

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, April 21, 1960.

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—About a fortnight ago I questioned the Premier on the Government's intention regarding amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act and he replied that a report was being prepared for presentation to the Government almost immediately by the Workmen's Compensation Committee. Can he say whether it has been received and considered by the Government, and can we expect legislation to be introduced this session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The report has been received by me. I examined it and submitted proposals to Cabinet, and a Bill to give effect to those proposals is now being drafted.

#### SOUTH-EASTERN POTATOES.

Mr. HARDING—During the current year South-Eastern potato growers have approached their local members, Messrs. Corcoran, Ralston and myself, to obtain a report on the condition in which South-Eastern potatoes arrive on the Adelaide market, and we have gone into the matter. Has the Minister of Agriculture any information regarding it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have a report, but it is too lengthy to read to the House. It contains extracts from reports from the Railways Commissioner and the Chairman of the Potato Board. The Railways Commissioner said definitely that no cases of damage had occurred in the transit of potatoes, which statement is supported by the Chairman of the Potato Board. The Railways Commissioner also pointed out that potatoes delivered in Mount Gambier, I think before 10 a.m. one morning, arrive in Adelaide within 24 hours, which is a fast means of transport. There has been no damage during transit, and any damage reported has been traced to damage occurring before the potatoes were delivered to the railways. That being the position, I believe that the rail transport of potatoes from the South-East is prompt and effective. I can make the report available to the honourable member.

#### VENDING MACHINE COMPANIES.

Mr. RICHES—Yesterday I asked the Premier whether the Government would consider introducing legislation to control the

raising of money by vending machine companies, and particularly to see that the interests of vendors were protected under satisfactory agreements. Has the Premier any information on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I promised the honourable member that I would get reports. I have two, and I believe that it is desirable that they should receive some publicity in the interests of the investing public. The first report, secured by the Attorney-General, is as follows:—

The above company was incorporated on February 25, 1960; the documents were lodged by L. M. Wright, solicitor. An advertisement appeared in the *News* on March 15 offering investors a 20 per cent return, inviting people to send for details of the offer and stating that the business of the company was the sale and operation of automatic machines. A similar advertisement appeared in the *News* on March 22, except that there was no mention of vending machines, although one sentence stated, "There is equity in Machines."

On March 22 an executive officer of the *News* telephoned me stating that a draft advertisement had been received from the company in which the nominal capital was stated to be £2,500,000 and the paid up capital was £400,000 and that he wished to ascertain if the advertisement constituted a breach of the Companies Act. I informed him that if the paid up capital was incorrectly stated the company would have committed an offence but that News Ltd. itself would not be liable.

Later that day Wright telephoned the Deputy Registrar on another matter regarding the company and the Deputy Registrar informed him that the draft advertisement had been referred to this office and that no notice of the allotment of any shares had been lodged here, but if the company's issued or paid up capital was incorrectly stated in any advertisement the company would have committed an offence under section 387 of the Companies Act 1934-1956. Wright stated the advertisement had been withdrawn.

However, on March 26 the advertisement appeared in *The Sunday Mail*, but there was no reference to the issued or paid up capital, although the nominal capital was shown as £2,500,000. The advertisement in the *News* on March 15 also referred to only the nominal capital. In both cases the company has committed an offence under section 387 of the Companies Act 1934-1956 and in view of the unsavoury reputation of vending machine companies in the Eastern States I suggest that the company be prosecuted.

A further report reads:—

No complaints have as yet been received in this office in connection with vending machine companies, possibly due to the fact that the movement is in its infancy in this State. Contracts entered into between investors and vending machine companies are not required to be filed with the Registrar, with the result that it

is not possible for me to comment on the degree of protection afforded investors.

An extensive advertising programme has recently been undertaken by Development and Vending Corporation Limited, a public company incorporated in South Australia on February 25, 1960. The advertisements make reference to a paid-up capital of £410,000 but there have been no returns of allotments of shares filed in this office to substantiate that statement. A statement in lieu of prospectus filed in this office, however, shows that it is proposed to issue 1,672,772 shares of 5s. each to William Phillip Walsh and Kalman Andrew Salgo, as fully paid shares in consideration of the transfer of certain Queensland mineral leases to the company. It seems probable, therefore, that the paid-up capital of £410,000 referred to in the advertisement represents the consideration paid to Walsh and Salgo for the transfer of the mineral leases, and does not represent cash received by the company on the allotment of shares.

An advertisement appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on March 26 last in which the nominal capital of the company was stated to be £2,500,000 but the amount of issued or paid-up capital was not stated. This omission constitutes a breach of section 387 of the Companies Act, 1934-1956. It is apparent from the documents filed in this office by the company that it is closely allied with a mining company called Molybdenite Mining (Australia) No-Liability which was incorporated in South Australia on November 12, 1959. Development and Vending Corporation Limited, by the issue of the 1,672,772 shares referred to above, has virtually obtained control of the mine, and it is understood that it intends to employ part of its funds in the development of the mining leases. No reference is made to this intention in the advertisements which have so far appeared in the press.

Contracts have been entered into by Molybdenite Mining (Aust.) No Liability and Development and Vending Corporation Limited with Salgo and Walsh in relation to the issue of fully paid shares and the payment of certain cash consideration, but the contracts have not been filed in this office despite the fact that every effort has been made by this office to obtain them. Until these contracts have been filed, the true picture of the connection between the two companies and the vendors of the mineral leases cannot be clearly ascertained.

The question of tighter control over vending machine companies is already under consideration by the Registrars of Companies in all States and will form part of the proposed uniform Companies Bill which is already in the course of preparation. In the meantime investors should exercise extreme care before investing in this type of company to ensure that their original capital investment is adequately protected. They are urged to seek the guidance of a reputable financial advisor before investing.

#### ALIENS' LAND TRANSACTIONS.

MR. MILLHOUSE—On April 13 I asked the Minister of Lands a question about aliens' land transactions and whether section 24 of

the Law of Property Act would be repealed. The Minister said he was awaiting written submissions from the Good Neighbour Council before making a decision. Has he received those submissions and has any decision been made?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—I have received a letter from the Good Neighbour Council expressing its views on this question. It has been placed before Cabinet, which has asked the Parliamentary Draftsman to prepare an amendment to the Act.

#### INTERSTATE CORRESPONDENCE COURSE.

MR. RALSTON—I have received complaints concerning an interstate organization known as Tractor Training Service Australia Pty. Ltd. which, I believe, is selling correspondence courses in country districts of South Australia. This is an American organization, the registered office being in Sydney. The basis of the complaints is that the correspondence course on diesel tractor maintenance and service is not worth the £165 fee charged, especially in view of the fact that a diesel tractor and automotive course—which, in my opinion, is much superior—is available through the Education Department at a nominal cost of £6. Can the Minister of Education say whether there is any check on the standard and value of these courses coming from interstate sources to see that the public is protected from high pressure salesmen who make statements that are entirely misleading as to the value of the courses being sold? I am extremely concerned about this matter as once a contract is entered into it is deemed to have been made in Sydney and is enforceable in the New South Wales courts, thus denying South Australian people access to South Australian courts when, in fact, the contract was entered into and signed in South Australia.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I understand that the Superintendent of Technical Schools (Mr. Walker) is familiar with the subject but, unfortunately, he is absent on leave. I shall be pleased to have the matter examined to see what our powers are and what sources of investigation we have. The fee of £165 mentioned by the honourable member for the course is fantastically high, and the department's fees for a similar course would not be one-tenth of that amount. As the honourable member is aware, the department has established a fine adult education centre

at Mount Gambier—in fact, I think the honourable member is a member of the council of that centre. I saw an advertisement in the latest issue of the *Border Watch* concerning this company—Australia Pty. Ltd.—and I obtained a hurried report from the Acting Superintendent of Technical Schools (Mr. Macklin Shaw) as follows:—

I would assume that the course proposed by Australia Pty. Limited would be conducted by correspondence and, therefore, would involve only a theoretical study with some practical application by students on tractors which may be available on their own property. As you are aware, the adult education centre at Mount Gambier includes a full apprentice training scheme with qualified men appointed to its staff. Under these circumstances, I feel that the adult education centre could institute a course provided that sufficient students were available, using the tractor syllabus, which is available at our Automotive Trade School, or a similar course devised to meet the needs of the students concerned.

