. Now we have accommodation where roads should have been made, and roads where there is no accommodation. Bad as it is to have these hutments and emergency units occupied, where attempts have been made to dismantle some of the accommodation the Government should provide money for clearing the masonry and lumber left there. The people still living there should have decent surroundings.

This area is a blot on the landscape and its clearing should not be the responsibility of the Mitcham Corporation or the Housing Trust. I believe the Government should arrange for Mr.

Leverington, who is at present removing tram tracks from the metropolitan area, to do it, particularly as he has the equipment and is not afraid to use it. The Education Department may require some of this land for new schools, and in replanning the area such provision should be made. However, under no circumstances should it be used for industrial purposes, particularly as it is immediately opposite the Springbank Repatriation Hospital. Much money has been spent on providing water and sewerage in the area and these services should be utilized if, and when, decent homes are constructed.

The area which is bounded by Sweetman's Road on the north, South Road on the east and Marion Road on the west embodies the suburbs of Mitchell Park and Clovelly Park. New homes, both purchase and rental, have been constructed there. In Mitchell Park it was originally proposed to build 320 rental homes in one group and 90 in another, but I doubt whether the 90 were built. About five acres of land have been reserved for a primary school and two acres for an infant school, and there is sufficient vacant land to permit the construction of up to 1,100 homes. This portion has not really been subdivided and the Marion Corporation should investigate the possibility of purchasing about 20 acres from the Housing Trust for recreational reserves, including an oval.

I was interested this afternoon to hear the Premier's reply to Mr. Millhouse concerning a second university. The Opposition has always believed that a second university should be far removed from the metropolitan area. I believe that the Bedford Park Sanatorium was suggested as a possible site, but last session the Premier said that the Government was not interested in that proposal. I understand the Government approached the Housing Trust and offered the area of 430 acres to the trust for subdivision for home building, and I should like to know whether it did. However, I believe the trust rejected the offer because it considered that most of the land did not lend itself to home building because the cost of foundation work for homes would have been prohibitive. I understand that there are fewer than 40 patients at that sanatorium at present. Many of the buildings were constructed in the period immediately following the 1914-18 war and, apart from the nurses' block, all buildings are timber-framed. Could this hospital be used for the accommodation of chronic or semi-chronic patients or for mentally sick persons?

Tuberculosis sufferers could more appropriately be accommodated at the Morris Ward at Northfield. I am sure that Dr. Birch would agree that Bedford Park would be an ideal site for mental patients but I doubt whether he would believe that the present buildings were suitable, because mentally sick persons are somewhat negligent and if one was careless with a match the whole place could be burnt down. The Government should investigate whether Bedford Park could be used for either mental patients and aged patients or for chronic and semi-chronic patients. Accommodation is urgently required for the latter and although the Government has utilized some of the accommodation originally provided at Northfield for infectious diseases cases it has never constructed a building solely for chronic and semi-chronic cases. I support the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I hardly expected to have to follow my colleague so early in the debate, but I rise to add my few brief remarks to the electors of Light, or rather, should I say, to the motion. I join with other members in expressing my sincere sorrow at the untimely death of our late friend, the member for Light (Mr. Hambour). Quite a lot of new Liberal members came into the House at the 1956 election and I must confess that, whilst I hope I maintained the ordinary decencies, I did not go out of my way to get to know them too well. Perhaps I thought it would be easier to fight Liberal members if I thought they were individually as bad as their policies. But, as someone very properly remarked, the heart is often wiser than the head, and it certainly was not very long before the honourable member for Light (the late Mr. Hambour) had earned his way into my affections as he had earned his way into the affections of all honourable members. When the achievements of the late honourable member are considered—the building up of a big business from practically nothing and the tremendous popularity he enjoyed in his own district amongst the people with whom he lived and worked—we shall agree that not least of his achievements was that in the relatively short time that he was in this House he earned the universal esteem of all members, irrespective of their background or political complexion. I was impressed by what the Premier said—this is one occasion when I can say that—when he said that he would sooner have George Hambour as a friend than most people when he was in trouble. I and most honourable members felt that, that

here was one person who would not desert you if you suffered a sudden attack of unpopularity, as of course we are apt to do at any time.

I move to a much more pleasant subject and join with those who have already spoken in congratulating the honourable Minister of Lands on his knighthood. I cannot imagine a more popular recipient of this honour than Sir Cecil Hincks, who has served his country extremely well in many spheres. I sincerely join with others in hoping that he and Lady Hincks will live long to enjoy the recognition of their Sovereign and the love of their family and friends.

As I am going along so smoothly in a congratulatory vein, I congratulate also the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. It was eminently appropriate that these two gentlemen should have been selected for the task, one on the threshold of his career, the other approaching the close. Honourable members on this side of the House were most impressed by the lament of the honourable member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) over the death of free enterprise under the economic conditions created by the present Federal and South Australian Governments. He quite properly drew attention to the increasing tendency to monopolies, cartels, trade associations, price-fixing rings, and so on, that are stifling competition today, well aware that they can do it with impunity, well aware that the Governments which pay lip service to free enterprise are, in fact, not free enterprise Governments at all, but are really big business Governments. What we are mystified about is how the member for Albert can reconcile his expressed views in this House with his support of the present Government. If he is as sincere in his views as he appears to be, then he must surely soon come to realize that the real friends of genuine private enterprise are to be found in the Labor Party on this side of the House; whereas the only economic freedom in which his Party believes is the freedom of the strong to oppress the weak, of the rich to rob the poor.

I listened most attentively to the honourable member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage)—not that I was in the least confident of hearing anything of interest, but mainly because if there did happen to be hidden away somewhere in his speech some item of interest after listening to him for seven years I did not want to miss anything this time, as the opportunities to listen to him grow rarer and rarer. I did not hear anything of interest, however, but I

heard enough to be able to come to this conclusion: that the honourable member had missed his calling. His speeches are so inane that, if they were put to music, they would never be out of the "hit parade." This speech was mainly a paean of praise for the Premier and a "pain" to the rest of us. We were constantly reminded that the Premier "will go down in history." Of course he will go down in history, just as assuredly as the honourable member will go down in Unley. But what is all this about going down in history? Should we pattern ourselves on Nero or Ned Kelly just to assure ourselves of a place in history? After all, Governor Gerry of Massachusetts is assured of a place in history because of the iniquitous gerrymander named after him. In history I think we may expect to see a very cordial relationship between Governor Gerry and Premier Playford, one the inventor of the system and the other its most skilful and ruthless exponent.

Whilst the honourable member for Unley was speaking, I noticed many interjections containing allusions to the great game of cricket. I really regret that, because interjections are out of order, but I could only explain these interjections by their perhaps being inspired by the knowledge that the honourable member for Unley is going to be replaced in this Chamber by a former international cricketer of renown—but I do not want to go ahead with any of those allusions. I will content myself merely with saying that I believe the honourable member for Unley should have been no-balled years ago.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech this year followed the fashion of recent years in devoting most of its time to telling us what the Government had done, both real and imaginary, rather than telling us what it was going to do. The speech was as platitudinous but not quite as propagandist as usual, a fact already remarked on by the Leader of the Opposition in his monumental speech the other day. Why the Speech was somewhat less propagandist in nature than usual we can only guess, but we can afford to be reasonably certain that it was not caused by any sudden attack of modesty on the part of the Government. That, indeed, would be a fatal disease for this Government, but I do not think there is very much chance of its ever contracting it. Even if the Premier had started off with only a normal degree of ego, how could he humanly keep it normal when he had behind him such a profusion of professional back-scratchers, yes-men and noddors, the noddors being the

yes-men in an embryonic state. The member for the dry Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said, in effect, that he would rather have the Premier at Booleroo than a water supply.

