

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 4, 1960.

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

### BUSH FIRES BILL.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### MILE END OVERWAY BRIDGE ACT AMENDMENT ACT.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Act.

### OPPOSITION APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that I have this day received a letter from the Secretary of the Parliamentary Labor Party, Mr. C. D. Hutchens, advising that the following have been elected to the respective offices as from this day: Mr. F. H. Walsh (member for Edwardstown), Leader of the Opposition; Mr. C. D. Hutchens (member for Hindmarsh), Deputy Leader of the Opposition; Mr. S. J. Lawn (member for Adelaide), Opposition Whip.

The Hon. Sir. THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—On behalf of members of this side, may I extend to the new Leader, the new Deputy Leader, and the new Opposition Whip our congratulations. No doubt we shall have political differences from time to time, because it would be too much to hope that we would not, but I assure these members that they have our high personal regard, and we congratulate them upon their high appointments. I have been associated with this Parliament for many years, during which time the Labor Party has had distinguished members leading it. I am sure that Mr. Frank Walsh will continue such service which, in the past, has been fruitful and to the good of the State. I assure him that any of his suggested amendments and any constructive proposals that he puts forward will receive the Government's utmost consideration.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I endorse the Premier's congratulatory remarks to the member for Edwardstown on his election as Leader of the Opposition, to Mr. Hutchens as Deputy Leader, and to Mr. Lawn as Opposition Whip. The Labor Party election this morning has

elevated to these high and responsible positions persons who have been members of this Parliament for many years. Effective government must have a virile Opposition, and we hope that these new officers will be able to contribute more virility from the Opposition and that the debates here will be the better because added responsibility brings out the best in all men. These members who have been elected to these high offices have the example of the late Leader, Mr. O'Halloran, to emulate. His mature judgment and sound commonsense should be a lesson to guide them. I congratulate them on their success.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—On my own behalf and on behalf of the Deputy Leader and the Whip I thank the Premier and Mr. Stott for their congratulations. We all regret the death of Mr. O'Halloran who will ever be remembered for his worth not only to this House but to the people of the State. I assure the Premier that all suggestions we may make from time to time on legislation, and any amendments we may move, will be constructive. As is well known, at times I have had to assume responsibility at short notice and at such times my Party has been able to help keep this House functioning. I hope Opposition members will be able to continue so doing in future. The member for Ridley referred to virility. Although I do not know what he meant by his reference, I assure him that these office-bearers are not senile. The members of my Party have made a choice and it will be my ambition to have their assistance and their co-operation. I assure the Premier that our objective is to prove to the people of this State that we will be capable of accepting the responsibility of Government if it comes our way.

### QUESTIONS.

#### LAND SUBDIVISIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Some publicity has been given to the fact that the Housing Trust is not to buy further land. As providing services for new subdivisions involves a heavy expenditure of State finances, will the Premier state whether the Government intends to examine the matter and to introduce a tax, not only in the interests of saving Government expenditure but in an effort to bring people back to reality in the matter of land values?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Housing Trust requires about 1,000 acres of

land every year for its building operations in the metropolitan area and at Elizabeth. Obviously, the trust could not have bought that land at high prices but has had to buy ahead to get land at reasonable prices so that it would not have its costs boosted by heavy land charges before building commenced. One reason why the trust has been so effective is that it has purchased land well ahead of requirements at reasonable rates having regard to the areas in which it has built. It has planned well ahead of actual requirements. I refute the suggestion that the trust has been the source of boosted land values. It has not: the position is quite the opposite. Because it provides houses at a moderate cost, it is interested only in land at moderate prices. It is not able to pay excessive prices. In an effort to bring back a little sanity to building prices and block values the trust does not intend to purchase land at present because, by developing the land it has, it can go on for a considerable time without making any new purchases.

I turn now to the Leader's question whether it is possible by some means to recoup the Government for services that may have to be provided. Recently we altered our practice regarding this matter. In some cases, where people have wanted services before the land has been built upon, the Government has provided those services only upon payment by landowners of the amounts prescribed, and it has paid back so much in relation to each house as the blocks have been built upon. In other words, the period of carrying empty land is being charged to vendors of land or builders of houses rather than to the Government. I believe that that in itself will bring about some sanity in relation to prices. I take the opportunity given by the Leader's question to say again that people who are now buying land for speculation are doing a foolish thing, because enough subdivisions have been made to cope with building likely to take place for at least 10 years. Anyone buying blocks of land with the idea that it will be necessary to hold them for only a few months to get a material increase in value is very foolish indeed, as that will not happen. Ample subdivisions have been approved and sold to provide for all the houses that will be required for at least 10 years. The Government is already requiring, where extensions of services are requested before houses are built, that the initial cost of the extensions shall be borne by the subdividers.