It is our policy to require ten students to enrol before instituting such a course, but there have been occasions when courses have been approved with fewer students when special circumstances apply. The matter of appointing a suitable instructor should not prove difficult, and there is every reason to believe that the adult education centre could meet the needs of students from this area at least as adequately as that proposed through Australia Pty. Limited. Assuming that the course would be conducted on a two hour per week basis for a full year, the cost involved to students would be £2 10s. per term or £7 10s. per year. If practical experience is required, I have no doubt that this could be organized as an adjunct to the theoretical course, using facilities available at Mount Gambier itself.

As I said earlier, I shall be pleased to have the whole matter thoroughly investigated and, if necessary, consult my colleague the Attorney-General as to the legality of the operations of this company if it does not possess any licence to operate in this State.

#### EYRE PENINSULA LAND.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Will the Minister say whether any land on Eyre Peninsula is available for application at present and, if so, how much and in which hundreds?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—An area has been gazetted open for application up to May 17, 1960, as follows:—

Hundred.	No. of Blocks.	Acreage.
Hincks . . . . .	1	2,626
Murlong . . . . .	5	14,006
Tooligie . . . . .	2	4,077
Shannon . . . . .	1	1,332
McLachlan . . . . .	1	110
	10	22,151

This does not include the 26 blocks containing about 30,000 acres recently allotted in the South-East.

#### MURRAY RIVER DAM.

Mr. BYWATERS—I think all people, especially those along the River Murray, were particularly interested to see an account in the *Advertiser* this morning of the proposed new dam in the upper reaches of the river. We are all hoping that on this occasion, the third time, we will be lucky. However, there are problems with all these things, and some come into people's minds before they really eventuate. One matter that is concerning people in the lower reaches of the river is that of the river levels. At present the level in the lower reaches is 109.50, which some people feel could even be raised a little for irrigation, but to drop that would be disastrous for many people irrigating from the Murray, particularly by the flooding system used on the river flats. Will the Premier state whether there is any danger that the river level will be reduced in the lower reaches or, if he is not aware of that, will he take up this matter with the Engineer-in-Chief and give me a reply later?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The quantity of water at present available to us under the River Murray Waters Agreement comprises some 1,250,000 acre feet a year, of which about half is to provide for evaporation in the stream itself and in the lakes, it being necessary, as the honourable member said, to keep the lakes at a sufficiently high level to enable the irrigation schemes that have been established to be maintained and effectively used. In a drought year, having taken into account the amounts that we must always lose through evaporation, we have only 500,000 acre feet, and in a severe drought I think it would be extremely unlikely that we would be able to maintain the level of the lakes under present-day conditions. The new proposals will provide a much more adequate water supply as they will enable us to maintain fully the level of the lakes at all times and to maintain the level at all our irrigation areas. The honourable member can be assured that the whole purpose of the scheme is to be able to meet our obligations, not only under existing schemes, but also in the development that inevitably will take place, I believe, in this State.

Mr. STOTT—In this morning's paper the Premier is reported as saying that some of the land would be in the Hundred of Murtho, which is in the district of Ridley. I and others in

the district are concerned about this, although there may be no need for anxiety. However, an early announcement by the Premier would be welcome on whether any of the land proposed to be inundated is held by private people and, if so, whether adequate compensation will be paid to those people.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not the particulars of all the land holdings in the area that would be inundated, but I can assure the honourable member that the £9,000,000 estimated as the cost of the scheme includes amounts to compensate for damages that may be occasioned to any private property or any loss that may be occasioned to any persons through the scheme. Mr. Dridan, in preparing the estimates, has allowed what he believes to be an adequate sum for compensation. Incidentally, we have assured the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria that this scheme will impose an obligation on South Australia regarding the inundation in other States. The general information I have is that the area almost entirely comprises pastoral lease land. There is no settlement in it, however, and I believe there are very few houses, although I understand there is a small orange grove, but I am not sure of its size. In any case, I assure the honourable member and landowners who may be affected that adequate compensation will be provided.

Mr. RICHES—Following on questions directed to the Premier today concerning the announcement about the dam to be erected across the River Murray, and in conjunction with it the establishment of a hydro-electric power station, will the Premier amplify press statements by saying whether the proposal for the production of power will affect the former proposal to generate power from stored sea water, and whether any firm arrangement has been made with the Commonwealth Government about its meeting 50 per cent of the cost? A fortnight ago the Premier said that the scheme depended on the Commonwealth Government bearing 50 per cent of the cost.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Referring to the first part of the question, the proposed water storage is primarily a storage against a drought period and not for the purpose of producing power. Mr. Dridan told me that it would always be necessary to have a certain quantity of water passing through the dam to maintain the river level, and that it would be possible to include in the plans a project for the production of a limited amount of power. There would be a permanent base load of about 6,000 to 7,000 kilowatts, equiva-

lent to about 10,000 h.p., which is approximately the amount of electricity we are now sending to the Upper River districts from the Electricity Trust scheme. It is a small but useful amount, seeing that the other work has to be undertaken. It would be something incidental, because the main purpose of the dam would be to store water against future needs of the State, particularly in dry periods. Later today I shall be giving some figures on power consumption in South Australia, but the production now mentioned would have no bearing on any of the major plans of the trust.

Referring to the second part of the question, I submitted a request to Mr. Menzies and Senator Spooner at an interview I had with them, but I have not received any definite reply as to whether the Commonwealth would be prepared to share the cost on the basis I suggested. Seeing that South Australia is at present paying enormous sums of the South Australian taxpayers' money for similar projects in New South Wales and Victoria I can see no reason for the Commonwealth Government refusing such a modest request from this State. When we consider that the Commonwealth Government is spending no less than £400,000,000, primarily in the interests of New South Wales and Victoria, for power and electricity, and that on a *per capita* basis South Australia would be providing more than the two States mentioned, I cannot for the life of me see how the Commonwealth can object to our modest request, especially as the project has such a tremendous bearing on the future welfare of the State. I am sure that the people, and all Parties in this House, are prepared to see that we get a fair appropriation in this matter. It is a political issue, but one where we have right on our side.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is a non-Party political issue.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. I am not so much concerned about that matter, but if the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Parliament consider the extreme importance of the project to South Australia they cannot, particularly in view of their contributions to the other States, have any grounds for refusing to assist South Australia.

#### HYDRO-ELECTRIC SALT WATER SCHEME.

Mr. JENKINS—Can the Premier say whether any progress has been made in investigating a hydro-electric salt water scheme on the South Coast?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Electricity Trust secured the services of overseas consultants in this matter and I believe they have closely examined two specific areas, both of which are either in the honourable member's district or in the district represented by the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that the preliminary investigations were satisfactory for either site, but the consultants, who have returned to England, have not made their final report. My general impression from discussions is that the scheme is regarded favourably.

#### MILLICENT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN—Will the Minister of Works state what progress has been made on the scheme to provide a water supply for the important town of Millicent and the approximate date of completion? I know it will not be completed during this financial year, but can he state whether there is any possibility of its being completed next year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The question of a water supply for Millicent is one which, amongst many others, is being actively considered. Neither the Government nor the department desires to defer the commencement or completion of work on this scheme any longer than is necessary. Many considerations are involved, and, as the honourable member knows, some difficulties that were experienced in planning the Millicent scheme have somewhat complicated the preparation of plans. Together with the Engineer-in-Chief and the Engineer for Water Supply, I am at present grappling with the matter of the next year's programme of works. As I suppose has always been the case throughout history, there are no funds to spare. Indeed, it is difficult to find the necessary funds to carry out the works programme each year. I assure the honourable member that I earnestly desire that we get on with the Millicent scheme in the next financial year, but I am unable to assure him as to when the scheme will be completed. Millicent is a rapidly growing town and the scheme, of course, will be required to be of sufficient size and capacity to cater for the needs as far ahead as we can possibly plan them. I assure the honourable member that it is the desire of the department—and I know, the Government—that we should get on with a scheme at the earliest possible moment, but until the outline of the works for next year is clearer I am unable to give him any definite assurance. We hope that we will be able to get on with the job in the next financial year.

#### KESWICK BRIDGE.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of March 31 regarding the widening of Keswick Bridge?

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

The traffic conditions on Anzac Highway have been considered by the Police and this department for some considerable time, and the general improvement of traffic flow is under review. It is known however that although Keswick Bridge forms part of the problem, it is not the sole cause of traffic delay. As the co-operation of the councils will be necessary to effect any improvement, a scheme will be submitted to them in the near future.