We can perhaps work out that the reason for the more restrained terms of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech this year was the drought. In the past we have been encouraged to believe that the good seasons, the waving wheat, the golden grain, the record wool clip, and all things of this nature have been due solely to the agency of the Government. This year, such things were rather skipped over, just in case those who in the past had really believed that the Government was responsible for the good seasons might have been caddishly consistent enough to blame it now for the drought. But, all in all, the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech was much the same as so many we have heard.

The opening Speeches in Parliament here always remind me of that little booklet of Quarterly Notes that we get from the Housing Trust. It never is content just to bring us up-to-date; it always starts again at the beginning. When I say "at the beginning," referring to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, of course I am not referring to the beginning in the way it was used in the Book of Genesis: I am referring to the beginning here as being the beginning of the Playford era, because we are encouraged to believe that that is when South Australian history began.

From time to time things are rather judiciously left out of the Governor's Speech after they have served their purposes and become something in the nature of an embarrassment. That is why we no longer see references to deep-sea ports or atomic power stations in strategic locations, or even an increase in the school leaving age, and things of that sort. These things drop out and are swallowed up with all the other dishonoured promises and discarded brainwaves. Once these things are discarded, their place or their space in the Speech is then taken up with the current figments of the Premier's fertile imagination, which shows itself at its greatest, which soars to its greatest heights in his celebrated weekly broadcasts, the greatest radio sensation since Rodney the Rabbit.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I hope the honourable member listens.

Mr. JENNINGS—I have listened once, and that was enough. These broadcasts are put over at such an hour of the night—unfortunately, because we should like everybody to

hear them—that no-one would think of listening to a political broadcast then, but they certainly serve their propagandist value well because long before they go over the air the text is sent round to the *Advertiser* to be set up for a front-page story next morning. On this subject, one of the intriguing questions we must ask ourselves is: how does it come about that political broadcasts (I do not think the Premier would deny that they are political broadcasts) are concocted from the files of the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust, the Harbors Board and such organizations when we are always told here by the Premier that those organizations are not responsible to the Government, are not under political control, and are completely divorced from any political apparatus whatsoever? That surely is one of the greatest mysteries of modern science! It is one of the mysteries of the nature which rather agitated the mind of Mr. A. P. Rowe, former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide. Indeed, he wrote a very excellent book entitled *If the Gown Fits*. I believe the House may be interested in a few quotations from it, from which members will soon appreciate that it did not take Mr. Rowe very long to realize, as we all realize, that the Premier and the Government are completely synonymous terms in South Australia. On page 55 of his book Mr. Rowe is telling about an approach he made to the Minister of Education in these words:—

In 1952 I asked the Minister of Education then in office for his support in bringing about a co-operative effort between the Government and the University for the purpose of looking at the whole problem of tertiary education in South Australia, including the question of a second university. The Minister said that this was a matter for the Premier. Nothing in my experience in the British Civil Service had taught me that educational policy was not a matter for a Minister of Education, but I was beginning to learn that the usual processes of government are not operative in South Australia and so I went to the Premier. I remember the occasion well, because it was almost the only one on which the Premier listened sympathetically and without apparent thought of politics.

Mr. Rowe did not know him very well, so I am glad he included the word "apparent." Later, when dealing with the proposed re-organization of the Waite Research Agricultural Institute, Mr. Rowe said:—

I put them (he is apparently referring to his ideas) to the Minister of Agriculture; we found him sympathetic and the State Department of Agriculture took over some of the routine work of the Waite Institute. This was a memorable occasion, since the usual

answer to approaches to Ministers on university matters were words such as, "You had better ask Tom".

On a couple of pages Mr. Rowe deals with what he calls his failure with the Government of South Australia, and says:—

As far as university affairs were concerned, and I suspect in much else besides, the Government of South Australia consisted of its Premier, who had been in power continuously for 20 years. He no doubt impressed visiting industrialists and others who were concerned with matters which interested him but, with one exception, dealing with the Premier on university matters was an experience which many might find incredible. The exception concerned his ready approval of annual budgets which provided for the maintenance of standards prevailing in the universities of the other States. It was indeed fortunate that he found it an intolerable thought that any other State should in any way get ahead of his own.

Even in financial matters, however, the Premier often embarrassed me by announcing publicly that he had never refused the university anything, from which some members of staff naively concluded that I had only to ask and the university would receive. What happened was that the Premier's economic adviser and I annually reached an agreement which was a compromise between what I wanted and what the Treasury would give, and it was this agreed figure which was the basis of the claim, made for political purposes, that the university had been refused nothing.

I had hoped to bring about co-operation between the State Government and the university on the whole question of tertiary education in South Australia, but co-operation involving dual responsibility seemed anathema to the Premier. Having little knowledge of universities or natural sympathy for them, he might have been expected to leave university matters in the hands of the Minister of Education, who was a university graduate. This was not so. It might be thought that he would have sought and taken the advice of Parliamentary members of the council of the university. This did not happen. It might be thought by those familiar with the British scene that a civil service would have advised him on university matters but, except on finance, it was not so. Only the voice of the Premier mattered and the voice was the voice of the politician. Away from South Australia, it is easy to recall only with amusement the answer I received when I asked the Minister of Health to receive a university deputation on the administration of a teaching hospital. A letter, signed by the Minister's Secretary, informed me that "as this is a matter of policy" the Premier would deal with it. It is a strange world in which a Cabinet Minister does not deal with policy in his own department.

We could have told him that a long time ago. The quotation continues:—

A few examples must suffice to show why I look back upon the relations between the Premier and the University of Adelaide with a

certain amount of anger which I trust is righteous. A long-term plan for the integration of secondary and tertiary education was impossible without the co-operation of the State Government and this was not forthcoming. In 1954 it was clear that South Australia was badly lagging in the field of adult education but a letter suggesting a joint investigation by the Government and the university remained unanswered. A grave crisis arose over the naming of a chair. The Council had decided that, instead of there being a Professor of History and Political Science, there should be a Professor of History and a Professor of Politics. The Premier conceived the curious idea that newspaper correspondents would besiege a Professor of Politics for his views on current political matters and declined to approve the necessary legislation. This was a matter involving the freedom of the university to conduct its own affairs and in the battle that raged I had splendid help from the Chancellor, who always rose to an occasion, and from a Parliamentary member of Council. The professorial staff were kept fully informed of events but no offer to help came from them.

On another occasion when the Chairman of the Finance Committee and I called upon the Premier to tell him, as a matter of courtesy, that the university was making a public appeal for funds for improved student facilities, we were told that the matter would need to be put to the Cabinet because the public might think that the Government was not doing enough for the university. The State Government refused to make a contribution to the cost of the new buildings for the students and a letter asking that it should publicly express its sympathy towards the appeal was unanswered. On other occasions, the Premier objected to recommendations of the Public Examinations Board on the teaching of biology in schools and on the broadening of school education in the final school year.