#### PARLIAMENTARY VISIT.

Mrs. STEELE—Will the Premier, on behalf of the Government, accept my thanks, and, I am sure, those of all members of the House, for arranging the recent trip to Leigh Creek and the Flinders Ranges? This trip enabled members to appreciate the value of the development of the coalfields as the basic factor in the State's industrial expansion and the real and potential value of the Flinders Ranges as a major tourist attraction of this State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I thank the honourable member for those expressions and answer the question by saying, "Yes, the Government will accept the honourable member's expressions." I appreciate that members have been able to see what I believe is a potential of great benefit to South Australia. I believe the two areas we visited last week will play an increasingly important part in the development of the State. Members saw the potential of Leigh Creek, but the potential from the tourist angle was not so conspicuous although I believe that tourist activity in inland Australia will become a big business in the future. I see no reason why it should not assume major proportions, much the same as the winter tourist attraction in Queensland has done. I say this because we have everything that Queensland has to offer, and a little more.

#### DEBT COLLECTORS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Last session I drew the Premier's attention to the practices of some debt collectors, and made it clear that I was not reflecting upon those who had been established for many years in this State and had acted with credit to themselves. Some people are now operating as debt collectors whose qualities and practices are in doubt. In reply to my previous question the Premier said he would consider introducing legislation. Has the Government considered introducing legislation to control or register debt collectors so that the public and those for whom the debt collectors are operating will be protected?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have this matter examined by Cabinet at the earliest possible moment and advise the honourable member. I agree that the attentions of some of these people can be very much more than is fair or necessary for the collection of debts and, indeed, in certain instances they can be not only a public nuisance but a menace. I am inclined to favour legislation.

## NOOGOORA BURR.

Mr. HEASLIP—Prior to the adjournment of the House I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the destruction and damage that Noogoora Burr can cause in South Australia. I pointed out that I had received requests on this subject from the Wilmington, Jamestown, Orroroo and Port Pirie councils, and I have now received another request from the Port Germein council. These councils embrace practically the whole of the northern areas, the people in which are well aware of the dangers and the added costs to primary producers that would result if this burr were to get a hold in South Australia. We have enough extra costs of producing wool without allowing other costs to arise. The Minister, in reply to my earlier question, said that the regulations approved last month by the Lieutenant-Governor in Executive Council gave authorized officers under the Weeds Act (1956) greater powers to deal with sheep infested with Noogoora Burr. He also said:—

More important, they have acted as a deterrent to dealers bringing burry sheep into the State. Officers of the Department of Agriculture have been attending sheep sales over the last month or so and it can be reported that there is no evidence of any burr-infested sheep entering the State during the last four weeks. It is therefore, considered that the measures taken have proved effective in dealing with this problem.

Unfortunately, damage has already been done as sheep have come in. Indeed, I know of flocks wandering around the roads in the northern areas and spreading these burrs. There are only one or two entrances into South Australia from New South Wales; apart from the railway and carriers through Broken Hill, very few sheep come in. In the interests of primary producers, and in an effort to prevent increased costs in the industry, will the Government take some action, similar to that taken by the Government of Western Australia, to prevent sheep infested with this burr from coming into South Australia in future?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—In contrast to Western Australia, there are so many avenues by which sheep can enter South Australia that it is impossible to prevent sheep that have Noogoora Burr on them from entering our State. I think I made that fairly clear when I spoke previously. After all, we are very concerned about the fruit fly, but of all the roads into South Australia we have blocks on only two. Because of the many entrances, it is impossible to prevent sheep from crossing our borders. It is incalculably

easier to stop the entry of sheep into Western Australia than it is into South Australia. The regulations approved by Executive Council were those required by the department to administer the Act correctly. Since I spoke on this subject in this House, we have received many letters from district councils in areas that could not grow the seed under any conditions. Letters from district councils in the South-East have endorsed the action of a council in the north in making a protest. I am certain that some letters were written by people who did not understand what they were writing about. I have at least four roneoed copies of the same letter from a council that has written not only to the Weeds Advisory Committee but has spent enough on postage, evidently, to send a copy to practically everybody it could think of. I do not know that such steps are helping the situation at all. The Director of Agriculture reported on this matter on September 23, and a copy of that letter has been sent to the honourable member. Since then, in view of the other correspondence that has come in, I asked the Director for a further report, and he states:—

I do not wish to modify those comments, but there is one detail which must be amended. The amended statement regarding the effect of the measures taken is that only one line of burr-infested sheep has been reported as entering the State during the last six weeks.