#### DERAILMENTS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report of two derailments that occurred on the railway between Cockburn and Port Pirie, one near Crystal Brook and the other near Winnininnie. These occurrences are always unfortunate, but a pleasing feature on this occasion was that no-one was injured in either derailment. I have understood for some time that lengths of this line badly need relaying. Will the Minister of Works secure from his colleague, the Minister of Railways, information on whether these derailments occurred on any of the sections that require to be relaid?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will obtain a report for the Leader.

#### CONVERSION OF SALT WATER.

Mr. HARDING—I congratulate the Premier on pursuing vigorously the matter of a dam on the River Murray. I was also very interested to note that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization had reported favourably on the rain-making project in the Snowy Mountains. Prior to the rising of the House last year I asked the Minister of Works the evergreen question regarding the possibility of converting salt water to fresh water. Has he yet obtained a report on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have over the last 12 months received some interesting reports from various sources, mainly overseas, regarding this project. Many difficulties are associated with this matter, and possibly I am rather more sanguine of success than some other people. I do not think there is anything to add to what I said when the honourable member asked his earlier question.

This will not be solved in a short time; it can be done, but it cannot yet be done economically. All sorts of ramifications are involved, and other associated matters have an impact upon the economic success or otherwise of such a proposal. The chief of these matters is the generation of power in association with the desalting of sea water. No fresh developments have taken place regarding this matter in the last three months, and I therefore feel that I can add nothing to what I previously said. This subject is engaging the interest not only of myself but of senior officers of the department. We will follow every possible lead because I believe that it is—or will be in the next decade at any rate—of significant importance to this State.

#### PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Minister of Works report on the progress of work on the new maternity wing at the Port Augusta Hospital, about which I asked a question earlier this session?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Director of Public Buildings reports:—

The work on the maternity wing involves alterations to the existing hospital buildings as well as the erection of a new wing. It has been necessary that the work be carried out with the minimum of interference to the hospital which has continued to function in the buildings, and as a result there have been inevitable delays in the building work.

I believe that the hospital staff has done all it possibly could to co-operate with the contractors and to facilitate the work, and the statement by the Director is not to be construed as any criticism of the hospital staff or the board. The report continues:—

Some of the work has already been completed and in an endeavour to hasten the completion of the remainder, arrangements have already been made for the District Building Inspector at Port Augusta to confer with the hospital authorities regarding the programme of work still to be done. It is not possible at this stage to give a firm completion date.

#### ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION.

Mr. SHANNON—I notice that the Department of Agriculture is calling for applications for positions in connection with artificial insemination in South Australia. Can the Minister of Agriculture say how far the department has progressed in extending this service? If he cannot do that today will he bring down a full report when the policy of the department is available?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—By chance I was asked a rather similar question the other

day, and I am getting a full report on the progress of artificial insemination in this State. I think it will be available by Tuesday next and I suggest that the honourable member ask his question again then.

#### SAFETY SALLIES.

Mr. RALSTON—Has the Minister of Works a report from the Minister of Roads following on my question of April 6 regarding the use of *Safety Sallies* at or near school crossings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that regulations under the Road Traffic Act, gazetted February 25, 1960, give the Commissioner of Highways the power to consent to the use of *Safety Sals* (being a device under 94B (11)) at or near a school crossing established under section 130 (e) of the Road Traffic Act. The approval of the Commissioner is necessary and applications from councils for the use of *Safety Sals* in connection with the establishment of school crossings will be considered.

#### BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE.

Mr. STOTT—Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether any of the gangs working on the construction of the Blanchetown bridge have been removed? I understood that the work was to proceed, and if gangs have been removed will the Minister ascertain the reason and why there is a hold up in the work? Also, can he indicate the progress made on the construction of the bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will inquire and bring down the information for the honourable member.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from April 20. Page 237.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—Members will realize that in speaking at this stage I do not close the debate on the Address in Reply, because other members may wish to speak. Whilst the Government cannot, and does not, try to answer every question posed during this debate, members' suggestions will be examined and, where practicable, be adopted, either in full or in part. Many purely district matters have been mentioned, and I shall not try to deal with them in the limited time I intend to speak; however, there are one or two matters of a different category to which I shall address myself. Firstly, and by far the most important, was the

statement by the Leader of the Opposition, which he said he substantiated, that South Australia's public debt had increased more than that of any other State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. O'Halloran—Mainland State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I accept that. In fact, had the Leader made it a general statement, it still would not have concerned me greatly, because this Government would not in any way try to refute the Leader's figures.

Mr. O'Halloran—You couldn't.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government would not try to refute them because when I inform members what has been done with the money, which has been expended to the great benefit of the State, they will appreciate why the Government makes no apology for that expenditure. The expenditure has been of the utmost importance to South Australia's progress and development and, what is more, has been necessary in view of that development. Finance is the main province of government, and if the Government falls down on its financial proposals it must be adjudged as not successful. It is fair to criticize the Government, but as the Leader has stated that we have spent vast sums and increased our public debt, I must assure members, and the State as a whole, that the money has been well spent. We have received value for the money, and without it we could not have attained the great prosperity we have achieved in the last few years. That prosperity is shown in every direction. It is shown in our remarkably low unemployment figures (consistently lower than in the other States); in our favourable overseas trade balances; in the number of motor cars *per capita*; in the Savings Bank deposits as compared with other States; and in the rapid increase in population here, far exceeding *pro rata* the increases in other States. The Leader, in his desire to criticize the Government, in fact revealed that he does not have an appreciation of what has been achieved and what has been necessary. Of course, all money that goes to increase the public debt has to be secured from the Loan Council.

Mr. O'Halloran—And ultimately repaid.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, and repaid with interest. Some members tend to forget that. That is why it is so necessary for the Government and for this Parliament to scrutinize every undertaking on which it is proposed to spend borrowed public money.

Over the years South Australia has been able to secure a very favourable quota under the formula from the Loan Council, and I ask members what other States would think about the sanity of the South Australian representation at the Loan Council if, on an occasion when we had an opportunity of obtaining money for developing the State, we said, "We do not want the money this year. Our Leader of the Opposition has an inherent objection to our increasing the State's indebtedness and, in deference to the views of the Opposition, we will not take the Loan money available to us this year." I believe they would do everything in their power to recognize the Leader of the Opposition's extreme kindness to them. They would also think that I was losing my touch and that old age had crept upon me.

Let me, for the benefit of members, supply figures of what has actually happened so far as the State's financial position is concerned in the 15 years since the war. In that time our public debt has increased by almost £210,000,000—from £108,000,000 in 1945 to £318,000,000 at June 30, 1959. I shall outline the services on which money has been spent—and I point out that these services could not have been extended throughout the State without this expenditure. The money was spent as follows:—water supply and sewers, £55,900,000; electricity and Leigh Creek coal-field, £52,275,000; housing, £44,100,000; railways, £26,300,000; school buildings and teachers' residences, £15,600,000; hospital buildings, £13,750,000; afforestation, £12,260,000; mining, including the Radium Hill project, £11,600,000; harbour activities and services, £9,000,000; and advances to the State Bank and for primary production and other purposes, £5,600,000. The total of this list of works is £246,385,000, which has been spent in this State over the last 15 years for these important and essential purposes. In addition, we have spent £30,000,000 on making advances to the Tramways Trust, the Abattoirs Board, for the construction of police stations, houses for police officers in country districts and court houses, on irrigation on the River Murray, drainage in the South-East, land improvement and settlement, roads and bridges and other sundry works. The total Loan expenditure in the 15-year period was £276,000,000 and this has been obtained by borrowing £237,000,000 through the Loan Council and re-spending £40,000,000 that had been repaid to Loan funds by various borrowers, including home owners and public undertakings.

During the 15 years £27,986,000 has been paid off the public debt and we have been able to meet all payments for interest, etc., associated with our public borrowing without going into debt to finance our revenue spending. In other words, over the last 15 years we have not had to call for any outside intervention in our Budget but have covered budgetary expenditure without calling on public Loan money to support it.

Mr. O'Halloran—Have all these projects serviced the debt incurred on their behalf?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, and obviously they could not. For instance, how could a public school service a debt?