Individually, these few examples of difficulties with the Premier may seem unimportant and I do not find it easy to describe a state of affairs which can hardly exist in many other university communities. I am concerned in this chapter with my failures; and one such failure, and a constant source of frustration, was my inability to bring about the ordinary relationships between a university and a government, working through ministers and civil servants. I believe I tried everything from bootlicking to righteous indignation, but with no result. The Premier and I did not speak the same language, and the language of politics was not one which I was prepared to learn.

The essence of the matter is that in university affairs in South Australia the ordinary processes of government are not operative and I can only hope that by telling my experiences the need for normal procedures will be ventilated. The following is an extract from a letter which in 1955 I drafted, but did not send, to the Minister of Education, from whom I received nothing but courtesy:

"All too often I do not hear of any point of difference until it becomes an issue and the Premier wants to see me. The interviews, except

on budgetary matters, are nearly always unsatisfactory. Neither the Premier nor I have been given the facts or the background. The atmosphere of these talks is usually governed by the Premier's assumption that the university is wrong. I seldom sense that the object is to arrive at the facts and reach a conclusion satisfactory to both. The points discussed have rarely been thrashed out between the Director of Education and his staff and the university staff concerned; nor can I recall knowing your views before these interviews. Moreover, Parliamentary members of the council are not brought into the picture. All this is plain bad organization. I am not inexperienced in dealing with Governments, but the way in which university matters are dealt with by the Premier is new to me and undesirably original."

I am far from thinking that Governments should have no views on the affairs of universities which are largely supported from public funds, but the ordinary processes of co-operation and discussion at various levels cannot lightly be disregarded. Greater men than the Premier of South Australia have not escaped the consequences of too much power for too long.

Members on this side, in listening to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, and those of members opposite, could have been pardoned for imagining that no such problem as inflation existed in Australia. However, I am glad to say that the member for Whyalla, in a very thoughtful and thought-provoking speech last week, gave the subject of inflation the prominence it deserves. The Federal Treasurer recently made one of his more inspired statements to the press, saying that inflation was not any problem at all in Australia today, but that the full Cabinet would meet for two days that week to discuss the problem—a problem which he said did not exist. It was all very nicely timed to coincide with the claims of the Australian Council of Trade Unions to the Arbitration Commission for an increase in the basic wage. From the Federal Cabinet meeting emerged a four-point plan, only two of which points are important: firstly, the virtual abandonment of import restrictions and, secondly, the suggestion to the Arbitration Commission that the economy of the country had not yet digested the last two wage rises, and that it would be most inappropriate for the basic wage to be increased at this time. Let us consider the first point—the virtual abandonment of import restrictions. As honourable members will recall, this has been the on-again and off-again policy ever since the present Federal Government has been in office. One of its very first actions when it took control of the Treasury benches was to completely abolish the import licensing system then in

force. Members will recall that, during the latter days of the Chifley Government there was an import licensing system that had been responsible over the years for building up our overseas balances to previously unparalleled heights, and it allowed into the country those things that were needed for the expansion and proper development of our country but kept out things that were of no use in an expanding economy. Those restrictions were completely abolished almost immediately after the Menzies-Fadden Government took office with the result that all sorts of useless junk and trash were imported into Australia.

The Government suddenly woke up when practically the whole of our overseas reserves were dissipated and then suddenly and savagely clamped down import restrictions more brutally than they had ever been applied under the Chifley Government. This had the effect of keeping out not only the trash but also the many things we needed to bring in to help our expanding economy, and it also had the effect of ruining many businesses that had been built up on imports alone. Since then it has been "on again, off again" on several occasions. Even on this occasion we have not been told how long there will be a virtual "free go" in imports, a fact that has been remarked upon already by many importers who are wondering whether they are going to build up businesses on these imports and then suddenly have restrictions clamped down on them again. Once again we are not told whether this policy will be constant or whether it will be on one day and off the next.

Mr. Bywaters—We have a fair idea, though.

Mr. JENNINGS—We have a fair idea from the history of the thing. Whilst I certainly do not agree with clamping down one day and giving a "free go" the next, I do believe that in an economy like ours, where we have only our exports to pay for our imports and where our exports are the kind that are subject to all sorts of seasonal fluctuations, we must maintain some permanent control over our imports. Also, we know that we must insist when necessary on restricting our imports to those things that a quickly expanding economy like ours needs to help in its expansion and if necessary, whilst looking at our overseas reserves position, keep out of the country by a licensing system those things that will not contribute even a little to our economy.

Mr. Shannon—That sounds good, but what would you do about Japan, one of our biggest wool buyers? Would you restrict it?

Mr. JENNINGS—Certainly.

Mr. Shannon—In what things? Would you let textiles in?

Mr. JENNINGS—I am not going to give a list. The next point, and the most important considering the time of this great statement about inflation, was that the Government was going to suggest to the Arbitration Court that the economy of the country had not had time to digest the previous year's increase in the basic wage or the marginal increases. The point—and it is not a new point with the present Federal and South Australian Governments—apparently is that the inflation that has occurred with such remarkable rapidity since the end of the war is to be got over always by breaking down the conditions of the ordinary wage earners. They are apparently the only people we expect to fight the bogey of inflation. We were told that, when the quarterly cost of living adjustments were abolished, that would allow the economy to settle down and then a proper assessment could be made by the Arbitration Commission, perhaps once each year, and, if necessary, wages could be raised accordingly. But, of course, that did not happen, and we knew it could not happen because price rises were never caused by rises in quarterly adjustments in the basic wage. Indeed, anyone who took the slightest interest in the subject knew that the quarterly adjustments were made only to compensate belatedly the wage earner for rises that had already occurred, so how this new system was going to have any effect whatever on inflation was something we found hard to understand. It has had no effect on inflation, of course, but has only meant that the worker has not received compensation for price rises and, when he gets some compensation, it is much more belated than it used to be. Of course, on this occasion he has not received any compensation because of this suggestion, as it is euphemistically called, made to the Arbitration Commission. The Premier must be very proud indeed that he has played such a wonderful part in the fight against inflation by being the Premier of the only State to go before the Arbitration Commission and oppose any increase in the basic wage despite the tremendous increases that have occurred in the cost of living over the last year.

Mr. Clark—Do you think the result will be that all prices will now remain static?

Mr. JENNINGS—Of course they will not, and I do not see how extra imports will have the slightest effect on inflation. We know that all the imports will be under the control of very few distributors and that they will be able to control the prices just as they control the prices of locally produced articles. I can envisage that it will not be long before we go up the street and see that imported articles are dearer than those manufactured in Australia, but we will be told that the imported article is worth more because it is imported. As the member for Albert said, we must realize that no genuine competition exists today and that the prices of things are worked out mainly according to how much these people think they can reasonably squeeze out of us. It will not matter whether the article is produced in Australia or Afghanistan.

Mr. Hall—Do you think a 35-hour week would fight inflation?