If the honourable member knows of flocks of sheep wandering around the north carrying Noogoora Burr, he will do us a service by telling us where they are. However, the Director made that statement following his previous report and all I want in addition to help me deal with this serious problem are concrete facts as to where the infested sheep are to be found.

## FEDERAL AID FOR ROADS.

Mr. McKEE—A letter which I received from the clerk of the Port Pirie council states:—

My council understands that additional money for roads is being made available by the Federal Government to State Governments, and it would appreciate any information you may be able to obtain on this matter.

If such is the case, can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, say what method must be adopted by councils to have this money made available to them?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a report.

## HEPATITIS.

Mr. LAUCKE—I am concerned at the incidence of hepatitis, the man-hours being lost through it, and its possible after effects. I have discussed this disease with medical friends, who concur that strict attention to personal hygiene is the most effective means of checking the disease. They particularly stress the need for washing hands after visiting the toilet. In view of the epidemic of the infectious hepatitis that has swept through the Bradfield Park housing estate near Sydney, and especially its impact on children, and bearing in mind that a similar outbreak could occur in our schools, I ask the Minister of Education whether he will obtain a report from the Director-General of Medical Services as to the need for close attention to personal hygiene in this matter; and, if the report indicates such a need, will he instruct the teaching staffs in our schools to emphasize to children the need for the observance of hygiene in this matter?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes; I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Health, and to obtain any report he desires from the Director-General of Medical Services, but I take this opportunity to say that from time to time instructions are issued in the *Education Gazette*, and headmasters, head teachers and head-mistresses also give instructions through their various schools for this very necessary practice to be continued. However, we shall be only too pleased to re-emphasize this in view of the outbreak to which the honourable member refers. If the Minister of Health can reinforce me with further information, I shall be only too pleased to give it publicity.

## CORNSACK PRICES.

Mr. BYWATERS—Last week I was approached by some of my constituents who were very concerned about the steep increase in the cost of cornsacks. Merchants tell me that last year the price was £37 16s. 3d. a bale for cornsacks, whereas this year it has risen to £49 1s. 3d. a bale. Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of prices, say whether cornsacks are under price control; if not, will he ascertain the reason for this steep increase in price?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get a full report on the present practice for the honourable member. I agree with him that this is a matter of great concern today to the rural industries. They are in many

instances confronted with large purchases of cornsacks, and the price is of great concern to them. I will have the matter investigated.

## VICTOR HARBOUR ROAD.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the Premier any further information on plans for the Victor Harbour to Adelaide road, to which I referred in my question of September 1?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Mr. Jackman, the Commissioner of Highways, informs me that survey and the preparation of plans for the general widening of the Main South Road to the Port Noarlunga turn-off are in hand, and widening on the Sturt Creek to O'Halloran Hill section has commenced. The above survey will include investigation regarding Reynella. As the traffic density is much less beyond the Port Noarlunga turn-off, no decision has been reached regarding the Hackham crossing, nor has Willunga Hill been surveyed.

## HOUSING TRUST LAND PURCHASE.

Mr. CLARK—Recently the Premier announced publicly that no further land would be purchased by the South Australian Housing Trust. At the same time, he criticized the inflationary influence of over-subdivision on land prices. May I say I entirely agree with that criticism. Is it a fact that just two days prior to that announcement, 1,200 acres, known as Becker's property, near Smithfield, had been purchased by the trust for £750,000?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Housing Trust has purchased a considerable area in the honourable member's district and adjoining Elizabeth—rather earlier, I think, than the period he mentioned. It arose out of great extensions planned for the area by General Motors-Holdens. That meant that the original land had to be obtained by the trust for its purposes as required. I do not know the name of the property, so I do not want to tie my statement to any particular property, but the land was purchased on condition that the trust did not have to pay cash for it. It will pay for it over a period of years, as it is required.

## MURRAY RIVER LEVELS.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Works any information on the effect of the flooding of the tributaries of the Murray in Victoria and New South Wales, particularly the Ovens, Lodden, and Murrumbidgee, on the Murray river levels in South Australia?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—No. I have not asked the Engineer-in-Chief to give me

that information. I think that probably until the last day or so it has been rather difficult for him to forecast, but by now some reasonably accurate forecast could be expected. I will ask him for full information and advise the honourable member tomorrow.