Mr. O'Halloran—What about a water scheme?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will come to these matters in a few moments. The Leader of the Opposition made a criticism of the public debt on the figures he collected of the debt *per capita* of population. I do not intend to devote much time discussing these figures because in my view they are no more than purely interesting statistical data with no practical value. These figures do not indicate whether the various States can meet the charges incurred in connection with their public debt nor do they indicate whether the money has been wisely used on essential services and works without which this State would not have expanded as it has. In June, 1945, the population of this State was 627,000; our present population, according to the June, 1959, figures is 921,000—an increase of 294,000, or 47 per cent in the 15 years. Without this increase in population we could not, of course, have supported the large increase in secondary industry that has taken place since the war. During this period the Government, by spending big sums on providing public hospitals, has been able to provide treatment, not only in the city and suburbs, but in many country areas as well, for 402,000 in-patients, including those people treated in mental and tubercular institutions.

Incidentally, I should like to correct some statements that frequently emanate from our friends opposite regarding the ratio of patients to hospital beds in this State compared with other States. A rather disparaging statement is made from time to time by a very eminent member opposite about the number of people to each bed in this State compared with other States. I shall correct his figures which entirely overlook a large number of hospitals.

He dealt only with a limited number of hospitals, whereas there are 10,190 beds made up as follows:—

Government Hospitals.		
	Number.	Beds.
General hospitals . . . .	9	2,251
Mental hospitals . . . .	3	2,710
Tuberculosis hospitals . .	2	224

5,185

We have 48 subsidized hospitals, and the Adelaide Children's Hospital, Crippled Children's Home, Magill Home, Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, St. Margaret's Convalescent Hospital, Home for Incurables, Kalyra Sanatorium, which provide 2,125 beds. In addition, we have no less than 145 community and private hospitals that provide 2,880 beds, so that the total number of hospital beds available for use in this State is 10,190. These figures do not include the additional beds soon to be available in the Mount Gambier, Port Pirie and Port Augusta hospitals. Taking the round figure of 930,000 as our present population and dividing it by the number of beds I have mentioned, one bed is available for every 92 persons in this State. The requirement established by the Medical Advisory Committee appointed by the Chifley Government was one bed for every 100 persons.

Mr. Shannon—In fact, that has since been watered down, as it has been found to be too many.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Whether that is so or not, that was the figure provided by the committee, and our figures are much better. I hope when members opposite are quoting figures they will not forget the great number of hospitals we have encouraged and supported, which are doing a magnificent job but which are not technically Government hospitals in that they are not completely run by the Government, although they are supported by Government activity.

Mr. Shannon—And they are very well run.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not think there is any doubt about that. We have spent £15,000,000 in providing school buildings. That is one item the Leader of the Opposition will say is not fully able to support its debt charges, but do my friends opposite suggest for one moment that we should not have spent this money?

Mr. O'Halloran—When did I say that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—All the Leader does is criticize the amount spent; he never singles out the item that should be eliminated.



Mr. O'Halloran—I gave a very good list last year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I listened with two ears to hear what the Leader had to say on this occasion, when he made his most up-to-date remarks, but all I found was that he made a general observation that did not have the merit of pinpointing any expenditure that should not have been approved. In fact, neither the Leader nor any of his members would be able to say that any of these expenses should not have been incurred.

Mr. Jenkins—They want more.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Exactly; that is the point I was going to make. Then the Leader had to limit himself in his statesmanlike address to the rapidity with which the national debt was growing and, having turned over a couple of pages, he gave some fruitful suggestions for spending money even more quickly. Members on both sides of the House recognize that this State is going ahead in a way that demands that we plan and spend. If we are going to keep up with the progress of the times and allow development to take place we must have big ideas and big public spending, although we have to be sure that our public spending is justified by economic results.

Mr. Ralston—That is why we wanted a Public Accounts Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Every work that costs more than £100,000 and involves the expenditure of Loan money has to be examined by the Public Works Standing Committee, which is an all-Party committee of this Parliament. This, I believe, has the great merit that the committee considers its recommendations not from a political point of view, but from the point of view of the general economic conditions and the welfare of this State. Under those circumstances how could the Leader criticize the expenditure. His own members sign reports recommending it.

Mr. O'Halloran—But how much more do public works cost than the amount recommended by the committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Leader is now getting on to a different topic altogether. He said that many public works recommended by the committee cost more than the original estimate, and that is true; but in many instances they cost less. In many instances the Public Works Committee suggests alterations which inevitably mean an increase in the cost.

Mr. Shannon—And it has frequently drawn attention to the trend of increasing costs.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Public Works Committee has before it the best estimates the departments can provide at the time. As members know, if we are planning ahead we have to prepare our plans and our basic estimates in the first place and it frequently takes many years before the project, which may be well planned and well warranted, can actually be completed.

Mr. Shannon—Two projects now before the committee will take six years and 25 years respectively to complete.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The Mannum-Adelaide pipeline has not yet been completed, and I would think that went before the committee not less than 10 years ago.

Mr. Shannon—That's about it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—During that period the Arbitration Court has increased the basic wage and margins, and a general national inflation of costs has taken place. As a result of those various factors, the cost of materials has substantially increased in that period. Let us assume for the moment that the original estimate for the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline was £2,000,000, although in fact it was very much more—

Mr. O'Halloran—Not much more.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I think it was about £5,000,000. However, let us assume it was £2,000,000, and let us assume that the cost to date has been £10,000,000: knowing what we know today, would the Leader get up in this place and say that the project should not have been started? The Leader is very silent, because he knows quite well that whatever the cost of the job it was absolutely imperative to the welfare of the community.

Mr. Shannon—It saved it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Assuming that it did cost more, this was due to factors completely outside the Government's control. The Leader would not suggest for one moment that we should not pay for the materials we used.

Mr. Jenkins—Or the labour.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is so. The Leader has sometimes hinted obliquely at something but has never come into the open about it. Years ago the Hon. John McInnes, a very distinguished colleague of the Leader, and a gentleman for whom I had the greatest respect, and who played a conspicuous part in the affairs of the country for many years, made a speech in which he said what the Leader would like to say but has never

been quite prepared to say, namely, that our water supply schemes throughout the length and breadth of South Australia do not pay and that we should make them pay. That was the criticism made by Mr. McInnes. The Leader has hinted at it today by interjection, when he asked whether all the amounts that were provided were for schemes that were self-supporting as regards their debt charges. Obviously they are not. We have to take water immense distances to service the community, we have to pump water over mountain ranges, and we have to construct long pipelines. The programme I mentioned this afternoon involved 9,000 miles of pipeline. Obviously no water schemes of this nature will be directly able to meet their full charges unless we are prepared to impose excessive charges on the community.

Mr. Shannon—Hardly a country scheme would pay.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is so. My friends opposite talk glibly of decentralization, but how many towns in South Australia would have had water had we adopted the policy that is being hinted at as being the criterion, namely, that they have to pay their way?

Mr. Ralston—The Mount Gambier water scheme is paying, and the Minister agrees with that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—My accountants are fairly able people, and they say that it is still a long way in the red.

Mr. Ralston—The Auditor-General does not agree with that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I suggest to the member for Mount Gambier that one day he should argue with the accountants, because the Auditor-General is a person of very positive views.

Mr. Ralston—Yes, and good ones.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—He says that the scheme mentioned by the honourable member is still in the red.

Mr. Lawn—That's not right.

Mr. Ralston—He says it is showing a profit.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I shall return to that in a moment. Is it the policy of my friends opposite only to supply water to towns under the condition that Loan charges are fully repayable? If so, then the Leader's criticism about our national debt has some substance. Is it the view of the Opposition that electricity should not be taken to the country? In fact, in the figures I gave the House this afternoon I pointed out that the second largest amount in the total we have

spent concerned expenditure on electricity, namely, £52,275,000. That has been spent mainly on increasing the number of power stations and the reticulation of country areas. Are my friends opposite—the Leader of the Opposition in particular—prepared to say that we should have saved one penny of that money? The Leader only criticized the general expenditure without getting down to individual items. This item is completely covering its debt charges and meeting every obligation—amortization, interest, and everything else—and is showing, in addition, a small nominal profit. It is serving the rural areas, the metropolitan area, and industry and that service is unsurpassed in any State. Is that what the Leader criticizes?

Let me quote some figures on electricity supply. In 1946, when the Electricity Trust took over from the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, the number of people consuming electricity in the State of South Australia was 118,262, whereas there are now 264,967 consumers. Perhaps a better picture would be given by the amount of electricity actually consumed. In the same period the number of kilowatt hours of electricity sold *per annum* has increased from 230,000,000 to 1,250,000,000 units. In other words, the increase has been more than 1,000,000,000 units, or four times the original consumption.