Mr. JENNINGS—I think it would; it would be a great help to me, anyway. I shall not answer any interjections made by the member for Gouger, who thinks that the Victorian "border" pays rent. Probably the most important matter facing the State today is decentralization. It is a matter that concerns every member on this side of the House whether he represents a metropolitan or a country district, but apparently it does not concern members opposite irrespective of whether they represent a country or metropolitan district. After all, they have had a majority in this House for years and have done nothing whatever about the problem. They show not the slightest inclination to do anything about it and, indeed, have resisted any attempt from this side to have the problem properly investigated. The other day we heard the member for Rocky River, in his spirited defence of his own representation, taking to task a section of his electorate for some criticisms it had made. The astonishing thing is that the real point made by the honourable member was not that those criticisms were not justified but rather that these people, bad as their conditions were, were not nearly as badly off as people all around them. It will not be very long before we shall have a scale of priority for discontent, and a member will have to stick religiously to that scale of priority when he is criticizing the Government.

Mr. Heaslip—The statements I was referring to were inaccurate.

Mr. JENNINGS—This sort of thing comes from a Party which has the temerity to call

itself the Liberal and Country League. It would be far better known as the illiberal and anti-country league. It has presided for years over the gradual deterioration and denudation of the country districts of this State, until today our country people generally are, by comparison with the city people, infinitely worse off than they were 30 years ago.

Mr. Hall—Utter rubbish!

Mr. JENNINGS—I said “by comparison.” They are worse off in opportunities to make a living off the land.

Mr. Heaslip—Why don't you talk about things you know something about?

Mr. JENNINGS—They are worse off in educational opportunities, and in the chance of employment in their own districts where they were born and bred.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Why do you say they are worse off in educational opportunities?

Mr. JENNINGS—They certainly are worse off in that respect compared with people in the city, and they are worse off as regards the ordinary amenities of life that are denied them under this Government.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Is that why you want to take away their representation?

Mr. JENNINGS—My next comment will, I think, answer the Premier's interjection. The only consolation these country people now have is a much greater share of a member of Parliament who does not care two hoots about them anyway.

Mr. Heaslip—You want to take that away, too.

Mr. JENNINGS—We know that the Government is afraid to decentralize, because if it did it would not be the Government very much longer. That is why the supporters of the Government remain silent, that and the other reason which is that, in the main, Government members represent that very small section in country areas which is not worse off as a result of the present drift—the fewer and fewer people who own more and more land. It is not yet too late. There are still remaining in country areas enough people with the interests of the State at heart to defeat Government candidates in country seats. A gradual awakening has taken place. Wallaroo and Mount Gambier were sign-posts along the way, and next Saturday Light will point in the same direction. The cult of the individual, the pomp, the vainglory and the neglect, and, above all, the tyranny of the last two decades will be broken forever.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (Eyre)—I join with members who have spoken previously in congratulating Her Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip on the birth of their third child. Although probably I shall never meet Princess Margaret or her future husband, I congratulate them on their engagement. I add my few words of praise to our late Governor and his lady for the excellent way in which they carried out their duties while in this State, particularly for the way they visited country people and called on almost every country town. I also add my congratulations to Sir Cecil Hincks, the Minister of Lands, and his good lady on Sir Cecil's good fortune in being knighted in the New Year Honors List. Perhaps nobody in the State deserved the honour more than the present Minister of Lands.

I add my word of condolence to Mrs. Hambour and her family on the passing of our late colleague, the member for Light. Mr. Hambour and I came into this House at the same election, and during our time together in Parliament we were on the very best of terms. Mr. Hambour endeared himself to all members on both sides of the House. We very much regret his passing at his age and at this stage of his political career.

I do not think it wise to criticize members opposite, whether they be good or bad, for I think such a course sometimes shows that a member has not very much to speak about and that it is a certain sign that he has not gone fully into his subject. I therefore do not intend to criticize any member. I wish to briefly bring before members the disabilities that parts of my electorate now suffer. I realize that we in the country cannot have everything, but there are some things we think we should have. We know we have more members in the country than the Opposition has; in fact, we are always being told about it.

Fire bans have often been imposed in the country, particularly on Eyre Peninsula. During this last year large areas of scrub had been logged preparatory to burning, and it was one of the best seasons for burning on Eyre Peninsula in the history of South Australia. Natural breaks existed for miles around some of the scrub that had been logged, yet on the best burning days the settlers were not permitted to burn because a fire ban had been imposed. One councillor in the Ceduna area told me that 15,000 acres of unburned scrub in his district should have been burned during the previous summer. I think that perhaps in many instances more authority could be given to district councils who understand the position

in their respective localities. They understand the man they are dealing with; they know what the weather conditions are like; and they understand the position generally regarding clearing scrub in their own districts. Perhaps the responsible Minister could go into the matter with people on Eyre Peninsula and arrive at some conclusion beneficial to the people who wish to burn their scrub.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—We are looking at the Act now and considering that matter.

Mr. BOCKELBERG.—Some of the best parts of this country in question have never been developed. Details which I have of the area reserved for fauna and flora on Eyre Peninsula indicate that almost 250,000 acres of some of the best land in the central part of Eyre Peninsula is so reserved. Thousands and thousands of acres of useless country on Eyre Peninsula where rabbits and foxes are able to breed could be used to grow shrubs. That would enable the best parts of the country to be used for agricultural purposes instead of for flora and fauna. I ask the responsible authority to investigate this matter and try to arrange that some of the flora and fauna country be taken up for agricultural purposes because land may be needed for that purpose soon. In this House we hear much about centralization but here is a wonderful opportunity for those young men who have had experience on the land to take up country in their own district.

I support the member for Rocky River in his warning to farmers, particularly young farmers, about bad seasons like the present one. So many of them have enjoyed beneficial seasons that they have overlooked the fact that the bad seasons must come. Some of them, in spite of warnings from the older generation, have neglected to conserve fodder, which is necessary on sheep-carrying properties in this State. Members heard a great oration on decentralization from the member for Enfield, but his comments do not apply to all parts of the State.

Mr. Lawn—You never hear an oration on decentralization from your side of the House.

Mr. BOCKELBERG.—The honourable member would not know because he has never been past Gawler. Decentralization does not come into the picture on Eyre Peninsula because the population is growing in leaps and bounds. The number of school children has doubled in the past 10 years. Homes are being erected in all the small towns from Penong to Port Lincoln and the Government has advanced large sums so that electricity lines may be laid to

the remoter places. It is doing everything possible to encourage decentralization. People all over the world will make for the big cities and that trend will occur despite attempts to combat it. The same position applies here and I have not seen many members of the Opposition going to live in the country.

Mr. O'Halloran—More than half of them do now.

Mr. BOCKELBERG.—Some of them live here. Water is fast becoming a problem in this State and, unfortunately, the only certain source of water is the Murray River. The Minister of Works tells me that at present a quantity of 553,000,000 gallons of water is in the Tod reservoir on Eyre Peninsula. With the population growing and with water being reticulated throughout the country, that quantity will be used in a short time and if the next season is as bad as the present we are going to be in difficulty. I urge the Government to do everything possible to develop the Lincoln basin so that the water position on Eyre Peninsula may be more assured. Districts like Kimba and Darke Peak are without a reticulated water supply and depend on rainwater which has not proved very reliable over the last season.

A speech from the member for Eyre would not be complete if I did not refer to the Eyre Highway. Fortunately, progress has been made on the highway, most of the road has been surveyed for bituminizing, and I have been informed that Cabinet has discussed it. The estimated cost of 600 miles of road is £7,200,000, provided material is available on the route. I understand that, because of the development anticipated in Iron Knob over the next few years, a road will be constructed from Whyalla to Iron Knob. I ask that this work should not interfere with the work on the road from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob on the Eyre Highway. The Eyre Highway serves the people of Western Australia and it is the only route between their State and the eastern States. This road therefore becomes a Federal matter, because it is only right and proper that Western Australia should have one highway connecting it with the eastern States. I urge this Government and the Federal Government to confer and to see that a road is constructed between Western Australia and the eastern States. I hope that if this work is started soon the road will be completed in two or three years.

I congratulate the Minister of Education and the officers of his department for the way they have attended to the education of the children on the far west coast and on Eyre Peninsula

in particular. I hope that the promised Kimba area school becomes an established fact soon. Localities in that area have had transport problems but officers in charge of this branch are fast overcoming the problems and most of the children will soon be carried to school.

I draw the attention of the Minister of Works to jetties on Eyre Peninsula. Recently a jetty that was being used by local residents at Smoky Bay was partly demolished and a buttress erected, which prevented people from going out on the jetty beyond a depth of water of 2ft. 6in. at low tide. People come to this area to fish and to spend their holidays, and they have been debarred from traversing the full length of that jetty because the few pounds necessary to repair it has not been forthcoming. The only way that they could go down the jetty would be if they repaired it themselves. I think that before things of this nature are done the people in the district should be consulted and should be enabled to have some small say in alterations being made to the amenities in the district.

A short time ago I asked a question about the gypsum deposits at Streaky Bay. I hope the Government will develop that deposit so that some industry may be developed in that part of the State. A few weeks ago I was fortunate enough to see the developments at Port Adelaide, and I congratulate the members for Port Adelaide and Semaphore on the money being spent in their districts. The sandhills in those districts are being carted away to be used somewhere else. Later, when the development has been accomplished, we may have one of the finest ports in Australia, if not in the whole world. I congratulate the people responsible on working so industriously and carrying out the plans as they are doing at present. I support the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—Unlike other speakers, I oppose the motion. I join with other members in expressing sorrow that once again we have a vacancy amongst members because of the death of Mr. Hambour. I always looked forward to his speaking in this House, perhaps more so than any other member. We disagreed with each other frequently, and interjected many times, but always within the Standing Orders, when the other was speaking. I think the only time that we agreed was on the hire-purchase legislation. I supported his amendment and I think he supported one or two of ours. Although we disagreed frequently in this House, I found him outside to be most friendly.

Mr. Millhouse—You agreed with him on price control legislation?

Mr. LAWN—He may have agreed with the Opposition on that matter. During all my conversations with him I never heard him speak ill of anyone. I always felt that he would go out of his way to do someone a good turn. I was considerably shocked when on the Saturday morning I received a telephone message about his death. I went inside my house to answer the call, thinking it to be the usual type of call, but I could not speak when I was told of his passing. I join with other members in offering the sincere sympathy of myself and my family to the family of the late honourable member. Earlier this year I spoke to my colleagues about the reshuffling of seats on this side of the House, and at the time it was said that the seat between mine and Mr. Fred Walsh's should be kept available in case a vacancy amongst members had to be filled. I thought it would be proper to have that seat available for a new representative of the Labor Party, but I hope we shall have no more vacancies this session.

I welcome back to the House the Minister of Education, who has been absent through sickness. I congratulate him, and the department, on the innovation this year of providing transport for retarded children. With other members I have for years been pressing the Government to provide that transport because of the difficulties experienced by parents in getting these children to and from school. In most cases the difficulty had to be faced by the mother. I referred previously to one mother who used to put her child on the back of her bicycle and because of the swaying of the bicycle by the child, who was enjoying the ride, the mother injured her back. Other mothers have suffered from high blood pressure. Private motor cars and public transport had to be used, and often it meant transferring from tram to tram or from tram to bus. I have received letters from mothers expressing thanks for the department's move in providing the transport, which is available to them at a reasonable cost. One mother had to travel 100 miles a week in taking her child to and from school. Now she is freed of it, because the child is picked up at the door and brought back again.

In December of last year I took up with the Minister of Education the matter of the insurance of school children, but I believe that he misunderstood my letter. I regret that he is not in the Chamber at the moment. I

submitted a case of an accident to a child in August. The doctor's account was rendered in September, the father telephoned the insurance company about particulars the company required, and afterwards the father received a claim form, which he filled in and returned to the company. On November 11 the company sent to the father a receipt form that it wanted signed and delivered to the office of the company before any payment would be made. I have always been taught to give a receipt when payment is made. I would not expect to get a receipt for what I owed until I paid the money. It was a receipt and discharge voucher that the company wanted signed. The father was to free the company of all liability before it would make any payment. Later he thought the company had paid the doctor direct, and that would have been satisfactory, but the father received the cheque, attached to an undated letter, from the company on the day after the school broke up for holidays. Parents should not have to sign receipts and discharge vouchers before the company makes payment. The entire transaction should be completed at the same time. It seems that the company withheld the cheque until the school vacation began because this voucher and receipt was returned to the company on November 12 and the company's cheque was not sent out until December 16. A similar situation could have applied to all accidents and I requested the Minister to investigate the position, but his eventual reply was that it was a matter over which the department had no control. As these insurance forms were distributed to parents through departmental schools I expected the Minister to give more attention to the matter than he did.

I compliment the Adelaide City Council on the work it is doing in the park lands, although this work could have been done in past years. The council should not have to foot the entire bill and the Government should provide financial assistance. I have heard favourable comment from people living outside the council's area on the changes that are taking place. Although the park lands are being improved and tram lines are being removed from the city, the parking problem remains. All available parking space in the city is occupied during the day as is parking space on the roads leading into the city. Although for some years it has been rumoured that the council might provide a parking station over the Central Market, I believe the Government, possibly through the

Railways Department, could largely overcome the problem by erecting a concrete cover above the Adelaide Railway Station yard to provide parking space for hundreds of vehicles in a central position. Such a car park would be revenue-producing.

Mr. Jennings—There would be no smoke difficulties now that there are fewer steam trains.

Mr. LAWN—That is so. However, I did not visualize any difficulties through smoke because I believe it could be taken out. The department's revenue would be increased considerably.

Mr. Quirke—You could interest private enterprise in the proposition.

Mr. LAWN—There is no need to interest private enterprise in it.

Mr. Hall—It would save Government funds if private enterprise were interested in it.

Mr. LAWN—Such parking space would be revenue-producing, so why should not we invest Government funds? The honourable member believes in private enterprise investing money for profit: he believes in R.I.P.—rent, interest and profit. Why should not the department profit? The Government provides money for the railways to develop the State for the benefit of the people, including the electors of Gouger, at an apparent loss. Why should we let the Government do that and then say, "Here is an opportunity to use railway property and make a profit; let private enterprise have the benefit of it?"

Mr. Hall—You would have that much more money to spend on Government activities.

Mr. LAWN—Rubbish! In providing such parking there would be no cost, apart from the initial expenditure, and if the department made an annual profit of £500,000 the Government would be relieved to that extent in its annual grant to the department. Surely that makes sense? I hope that the Government, if not the Railways Department, will consider that because I think it is worth investigating.