Mr. O'Halloran—Who is upset by that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It has been a benefit to every section of the community, yet honourable members opposite criticize that expenditure. I have heard them say we have not spent enough on schools, but I have never heard the criticism that we have spent too much on schools. I have heard them criticize the amount we spend on houses.

Mr. Corcoran—I am not doing that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The member for Millicent is always asking when we are going to spend some money in Millicent.

Mr. Corcoran—The Government is not spending enough at Millicent on housing or the water supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I agree entirely with the member for Millicent, and I suggest that he take the Leader outside and brief him on these important matters. Obviously, the £44,000,000 spent on houses, which has led to the erection of 40,000 houses in this State, is a contribution to the activity and the general welfare of the State. I could go through every other project that I have mentioned with similar good figures, but I

think I have made the point that the real things we have to consider in this House are that when we get our Loan money we should put it to purposes that will be to the best advantage of the people of this State, that we should plan to meet the shortages that are likely to occur, and that we should give to all sections of the community, as far as humanly possible, a fair share of the expenditure.

Mr. Corcoran—They are fine sentiments, but do you carry them into effect?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I deprecate the suggestion that because the metropolitan area is the only area that has met the full charges on its water supply it should be the only place to have a water supply.

Mr. O'Halloran—It has not met the full charges.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, it has. I want now to deal with a matter that has been receiving the oblique attention of Opposition members, but again I point out that their objections are based probably on the fact that they were not able to get exact information. I do not know whether the statistics were available to them, but I will give them some figures to show what is taking place. If the annual reports of the Lands Department had been studied the member for Mount Gambier would not have made the observations he did. I will give members some figures showing land settlement over the last few years. These cover the settlement of Crown lands, other than land under the war service land settlement scheme, and allotments made since World War II, up to June 30, 1958. The number of allotments by the Land Board in all cases except pastoral leases was 4,481, comprising 6,826,411 acres. Allotments by the Pastoral Board totalled 53, covering 10,159,829 acres. That gives a total of 4,534 allotments and 16,986,240 acres.

Mr. O'Halloran—In which areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not got that information, but I have no doubt that it is available in Lands Department reports. Much of this land had been previously held and had reverted to the Crown for re-allocation.

Mr. Ralston—Where has this occurred in the South-East?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I can see that the honourable member has not studied the matter. Of the total I have given no less than 4,900,000 acres was "newly-opened" land, comprising 1,150,000 acres allotted by the Land Board and 3,750,000 acres by the Pastoral

Board. Included in the "new" land gazetted in the last year or so was 26,000 acres in the upper South-East covering 16 blocks, 19,000 acres on Kangaroo Island covering 15 blocks, and 30,000 acres on the West Coast covering 20 blocks. Not included in these figures is land made available under the A.M.P. scheme. Since June 30, 1958, further work has been carried out by the Minister of Lands and the Lands Department. Additional Crown lands, other than land available for war service land settlement, have been made available during the period from July 1, 1958, to March 31, 1960, which brings my figures almost up-to-date. Allotments by the Land Board, which deals with all land except pastoral land, total 377, comprising 1,262,198 acres. Allotments by the Pastoral Board were 15, comprising 4,323,520 acres, making a total of 392 allotments comprising 5,585,718 acres. Again, some of this land had reverted to the Crown.

Mr. O'Halloran—Was any town land concerned?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. In that short period an area of 1,362,532 acres was "newly-opened" land. The Land Board allotted 459,492 acres and the Pastoral Board 903,040 acres. These figures do not include blocks allotted in the South-East, as that allotment was made after March 31, 1960. If members realize what has been done in this matter and recall that in the last few years no less than 1,000,000 acres of "new" land has been sown to permanent pastures, they will see how far this State has advanced in increasing its stock-carrying capacity. One of the first speeches I heard in this House after becoming a member was made by the Hon. A. J. Melrose, now a member of the Legislative Council. He has always been closely interested in sheep production. If members want further details of what he said in that speech they can find it in *Hansard*. He said that the sheep population in the State was approaching 9,000,000, but that history had proved that South Australia could not carry that number. He stressed that we had reached the danger point in connection with stock carrying and asked the Government to act towards establishing canning works at the abattoirs to deal with the surplus sheep. Prior to the drought we have just passed through, our sheep population was about 15,500,000, and in addition there had been an increase in the cattle population to about 600,000. There has been no suggestion that we cannot carry that number of stock under ordinary conditions.

Mr. O'Halloran—There have been many suggestions.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, but not borne out by facts.

Mr. O'Halloran—How many sheep have we today?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member went to the abattoirs now that we have passed through the drought period he would see remarkably firm prices being paid for stock. Sheep prices are abnormally firm. Every prominent pastoralist reduced his stock numbers when the drought period came, but everyone has been amazed at the way we have got through that drought with our stock still in excellent condition. At present we have no less than 12,000,000 sheep in the State. Mr. Ralston made some statements about land settlement—

Mr. Ralston—They were perfectly true, and you know it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member should study the background of the position before making his statements. Mr. Jennings referred to a book written by a former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, in which I was taken well and truly to task for my attitude towards the University.

Mr. Quirke—Haven't you read it yet?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. I would not be concerned about it except that I want to clear up a point that is important to the Government and to the University. If honourable members would like to see some correspondence that took place between Mr. Rowe and me before he left South Australia I am prepared to show it to them, but I modestly refrain from reading it to the House because he said I was the chief benefactor of the University, and expressed publicly his appreciation of what I had done for the University. He expressed his kind regards for me, and said he was leaving because he did not want to look at the older professors at the University any longer. The matter assumes an increasing importance because the Commonwealth Government has established a Universities Commission to consider university finances. One complaint the honourable member appears to have arising from the book is that it said that whenever Mr. Rowe had to deal with matters associated with the University it was no good going to the Minister of Education, because it was better to go to the Treasurer. The answer to that is simple. In some other States the Education Departments control the universities. In Queensland,

for example, the University Council is largely nominated by the Government. In other words, the Government is directly involved in the control and operation of the university. In South Australia, however, the Government has always taken the view that if a university is to perform its functions it should be free and untrammelled and the control of our university is vested in its council.

The Minister of Education does not direct the university on educational matters. As a matter of interest, the Director of Education is not even a member of the University Council, although I understand that on one occasion the University authorities did say that if Mr. Mander Jones would submit his name for nomination they would probably be able to get him elected to the council. The council determines all educational policy for the University and controls its discipline. At one time Mr. Rowe suggested that I might like a representative on the council and I told him that I was not interested in such a proposal, because if members study university development through the ages, particularly in Great Britain, they will realize that universities should not be controlled by Governments. If the Government controlled our university it would stifle the free expression of opinion which we get from it. Sometimes some of it is not good criticism, and sometimes it is not even on the ball, but the fact remains that if universities are to function they must be able to criticize. Earlier this week members opposite applauded me when I said that any second university in this State should be in the country. I noticed in the press that that statement has been criticized by two university professors who suggest that instead of having a second university in the country they should take over the Teachers' College. It is good that such opinions can be expressed, even though no-one will take much notice of them.

Mr. Rowe could not go to the Minister of Education because the Education Department does not control the University. It has never sought to do so and I hope it never will. It was necessary for Mr. Rowe to go to the Treasury because he was seeking additional finance, and an arrangement was soon evolved whereby finance was made available. That arrangement, which has operated ever since, was that in January of every year the University Council should prepare a budget for the State Treasury and, provided the Grants Commission did not object to it—and the Grants Commission made it obvious at the outset that it would not be difficult over any money that

was made available to the University—it would be approved. That was one reason why, when the Murray Commission investigated university requirements in all States it recommended such a small amount for South Australia. That commission reported that the Adelaide University was well provided for.

Our University is self-controlled, as it should be. However, I am not too sure of the future. Not only is the Commonwealth Universities Commission—the Martin Commission—going to recommend financial assistance to universities, but, I believe, is going to physically control them. I entirely agree with the commission recommending assistance for universities, even though the formula is extremely lopsided (the Commonwealth makes a big song about what it is doing for universities, but for every pound it provides the States are expected to provide two), but if the Martin Commission tries to control universities academically I will most strenuously oppose it. I commend members for their attention to the Address in Reply and I support the motion.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I completely agree with the Premier in one respect: I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. However, I am afraid that marks the end of our agreement. The Address in Reply is a short address, studiously drawn up and carefully worded by a committee appointed specifically for the purpose.

Mr. Millhouse—It is almost an expert committee.