There has been another instance where I have availed myself of the opportunity that the Premier has given to honourable members, where they receive complaints, to send them on to him for investigation. This is another case concerning the hire-purchase racket. Even this afternoon I was called out to interview a person involved in a hire-purchase transaction. His story is that through unemployment he missed two payments on a motor car; the firm concerned came and took the car away without asking him about it; it was towed away and he was not even asked for the keys. He went

in four days later to pay the arrears and was advised that the car had been sold. Other used car dealers advise him that they usually wait 28 days after repossession of a car before selling. However, the position is that there is no law governing this. If it were something concerning a trade union or a workman, if the position were reversed and the person who was interviewing me did something like that, no doubt plenty of laws could be found to cover him for his action.

Mr. Riches—He has no equity at all.

Mr. LAWN—In this case the individual has no equity at all. Private enterprise has free rein to do what it likes. However, I have advised him to send me a letter that I can send on to the Premier for investigation. As a matter of fact, he was sent to me by the solicitor he consulted, who told him that there was no redress whatsoever for him in our courts. He said, "The only thing you can do is go and see your member of Parliament, to see what he can do about it." I am waiting for that letter to come. I will send it on to the Premier and in due course will receive his reply, as others do. The member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) has been in the same position as I am. He sent on cases like this to the Premier and received a similar reply to the one I received.

In another case I have not yet received the Premier's reply, but I want to mention it to have it on record that these instances are mentioned in this House and the Government is not prepared to take any action.

Mr. Hall—Did you say other dealers waited 28 days? I missed what you said.

Mr. LAWN—I said that this man who interviewed me went in four days later and the car had been sold. Other dealers have told him that they wait 28 days—at least, one other dealer said so. There is nothing to make it obligatory on him; he can please himself. One dealer said, "I wait 28 days after repossession before selling." I have been in touch with the company in this particular instance and can do nothing for him. The car was sold within four days after repossession. The man was out of work. As regards these hire-purchase agreements for the purchase of a car, I myself was involved in taking out an insurance policy against my own will. I was forced to take out an insurance policy with the company that the hire-purchase company nominated, and I had to make additional payments in case I lost wages through unemployment or sickness—and I am a member of Parliament! If I were away sick, my salary would be paid just

the same, as long as I was a member of Parliament, yet I was forced to pay additional premiums for this insurance policy I did not need. I asked the man, "What about yourself?" He does not know. I have told him to consult his solicitor to see what papers he has signed.

Mr. Hall—Was not this matter about choice of insurance dealt with in the new Bill?

Mr. LAWN—I do not know about the new Bill. The honourable member might have more inside information than I have.

Mr. Quirke—The honourable member meant last year's Bill.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. The Bill before the House last year was defeated because the member for Light, the late Mr. Hambour, succeeded in getting an amendment through in this House to provide for a deposit. That is why the Bill was suspended in the Legislative Council. This is a case that I have sent on to the Premier, dated March 24. I need not read the letter at length but I will state the figures. The person in question bought a television set from a place at Enfield the cash price of which was 169 guineas. After he had paid £53 5s. some trouble developed. He got the firm to look at it, and they told him that for some reason it would be much better for him to get another set because if they repaired that set something else would go wrong. So he bought another set, which cost 225 guineas cash, less the £53 5s. First of all, let me say that the set he purchased cost 169 guineas cash, and the price on the hire-purchase agreement was £311 5s. After he had paid £53 5s., he took another television set costing 225 guineas cash, less the amount he had paid leaving a balance of £225 or thereabouts, to which were added £109 charges plus £40 insurance and maintenance, making a total of £424.

Mr. Jennings—Does the Government think these things cause inflation?

Mr. LAWN—These are facts that the Government could well look at before sending a representative to the Arbitration Court to try to save a few shillings rise in the basic wage. The Commonwealth Statistician tells us that in South Australia we are still 6s. below the cost of living figures, and yet the Government sends a representative to the Arbitration Court to say, "If you want 6s. a week increase for basic wage earners in South Australia it will cause inflation."

Mr. Quirke—Did he want a television set that badly?

Mr. LAWN—I do not know the answer to that but, just after he commenced payments on the second set, his wife said, “Why go and pay all these charges and interest; why don’t you pay cash?” He said, “All right.” He wrote a letter to the firm concerned and he showed me the reply, which was that they wanted £280 5s. Only a few days before this it was 225 guineas cash, less the £53 5s. that he had paid on the previous set. A few days later he said, “How much will you charge for cash?” They said, “£280 5s.” I have sent that letter on to the Premier. That is big business; that is private enterprise, and private enterprise has all the supporters in the world on the other side of the House. You mustn’t touch these sorts of deals by private enterprise! That letter was sent on to the Premier; and it is dated March 24. In the *Advertiser* of March 24 appeared the following court report regarding the purchase of a television set:—

“The defendant entered into a hire-purchase agreement with H. G. Palmer Pty. Ltd., for a TV set, on October 10, 1959,” said Sergeant L. E. Samuels, prosecuting a 28 year old man, charged with false pretences. The cash price for the set was £198 0s. 9d., said the prosecutor. On completion of the agreement the defendant was indebted for £366 19s. the charges that he would have had to pay over the next five years. The magistrate, interposing, noted that the agreement involved the payment to the company of £168 above the cash price for the set.

The magistrate could do nothing about it, but thought it worth mentioning because he considered that the charge was too high. That is the way the public are being treated. I notice that a new organization, about which I had heard nothing before, has published a set of figures regarding price increases since the 1950’s and mentioned that from 1950 to 1955 there were galloping increases. I well remember in December, 1949, the present Prime Minister said that he would put value back into the pound, and in 1948 our Premier said that he could and would control prices. No doubt his Government could, but it never intended to. Last year I mentioned that there had been increases in the prices of ham, beef and other small goods during the first six months of the year, and that was before there was an increase in the basic wage of 15s., which commenced in June, but the following week the prices of those goods were advanced and the reason given was the increase in wages. I have before me articles by Professor Copland; and honourable members opposite will not say that he is a Labor Professor of Economics. I can remember the

days when he was used in the Arbitration Court against the trade union movement in support of employers. He has recently said there was nothing to worry about in inflation and that wage increases would not cause inflation.

There was an article in the *News* of April 7 under the heading “Don’t fear inflation” and there was included a cartoon of Professor Copland. We all know that price increases have taken place and that last year the Arbitration Court increased the basic wage by 15s., because of those increases, but the basic wage in South Australia is still 6s. below the cost of living figures, taking into account that the court in 1953 suspended quarterly adjustments. The court then said and has always said that it never fixes a wage which it considers should meet family requirements, but what in its opinion is the highest wage the economy of the country can afford to pay. Government members might tell me that I must respect the judiciary. They are learned men, and I do respect them. In the main they have been appointed by Liberal Governments. Last year they said that the economy of the country could stand a 28 per cent increase in margins. We then saw wholesale movements in salaries and wages and the Commonwealth and the Victorian Governments increased salaries and wages.

I will now devote a few minutes to the salaries paid to members of Parliament in South Australia and compare them with those paid in other States. All my life I have been fighting for someone. When I worked in industry I always wanted my full entitlement provided by the award. Later I became a union official and it was then my job to appear in court and present the case on behalf of my members for a review of wages because of the nature of their work. Until I became a member of this Parliament I always had the right to appear before some tribunal, and all the members of my union still have that right. I now find myself in a Parliament dominated by the Liberal Party, which has consistently done its best to depress wages and worsen conditions.