Mr. RICHES—It would be about as expert as the committee that drew up the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, and although the Address in Reply is extremely short it contains about as much matter as the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. I do not think that in recent years we have listened to a more uninspiring programme than the one with which this session was opened. Even Government members remarked upon the lack of anything really constructive or new in the Speech. The fact that His Excellency called us together and had to read that Speech demands from us a reply, and I think the reply that has been drafted meets the situation quite well.

The Premier went to great lengths to reply to the Leader of the Opposition who, fulfilling his proper function as Leader, has kept a watchful eye on the Government's expenditure, has asked that that expenditure be subject to scrutiny by a Public Accounts Committee, and has drawn attention to the increasing burden of the public debt. In his reply the Premier tried to imply that members on this side of

the House, because of their concern at the state of the Government's finances, are somehow opposed to the programme of public works that has been carried out from Loan moneys. Of course, nobody knows better than the Premier that that is not so, and he hastened to assure the House that he is well conversant with the attitude of Opposition members who are demanding, in the name of their constituents, that the development of the State should proceed not only at the rate we have noticed, and which has been reported on in previous years, but that, if we are to keep pace with development in other parts of Australia, our expenditure on public services should be stepped up. We advocate that in season and out of season, but that does not interfere with our request that we should try to get full value for the money expended.

The Premier claimed, in giving details of the Loan works programme, that the works carried out are subject to scrutiny by the Public Works Standing Committee before any programme is put into operation. However, he immediately said that the largest item of expenditure was in connection with the Electricity Trust and the extension of services throughout the State. Electricity Trust expenditure is not subject to scrutiny by the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr. O'Halloran—Nor is Housing Trust expenditure.

Mr. RICHES—That is so. So far as the Electricity Trust is concerned I am firmly convinced that considerable savings could have been effected had the plans for the power stations, for instance, been scrutinized by the Public Works Standing Committee which, I am sure, would not have permitted their erection without provision being made for controlling the smog issuing from them. The position now is that hundreds of thousands of pounds must be spent in order to deal with a nuisance that was not dealt with in the planning stages. Even with that expenditure it is questionable whether the measures will be effective. We have been told it is impossible to install in the A power station at Port Augusta electrostatic precipitators which, on the best advice we can obtain, is apparently the only possible method of clearing Port Augusta of the smog nuisance.

Mr. Millhouse—What advice have you had?

Mr. RICHES—I have personally obtained advice from engineers who were involved in capturing the smoke at Port Pirie. I have written overseas in response to advertisements inserted in engineering journals and have

obtained advice, which has been placed before the trust and has not been disputed, from that source. Electrostatic precipitators are being installed in the B station, and I do not think these would have been used if the trust had not been satisfied that they were necessary. They were not installed in the A station because the building was so planned that it was physically impossible to install them.

I think the Public Works Committee has rendered a valuable service to Parliament, but once it approves a scheme there is no further control over the project and the finished job can be a considerable departure from the original plans. The only control after the recommendation is that exercised by the Auditor-General. If we say we are not satisfied with the control of expenditure after it is approved by Parliament, that does not mean that we criticize the programme of works that has been drawn up. As a matter of fact, all the projects mentioned by the Premier that have been submitted to this Parliament have been supported by members on both sides of both Houses; no Party politics have come into the matter.

In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a report of a statement made by the Premier that gave much hope to the people of this State. He was outlining details of a scheme drawn up by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for damming water in the upper reaches of the Murray. I hope this scheme has substance, that the Premier will pursue the negotiations he has started, and that at a reasonably early date they will be brought to fruition. The press statement referred to the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline: the Premier said that the duplication of that main was an immediate necessity. I remind the House of the importance of that reference, because the Premier has not done anything new in coming forward with a grandiose scheme that catches the imagination of the people. He has outlined schemes in the past and there have been long delays in bringing them to fruition, and a number have got no further than the publicity for which they were propounded.

In 1952 the Premier made a broadcast on a Wednesday night, a report of which appeared in the *Advertiser* on the following day, in which he outlined proposals to duplicate the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. They appeared to be so definite that on the Thursday the Leader of the Opposition asked if details of the route could be given, and in

the following week the Premier indicated the possible route. After two years the Governor in his Speech said that the Government was considering duplicating the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. Another two years passed, after which I asked the Minister of Works whether he could give a report on the progress of the planning or work done in connection with this duplication, and the Minister said that the project was years off, although this was four years after the Premier had referred to the matter in a broadcast.

A year later another reference appeared in the Governor's Speech: His Excellency said that the Government was considering duplicating the pipeline. The next year it was omitted from the speech, although questions had been asked over eight years. A year later it was again mentioned in the Governor's Speech; in 1959 it was omitted; and in 1960 His Excellency said that the Government intended to press on with the construction of the pipeline. Only last month this proposal was submitted to the Public Works Committee and in the meantime people who hoped to be connected to the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline were told that they could not be connected to the pipeline in time to save them from shortages through another summer and that alternatives would have to be found pending the construction of the pipeline.

Mr. O'Halloran—It will take 25 years to complete.

Mr. RICHES—Yes. Booleroo Centre has been told that an alternative scheme will have to be found because the duplicated pipeline will not be ready in time to give a connection. This scheme was announced eight years ago yet it has just been referred to the Public Works Committee. Year after year residents of northern districts have feared the imminence of water restrictions. They know that the development of northern towns and towns adjacent to the pipeline depends entirely on the availability of a water supply. Other parts of the State have also been looking anxiously for the duplication because it should afford them opportunities to be connected in later years. I urge that this is an immediate necessity. After eight years we should expect something more from the Premier than one sentence in the statement he made in a broadcast last night, which appeared in this morning's paper.

We have about reached the limit of our advancement until water supplies can be assured. Towns in the country are adopting

methods of sewerage, hygiene and garden treatment, and it is absolutely essential to do everything possible to make living conditions in the country better than they are now. In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared statements about the establishment of a second university in the country. Professors who made the statements said nothing about the practical difficulty of establishing a country university, but only that they were not prepared to go there.

Mr. Millhouse—They did mention the question of hospitals for medical training, of course.

Mr. RICHES—That may be so, but the main point they made was that people were not prepared to live in country districts. Everything that can be done to provide conditions in the country conducive to good living should be done, and the first necessity is an adequate water supply. When the pipeline is duplicated it should be seen that it is of sufficient capacity to allow future extensions to be made. Kimba is asking for an extension from the pipeline already promised to Iron Knob, and I have great sympathy for the request. I know there are difficulties but this town is only 60 miles from Iron Knob, and nobody has mentioned difficulties associated with taking water to Iron Knob. If iron ore were found at Kimba tomorrow nobody would raise any difficulties about taking water there. It all depends on who wants the water.

In earlier days the Government of South Australia established the Tod River scheme. The schemes being requested now pale into insignificance when compared with this undertaking. I do not believe it is beyond the resources of this State to provide a water supply to people living in those areas. The production of those areas should be taken into the balance sheet when we are assessing the economics of such a scheme and when we are making up our minds on whether this State can afford them. It would be wrong to construct a pipeline from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob that would not be capable later of being extended to other places. I am convinced that South Australia has to depend on the River Murray at least until some economic way can be found to de-salt sea water. I believe we should conserve every drop of flood water that we can, but the experience of those who have lived in the northern areas is that rainfall cannot be relied on and that industry cannot be established unless natural rainfall is supplemented by an assured supply. The demands on the River Murray will increase, or progress in South Australia will cease. We also realize that we are no longer a claimant State for Commonwealth

grants, although we still have to go to the Commonwealth—and rightly so—for its concurrence in every major undertaking that we wish to embark upon.

Mr. Millhouse—Why do you say “and rightly so”?

Mr. RICHES—Because the Commonwealth is the controller, for the time being at any rate, of taxation and the financial policy of Australia. I believe that South Australia had a better deal when we regarded ourselves as Australians and were entitled to a fair share of the prosperity of Australia, even if it did come back to us by way of Commonwealth grants, than we are likely to get under the present set-up, in which we are no longer a claimant State.

Mr. O'Halloran—We don't know where we are today.