Mr. Jennings—It has depressed everyone.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and I found that out last week when I was in the district of Light, where the people are hoping for a change of Parliamentary representation. Some people there said that they had voted Liberal all their lives but would now welcome a change. When the Vehicle Builders’ Union

obtained the 44-hour week from the Arbitration Court, its members at Islington Workshops were working under a State award. Afterwards when it was granted the 44-hour week the Government appealed to the court and opposed the judgment, and had it upset. This Government has consistently opposed wage increases in the courts, and was the only State Government to oppose the unions in the Arbitration Court case last year; for years it has opposed any increase in the basic wage, and is the only State Government to have done that. South Australia was the last State to obtain the 44-hour week and also the 40-hour week by legislation, and as regards sick leave and other provisions in favour of the workers we have always been the last. Now I find that the Premier, his Ministers, and members of Parliament in South Australia are the worst paid in the Commonwealth, and that of course is the result of the depressing attitude adopted by the Government. I have made a comparison of the salaries paid to our Speaker, the Premier, his Ministers, and members of Parliament, with those of similar persons in other State Parliaments. When I worked in or was associated with industry, if men did not get what their counterparts obtained under some other award or in some other State they were called "scabs." In the trades union movement we want equality. If a tradesman can get a 36s. margin in Melbourne, Sydney, or other States, those in South Australia want the same margin. That applies to all types of labour, and the Arbitration Court has agreed. Although there may be different basic wages in various States, as far as I know all tribunals have accepted the argument of the trades union movement that tradesmen of a similar group—fitters, carpenters, etc.—should receive the same margin irrespective of which State they are working in. The process worker, irrespective of whether he works in South Australia, Western Australia, or anywhere else, gets the same margin.

Following on the 28 per cent marginal increases last year some departmental heads, and even bank managers in the city, received more money than the Premier and other Ministers, and increases were granted in the Public Service. Although I am certain in my own mind that the Public Service Board did not apply the 28 per cent it did provide increases. I have heard references inside and outside this House to the fact that our departmental heads are receiving more than Ministers, and the same

thing applies in this House. The *Government Gazette* of March 31 sets out the decision of the Public Service Board. Some of the salaries paid to officers in the House are set out. They are more than those paid to members and some are not in their proper position compared with others. I think our library staff is underpaid, but the Librarian's salary was increased from £1,950 to £2,115, the Assistant Librarian's from £1,530 to £1,655, the Library Assistant's from £1,016 to £1,075, the Clerks' of both Houses from £2,640 to £2,850 and the Clerk Assistants' from £2,010 to £2,180. I am not sure whether the messengers have received increases yet, but I know that the domestic staff is shockingly paid. I do not know that the salaries of the domestic staff have been adjusted yet, but they will be. I am not making this statement to condemn anybody, as there will be some adjustments, but these salaries are out of all proportion to what they should be and to what would be paid by private enterprise; and that applies, of course, to members.

I have prepared a chart comparing the salaries paid in the different States. In New South Wales the Premier receives £7,000; in Victoria, £7,850; in South Australia, £4,250; in Queensland, £4,452; in Western Australia, a claimant State, £5,030; and in Tasmania, £4,232. Deputy Premiers receive the following salaries: New South Wales, £5,550; Victoria, £5,500; South Australia, £4,000 (this is the Chief Secretary's salary, as we have not a Deputy Premier); Western Australia, £4,480; Tasmania, £1,100 in addition to salary as a member. I have not the figures for Queensland. The following table shows the salaries paid to Ministers:—

State.	Salary.
	£
New South Wales	4,750 (City) 5,050 (Country)
Victoria	3,500 (Plus £600 expenses)
South Australia	3,750
Queensland	3,702
Western Australia	4,100 (City) 4,350 (Country)
Tasmania	2,382 (Senior ministers, plus allowances from £650 to £800)
	1,882 (Junior ministers, plus allowances)

I turn now to salaries paid to members. In New South Wales a metropolitan member receives £2,350 plus £650 allowances. In that State there are three higher scales for country members or semi-country members; the same

base salary of £2,350 is paid, plus an allowance of £750, £850 or £950. In Victoria the base salary is £2,000 plus £550 to a metropolitan member, £750 to an urban member, £850 to an inner country member and £950 to an outer country member. In addition to this, country members receive an allowance of £3 3s. for every sitting day. The base salary in South Australia is £1,900, and a £250 allowance is granted to metropolitan members, £300 to some country members and £325 to the rest. The member for the Gawler electorate, which is recognized in the Constitution Act as a country electorate, receives £250, the same as is paid to metropolitan members, yet the member for Gawler has to travel to and from Gawler. He has either to buy a car and pay running expenses or to travel in some other way; he is inconvenienced and he has to travel and telephone all that way to the city; yet he receives no more than I receive as a metropolitan member. I ask members to compare the country allowances with the city allowance. It is ridiculous to suggest that a country member can come to the city when the House is sitting and pay his board for only £75, which is the difference between the highest and lowest allowance. I know that many country members come to the city even when the House is not in session, for I have been with them in the rooms and have heard them transacting business on the telephone on behalf of their constituents. Those members have made special trips to Adelaide. I know the late member for Light made numerous visits to the Electricity Trust querying accounts or seeking the adjustment of accounts on behalf of his constituents. Those members receive only £75 a year more than the metropolitan members.

The Queensland members receive £2,512 plus allowances varying from £65 to £400. In Western Australia, where the salaries have recently been adjusted, members receive £2,180, and country members an additional £50. The allowances in Western Australia have also recently been adjusted and provide for £450 for a city member, and £600, £650 and £700 for country members. Those amounts are automatically adjusted according to the cost of living figures. Tasmanian members in the Lower House receive £1,382 plus allowances varying from £500 to £800. In the Legislative Council the members receive the same salary but their allowances vary from £250 to £550.

I turn now to the Leader of the Opposition. In New South Wales, the Leader receives an allowance of £1,000 plus an additional expense

allowance of £500. The Deputy Leader receives an allowance of £400. Those figures are additional to the base salary. In Victoria, the Leader of the Opposition receives an additional allowance of £1,500 plus an expense allowance of £600, and the Deputy Leader receives an extra £500 plus an expense allowance of £125. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in most States receives more than our Leader, who is paid an additional £500 but no expense allowance. In Queensland, the Leader of the Opposition receives £3,001 10s., and in Western Australia the Leader in the Lower House receives an additional £700. I will refer presently to another Western Australian Act which provides specifically for reimbursement of expenses. The Deputy Leader in the Lower House in Western Australia receives an additional £400, and the Leader in the Legislative Council receives the same. In Tasmania (a claimant State) the Leader of the Opposition receives an additional £1,000 and the Deputy Leader an additional £300.

I now turn to the Speakers in the various Parliaments. The Speaker in South Australia receives an additional £850. In New South Wales he receives an additional £900 plus an expense allowance of £250. Members know that just as we have to entertain so do the Speaker and the President of our Houses of Parliament, yet we in this State do not provide for such allowances. The Speaker in Victoria receives an additional £1,100 plus an expense allowance of £275. In Tasmania he receives a straight out expense allowance of £500. In Queensland the total amount payable is £3,251 10s. and in Western Australia it is £2,550.

We all know the important part a Whip plays in the life of the Parliament. A Whip is more important to a Government than to an Opposition, but the person occupying that position is playing a most important part in the life of Parliament. I will not go into his duties now, but it is well known how vital it is both to the Government and the Opposition that the Whip does his job thoroughly. In New South Wales, the Whips, both Government and Opposition, receive an additional £350 and an expense allowance of £100, making a total of £450. In Victoria, the Government Whip receives an allowance of £225 and the Opposition Whip an allowance of £150. In South Australia the Whips receive no additional payment, but the Government, realizing the value of its Whip, makes him a small allowance out of Ministers' meagre allowances to which I have already

referred. I shall not mention the amount because it is a private transaction made by the Government Ministers, who should not have to take such a course. To all intents and purposes the Ministers receive certain allowances for carrying out their duties, but out of those allowances they are making some payment to the Whip in recognition of the important part he plays in looking after the Government's interests. In Tasmania both the Government and the Opposition Whips receive an expense allowance of £150, and in Queensland they both receive a total salary of £2,601 10s.

When we as an Opposition meet, the first person we elect, naturally, is our Leader. The Government Party does the same. The second person the Opposition elects is the Deputy Leader, who only recently was awarded an additional £250, whereas members of a committee in this Parliament are receiving an additional £400 a year for their duties. The third man we elect is our Whip, and he receives nothing for the duties he carries out. After his election we elect our committees. The Leader of the Opposition in South Australia should receive an allowance approximating that of New South Wales and Victoria, and the Deputy Leader should be on a salary midway between that amount and the amount payable to members of our committees. The Whip on this side of the House and the Government Whip should receive an additional amount of not less than that paid to members of the Public Works Standing Committee.

Under the separate Western Australian Act dealing with reimbursement of expenses the Premier receives a further £300 and the Deputy Premier a further £200. The Leader of the Opposition receives another £150, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition £90 and the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council £90. Ministers receive another £170, the Speaker another £120, the Government Whip another £200 and the Opposition Whip another £150.

Mr. Quirke—What is that for?

Mr. LAWN—It is a special reimbursement of expenses the Government of Western Australia believes the persons incur. Briefly summarizing, the figures I have given show that our Premier receives £18 above the lowest paid Premier in Australia who is the Premier of Tasmania. Is that the value the Premier places on himself? We hear much publicity about what he is doing for the State. South Australia provides for a Ministerial group but, when we consider that the Government or the Ministers

provide for the Government Whip, our Premier is the lowest paid in Australia. I disagree with the Premier politically but I say that he is worth the same as the Premier of New South Wales. I have advocated that policy all my life. He is doing in South Australia the same job as Mr. Bolte is doing in Victoria. If I made the statement in the Arbitration Court that the Premier of South Australia does the same job as the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria do in their States I would be successful in my advocacy.

I go further and say that our Premier receives less than a Federal member. I have already compared his position with that of a person doing a similar job in other States but as Premier, he receives less than Federal members because country members of the Federal House of Representatives receive £3,800 and metropolitan members £3,600. Senators receive £3,550 and all Federal members receive £4 a day additional when in Canberra.

Mr. Jennings—And when travelling between their homes and Canberra.

Mr. LAWN—Not only do they get paid that money for travelling but air transport is provided for them. Should a bush fire occur in the Millicent or Mount Gambier district the only way for the member to get to the scene in an emergency is by aeroplane but there is no provision made for him to do that. He must either go by railway or pay his own fares by air or car. Federal members receive handsome air transport provisions and we have seen some comment on how they use their overseas travel warrants. South Australian members receive nothing additional apart from what I have stated. When I have explained that to people they have said members are able to purchase goods more cheaply, but I am not able to buy goods wholesale as some people suggest I can. Trades unions deal with certain firms and people and arrange for discounts and I am able to get exactly the same discount as other members of the union. Other unions could make the same provisions for their members. Anyone buying goods worth £1 or more from Myer's can get 2½ per cent discount and I get no more than any other person.

The salary of the Premier of this State does not compare favourably with that of Federal back benchers. Prior to my coming here, and since I have been here, I have advocated that if an employer requires an employee to use his private motor car or to have a telephone or an office in his home to be used on the employer's business the employer should pay for it.

Mr. Jennings—That is common business practice anyway.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and all businesses do it. The Government even does it because certain public servants run their private cars and receive 11d. a mile when using them on official business. Members in this House are employed by the people of South Australia, but they have to purchase and run their own motor car, to pay their own telephone account and to entertain and do all the other things needed out of their salary or out of £250 a year. It is impossible to do those things from that sum. Some members travel 24,000 miles a year on Parliamentary business. The member for Burra said, a year or two ago, that he was doing 20,000 miles a year and other members have stated that they travel 24,000. I travel 11,000 miles a year and 85 or 86 per cent of that is on official business and I keep records and submit that figure to the Taxation Commissioner. One Government member told me (and in doing so told some of his fellow members) that his first year in Parliament cost him £1,700. That figure probably included election expenses. It is common for my wife to tell me, when I arrive home, that there have been telephone messages and that the callers have asked that I call them back. It costs me 4d. to make each call. This sort of thing happens more to a country member than a metropolitan member, and I understand that his calls cost from 6s. upwards. When an employee entertains in connection with his employer's business he receives an allowance for it. Members here have to meet all these expenses out of their pockets. We get requests for donations. Members are invited to all sorts of functions. I have received invitations from organizations I did not know existed, and I doubt whether they knew that I existed. Members are also asked to open flower shows and fetes, and, in addition to making donations, the member and his wife are expected to make purchases. I do not go to many of these functions but I know that the members for Edwardstown and West Torrens do. I get many appeals for donations and am expected to meet them. This matter should be reviewed in a better way than in the past. A former Agent-General in Vic-

toria last year made an inquiry and recommended salaries and allowances to members there. A responsible person should be appointed by our Government to investigate this matter, either publicly or in private. I would welcome such an investigation and would be ready to go before it. There might be an all-Party committee, as applies in New South Wales, to investigate the matter.

Mr. Stott—What about superannuation?

Mr. LAWN—That is a matter that should be reviewed. Out of my salary as a member the Government takes £100 a year, which will prevent my getting a full old-age pension. If I stay here another two years before going out, I shall receive a superannuation payment of £8 13s. a week. Without it I would qualify at 65 for a full old-age pension. It smells! Commonwealth members receive a higher salary than members here and they pay £5 a week for superannuation purposes. If I were a Commonwealth member I would not mind paying that amount because after a Commonwealth member has served in three Parliaments, not 12 years, and is under 65 years of age, he gets a superannuation payment of £18 a week on retirement. If he is more than 65 years of age he gets £21 a week. If a member of the New South Wales Parliament he would get £24 a week. Be it salaries, superannuation, or expenses, the South Australian Parliament is the worst in Australia. The Government is not giving justice to members. We have to accept just what the Government gives us, and it is time that members demanded from the Government the same rights as employees generally get. The Government will not let rural workers go to the Arbitration Court for an award. We are in the same position as they are. All other employees can go to the court for a hearing of their case. Members of this place should have the right to go before an independent tribunal or an all-Party committee on this matter.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 20, at 2 p.m.