Mr. RICHES—We know that nearly every charge the Government can increase has been increased. We know that hospital charges have risen, and that expenditure on schools is difficult, so difficult that an edict has gone out from the Public Buildings Department that school buildings may be painted on the exterior only. That is the advice I have received from the Minister of Works. What sort of a state are we getting into when we cannot afford to paint, when necessary, the interior of school buildings? We shall have to come back a second time and ask that the interior work be put in hand. We also notice that although the demand for housing is increasing more houses are not being built. As the demand for houses at Whyalla, for instance, develops, that work will only be carried on at the expense of the housing programme in other parts of the State. We know that rail fares and freights and just about all other Government charges have been increased. I do not know whether there is any substance in them, but I have seen reports in the Port Pirie and other country newspapers that the Government is considering substantial increases in water charges, mainly assessments, and in charges associated with an upward movement in land values throughout the State. That is the situation in which we find ourselves. It seems to me that the people are paying a heavy price for the fact that they can hold their heads up and say, “No longer are we a claimant State.” I think we are paying too great a price and that we are not getting what we are entitled to from the Commonwealth.

I was handed in the street the other day a publication entitled *L.C.L. News Letter*. I

refer to it only because of two things. The water problem is referred to under a big headline, and the statement is made that the Premier had made 27 broadcasts on major subjects affecting the welfare of the State and its people, four of which dealt particularly with the water supply problem. Another paragraph reads:—

The Premier put forward on October 21 a plan to store River Murray water in Lake Bonney, near Barmera, on the River Murray. If approved and implemented it would create a storage of nearly 14,000,000,000 gallons of fresh water, equal to the combined storage of the metropolitan reservoirs.

It goes on to say that broadcasts by the Premier are given over Station 5AD and relayed over stations 5PI, 5MU and 5SE at 9 p.m. on Wednesdays, and that the *Advertiser* gives full reports on the following Thursdays. In my judgment that is a contempt of Parliament, and it is a procedure to which I feel attention should be drawn. Here is a broadcast concerning Lake Bonney, and a statement which has been given, not to Parliament at any stage, but outside Parliament. Apparently plans were drawn up, the proposal considered, and after that the proposal was discarded, and Parliament has never discussed it at any stage. This is a practice which has grown up and one which I think is quite wrong. We heard of another scheme, and we do not know whether it has been discarded or not. The Premier mentioned a scheme for pumping sea water to high levels and using it to supplement the power supply to the city. Parliament, as a Parliament, has never been consulted on these matters.

Mr. Millhouse—A question was asked on that matter today.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, after we find out about it in the press, and after we get it by means of an L.C.L. newsletter distributed around the State.

Mr. Millhouse—I am glad you read it.

Mr. RICHES—I assure the member for Mitcham I will read it. Surely the Premier should take Parliament into his confidence. This is the place to make statements of policy regarding developmental programmes drawn up by Government departments. These plans have been announced to the world, not here, but outside; considered not here, but somewhere else; and discarded, not here, but somewhere else; and Parliament has never been consulted about them at any stage.

Mr. Jennings—I guarantee that not even the Cabinet heard of the one you mentioned.

Mr. RICHES—The same thing is going on concerning the proposal to standardize the railway from Port Pirie to Broken Hill. Proposals have been submitted by the Commonwealth to South Australia—or so I have been told by the Commonwealth—and the Premier has merely risen in his place and told us that these proposals are not acceptable. Those proposals have never been brought to this House, and Parliament has never been told what they are; it has never had an opportunity to discuss them, except in a general debate such as this, and they have been rejected in the name of South Australia, not by the Parliament of South Australia, I am not sure even by the Cabinet of South Australia, and this disputation has been going on without anybody knowing what proposals have been submitted and discussed. It seems to me to be an attitude of contempt towards members of this House. I believe the standardization of the lines between Port Pirie and Broken Hill and between Port Pirie and Adelaide is a work of major importance and great urgency to this State. Wrapped up in these proposals, I believe, is the future development of Port Pirie, and I believe also that they are important to the manufacturing interests of the metropolitan area.

When the line between Albury and Melbourne has been standardized, manufacturers in Sydney will be able to send their goods to Queensland or Victoria without any break of gauge. Manufacturers in Melbourne will be able to send their goods to Adelaide, Sydney, and Brisbane without any break of gauge, but Adelaide manufacturers will have Melbourne as the only market available to them without a break of gauge. Difficult as it is now to entice any industry to establish itself in this State, unless we standardize the South Australian lines I have referred to it is going to be more difficult than ever.

Although the Premier has never taken the House into his confidence to tell us the proposals, I understand that they are that the line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill should be standardized, and that the lines between Peterborough and Quorn and between Gladstone and Wilmington should be modernized on the present gauge and modern rolling stock and diesel locomotives should be used. I understand that this is claimed to be much cheaper than standardization and could adequately serve the needs of those districts at this juncture. I agree that ultimately we should aim for standardization throughout the State, and throughout the northern areas in particular,



but I cannot see why there should be any further delay in standardizing the line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill while the negotiations over the other lines are taking place. In any case, I think it is high time the Premier gave details of the Commonwealth proposals to the House, so that the House might decide whether it supports him in his objection to them or whether they should be adopted.

I mentioned that in 1952 the first announcement of the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline was made. It is also interesting to note that in the same year representations were made concerning the reconstruction of the Port Pirie wharves and the deepening of the harbour, and the Government of the day acknowledged the necessity for this work to be undertaken. We are still waiting for that work to be put in hand.

I have been requested—and I comply because I believe there is merit in the request—to bring before the House the need to establish in South Australia a poison clinic, a centre in which poison cases can be treated, and in which research can take place into the treatment of poison cases throughout the State. I am advised that in 1958 there were 81 cases of arsenical poisoning in the metropolitan area. The need for such a centre was brought to our notice in recent weeks when a man was taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital suffering from arsenical poisoning and was there for several days without receiving any treatment at all before he died. That would be bad enough if it were the only case, but I have details here of the case of a doctor who was admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital as a result of arsenical poisoning in February, 1958, and although he repeatedly told the doctors and those looking after him that he was convinced he was suffering from arsenical poisoning he was refused treatment. He left the hospital in order to get treatment elsewhere, but he eventually returned, and it was some time before he got the injections which I am informed are the first essential in the treatment of arsenical poisoning. Because of the long delay that took place the doctor has not yet fully recovered. There seems to be a need for the establishment of a centre and further research into the matter. There should be a full inquiry into the operations of this branch of hospital activities to make sure that people suffering from arsenical poisoning can get treatment.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you suggest that it be done at the hospital or at a separate institution?

Mr. RICHES—I think it should be at a separate institution, but only experts can advise on that matter. I have been asked to suggest that the investigation be made on the highest level. Whoever made the investigation could determine the best situation for the centre and the service it could render. There is one centre in New South Wales and about 40 operate in the United States of America. Statistics show that many poisoning cases are reported in South Australia, and that number could grow, so there is a need for an institution. I am advised that the doctor suffering from arsenical poisoning contracted it whilst taking wallpaper off the rooms of his house. Arsenic had been used years ago in the mixture that was applied to the walls when they were papered. Many other poisoning cases are the result, I am informed, of using weed killers. There is a need for considerable research into diagnosis, the method of admission to hospital, and the form of treatment when a patient claims that he or she has been poisoned. When people are refused treatment after telling the doctors that they are poisoned it shows that there is room for the establishment of a centre in order to offer a better service than is available now.

Much has been said in this debate about decentralization of industry and it is becoming a more urgent problem every year. It is becoming increasingly difficult to entice an industry to establish itself in the country. South Australia needs to do more than it is doing in this matter.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—What should it do?

Mr. RICHES—We should have competent officers to deal with the matter. They should be men of the calibre of the special officers employed by the Housing Trust. They could contact industries capable of expansion and place before leaders of industry the desirability of extending their operations to country centres. It is no-one's responsibility at present and until someone is responsible we will not get much done. The Housing Trust has done good work at Elizabeth where it exercises authority in this connection. It has men who contact visitors from overseas and it even sends men to other parts of the world. They are fully qualified and they try to get industries to establish themselves in South Australia, and at Elizabeth in particular. Many applications are being received for the establishment of industries.

The amount of assistance the State is prepared to give to an industry going to the

country is not generally known. The Government will build factories in country areas and lease them to industries for periods with the right of purchase at any time. The Government will also provide land. If an application made to the Industries Development Committee is supported by that committee the Government will guarantee bank finance. That is, if the industry can show that it has a reasonable chance of success and that it will provide and maintain employment at full award rates. Where necessary the Government will provide water services, power and housing for the establishment of industries. We have circularized industries in other States in the hope that they might establish branches in South Australia, but that sort of thing should be done at the highest level, not a local level. The Government should set up an authority. It may be a Ministry of Decentralization or an Industries Promotion Committee, but it should be the authority to contact people coming to Australia to establish industries. Now people who want to establish them in this country hawk them from State to State in order to get the best deal, and the first person they call on is the Premier. We have State competing against State in order to get industries. Western Australia offers land free and money at 2 per cent. South Australia offers factories. Victoria and New South Wales do not need to be so generous because they have distinct advantages over the other States.

Mr. Jennings—Markets are there.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, and freight concessions. Victoria has assisted industries and at Ballarat it has provided one industry with free transport until production reaches a certain point. What hope is there for enticing industry to the country unless the matter is dealt with at a high level? The Government is the only authority that can give concessions and it should try to get industries established in the country, where land is cheaper and where transport difficulties can be overcome. If that were not so we would not have Holden motor car bodies built in South Australia.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Do you mean that we should subsidize these firms?

Mr. RICHES—Yes, if necessary. South Australia has not lost anything by giving concessions to General Motors-Holden's. I do not intend to argue about the price of Holden motor cars and whether the company has played the game in return, but what has been done for it can be done for other industries. Without getting too much involved in side issues, I stress that no local authority can talk

to an industry in this way. It must be done at Government level.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—You have just set out what the Government does towards establishing industries in the country.

Mr. RICHES—It has had to do that to get industries established at Elizabeth. As the Act had been altered to provide for these things at Elizabeth, Parliament asked for the provision to apply anywhere in the State, and that was done. I am not unduly criticizing the Government for what it has done in the past. Year after year members on this side talk about a programme of decentralization of industry but we see no results. The only value of the Address in Reply debate to members is that it gives them an opportunity to reiterate their claims and ideas. Who knows that at some future time someone may listen to what we say?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Port Augusta and Whyalla have been heavy decentralizing trends in the past year or so.

Mr. RICHES—I agree with that entirely. It has been proved that where large deposits of raw material exist it is possible to establish industries. That can happen also where there are unsatisfied markets. Whyalla's development is based entirely on iron ore deposits. However, my firm conviction—and I make it clear that my colleagues may not agree entirely with me on this—is that the development is over-balanced in favour of the company carrying out the work. If we think of the Government as the people of the State, we must realize that the people have some rights over the iron ore. The people did the drilling and exploration to discover iron ore outside the limits that were placed on it by the company's experts; the people bore the expense of all that exploration; they bore the expense of research into methods of beneficiation and treatment of low-grade ores; they provided housing for the company's employees; they provided rail services, the water supply and power. They have given to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company iron ore rights for ever at 1s. 6d. a ton on ore that could be sold at the wharf for about £6 a ton.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Everything you have mentioned is paid for in some way or another.

Mr. RICHES—The Premier went to great lengths to tell us that they are not paid for directly. They are all provided at a loss if one considers the direct returns from the services provided. The people get little in return. Private industries, in various parts of the State, are being assisted by Government

guarantees of finance. For the pyrites industry at Nairne, housing, transport, water and power are being provided by the Government at normal charges, and it has guaranteed the industry about £1,000,000 as financial backing. If it is a success the Government gets its money back: if it is a failure, the people bear the loss, but under no circumstances can they participate in any profit. I think that is somewhat lopsided.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—I do not think it is lopsided when we cannot get sulphur.

Mr. RICHES—I do not object to that industry: I voted for it. Similar circumstances apply to every industry the Government assists. Government members believe in private enterprise and that the State should bear the losses in providing services but should never share in the profits.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—If we didn't make these provisions we would never get an industry in the country.

Mr. RICHES—I do not know. Consider what happened with the coal deposits at Leigh Creek. Private enterprise did not develop them.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Private enterprise would not take it on.

Mr. RICHES—No, and the Government stepped in, and developed it. The Government had to adopt a policy that we advocate—Government enterprise.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—So we do everything as a Government enterprise?

Mr. RICHES—Almost everything that is worthwhile. The State has benefited enormously from what was done at Leigh Creek, and no-one has been more consistent in advocating the development of Leigh Creek than have Opposition members.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—How can you advocate putting private enterprise in the country one minute and, five minutes later, advocate Government-owned industries?

Mr. RICHES—Has the fact that the Government developed Leigh Creek, established power stations, and decentralized the production of power adversely affected private industries?

Mr. Quirke—Isn't Leigh Creek a major instrument of decentralization?

Mr. RICHES—It is. It is Government enterprise and it is good.

Mr. Quirke—Would you concede that that was a Government contribution to decentralization?

Mr. RICHES—Yes. I am proud of Leigh Creek and of all Government enterprise. At

one time the people depended on private enterprise for housing and unless they could find a landlord they went homeless. When private enterprise firms discovered that there was no profit in housing they were no longer interested in it. During the war not even one house was built by private enterprise, and the State stepped in and built houses. The people are being housed now and are not dependent on someone looking for a profit from the transaction. They are being housed in all parts of the State, but we need more housing.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you know what proportion of the people in Australia own or are purchasing their own homes?

Mr. RICHES—Many are buying them through the State banks and their mortgages are financed through Government instrumentalities. Most of those who are buying Housing Trust homes are being financed on second mortgage, not from private banks but through the trust. There are many other undertakings involved, and, whether honourable members opposite like the principle or not, they are compelled by public opinion to adopt it, or the State just could not function. We are not populating the country as we should, and the development of South Australia is getting more top-heavy every year, despite all the efforts being made to bring about a balance in development. I am convinced that unless this problem is grappled with at Government level, the position will worsen. The Industries Development Committee is constantly receiving applications from industrial concerns anxious to start at Elizabeth. This morning I was trying to think when it last had an application before it for the establishment of an industry in the country. We should have to go back for years.

Mr. Millhouse—Be fair.

Mr. RICHES—Tell me of one. Nairne Pyrites is the last I can remember. In recent months the committee has received two applications from industries established in the country which are moving to Elizabeth.

Mr. Quirke—Why?

Mr. RICHES—One claims that it has to match interstate competition. An engineering firm which does work for General Motors-Holden's has been told that if Holden's cannot get someone who will be on its doorstep it will not get orders. I cannot remember one industry being established in the country in the last three or four years, or assisted in any way. That is a matter for serious concern. I know that under our present system every industry

has to consider this problem. Industries cannot establish themselves in the country because, as soon as a demand is created for their product, they may have to face competition from a factory established where the goods can be produced more cheaply. However, some places seem to be getting over that problem.

Mr. Heaslip—Give us an instance.

Mr. RICHES—I heard this morning of an industry that had been established at Ballarat.

Mr. Quirke—That is a city.

Mr. RICHES—We have reasonably big towns in South Australia. Can any member tell me of any industry that has been established in the country in the last three or four years?

Mr. Heaslip—What about Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie?

Mr. RICHES—Can the honourable member tell me of one industry that has been established by private enterprise in his electorate in the last 20 years?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—You will agree that a firm has already offered to start abattoirs in the South-East.

Mr. RICHES—I know that abattoirs are to be erected at Naracoorte. However, all the inducements which I have outlined and which are available in other parts of the State had to be offered, and in addition there had to be made available access to the metropolitan meat market, and that could be done only at Ministerial level.

Mr. Heaslip—Which means that it is not economic to undertake it down there.

Mr. RICHES—But they are going to do it. Don't worry about its being economic. I have no qualms at all about that industry the way it is to be operated. I have great faith in it

and cannot see that it can go wrong. Mr. Popp would not have considered going to Naracoorte unless he was guaranteed a share of the metropolitan meat market.

Mr. Harding—You must admit that he is now operating at Port Augusta, or don't you know?

Mr. RICHES—If he is, he is not doing it under his own name. I know, as there are negotiations taking place between Mr. Popp and the Port Augusta Abattoirs, because I was instrumental in making the contact. For a while I thought the honourable member was being serious. I am serious in this matter, because it illustrates perfectly the point I have set out to make—that in addition to all things I have outlined, in order to get the Naracoorte Abattoirs established, Mr. Popp had to be guaranteed a share of the metropolitan meat market. That could be done only at Ministerial level and that is where it should be done. I am asking that some authority should be set up at that level to encourage other industries to go into the country; and until we get that I cannot see any industry being established in country centres. I am not suggesting that that is the only answer. There may be some other way to do it, but if there is it is not being done and industries are just not being established in the country. Consequently, the situation is going from bad to worse. I am grateful for the patient hearing given me and support the motion.

Mr. QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.04 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 26, at 2 p.m.