Mr. JENKINS—I understand from reports that the Murray River is reaching high levels upstream. Does the Minister of Works consider that there is likely to be any danger to the embankment protecting the dairying properties at Jerovis?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—As indicated, I have not yet asked the Engineer-in-Chief for his forecast of the river heights because I thought that until about this time it would be premature to do so. However, I will ask him for the information. I am confident that there is no serious danger of flooding, particularly in the lower reaches of the river, although there will be a temporary rise, the nature of which I am not capable of forecasting. I will obtain information for the honourable member.

#### BASIC WAGE CASE.

Mr. RYAN—At the beginning of this session various questions were asked in another place of the Attorney-General regarding the appearance in the Arbitration Court of the Crown Solicitor in the employers' application dealing with the basic wage and differential rates. The answer given in another place on various occasions was that the Crown Solicitor was appearing in the case, not supporting the application but only as a representative of the Government as a respondent to the various awards. Will the Premier say whether the Crown Solicitor is in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court today and whether he is acting on the authority of the Government in supporting the employers' application in relation to the basic wage?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get a report from the Minister of Labour and Industry and advise the honourable member.

#### SKILLED LABOUR.

Mr. DUNNAGE—The Premier is reported in the press today as saying about the shortage of skilled labour:—

It has reached the stage where the State Government has had to embark on a policy to bring more migrant artisans and skilled craftsmen to South Australia.

How do we go about getting skilled labour? Is it not the prerogative or duty of the Commonwealth Government to bring out migrants to this State? Do we apply to the

Commonwealth Government for skilled artisans, or do we set up our own labour exchange over there? If so, do we do it through the Agent-General, or do we send men overseas to recruit these skilled workmen?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—From time to time in addition to the number of people brought out by the Commonwealth Government to South Australia, we have had to augment that supply of skilled and qualified people by our own importations. That has been done largely on our own selection, but frequently the Commonwealth Government assists in their transportation. The honourable member will realize that, with the large volume of expansion now taking place, there is scarcely any category of skilled artisan that is not at present in short supply. We are most anxious to augment the supply here to effectively achieve the development planned for the next six years.

#### GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. QUIRKE—Last year I referred to the wine prices that were proposed to be charged in South Australia and the Premier placed the matter in the hands of the Prices Commissioner. As a result of his able administration, much stability has been achieved in that industry. However, he said that it was possible for the industry to pay increased prices to grape growers. Some wineries followed his recommendation, but others did not, or did so only in part, and consequently many growers did not benefit. Can the Premier indicate what action will be taken this year to ensure that growers gain some benefit from the higher prices being obtained for wine sold in South Australia and in other States?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Mr. Murphy's investigation was probably the first into South Australia's wine industry. He reported to me that all sections of the industry gave him every assistance. A copy of his report has been tabled and is available to honourable members. If the honourable member examines the report he will see that Mr. Murphy recommended an increase of £4 a ton for certain grapes and £2 a ton for other varieties, but such increases were consequential upon an increase in the price of wine. Wine makers did not accept all of Mr. Murphy's recommendations: they accepted the increase of £4 a ton, but rejected the suggested increase of £2 a ton for other varieties. It has been requested that Mr. Murphy continue his investigations this year to ascertain to what extent the industry has been able to increase

its prices and to determine what prices could be paid by the industry next year. Those prices will be based upon actual results obtained from the increased wine prices in Australia. A real problem confronting the industry is that only a small percentage of the wine is sold in South Australia. Overseas it has to be sold in competition with world supplies. Of course, in South Australia, to some extent it has to be sold in competition with the production of Victoria and New South Wales. It is not easy to ascertain quickly a change in prices. Mr. Murphy will continue his investigations this year and I have no doubt the industry will accept his recommendations.

#### LAMEROO RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 6 regarding a new platform and station for Lameroo?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received the following reply from the Minister of Railways:—

The Railways Commissioner reports that the passenger platform at Lameroo is listed for replacement, and it is planned to have the work undertaken during the financial year 1961-62. It is not proposed to replace the station building at Lameroo at present.

#### MARINE DRIVE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—From time to time proposals have been made for a marine drive from Marino to Outer Harbour and certain works have been effected, notably from Largs to Outer Harbour. Recently the proposal has been revived, but I understand that the West Beach Reserve Trust does not agree that the marine drive should pass between the foreshore and the reserve. Can the Premier indicate the trust's policy on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no knowledge of what the trust proposes on this matter, but I will get a report from Mr. Baker and advise the honourable member in due course.

#### ANGORICHINA HOSTEL.

Mr. HARDING—Does the Premier know, or will he ascertain, whether the Government financially assists the Angorichina Hostel annually and whether a rebate of 50 per cent is allowed on railway fares for patients of the hostel?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get that information for the honourable member.

#### POISON CENTRE.

Mr. RICHES—It has been suggested that there is a need to establish a centre at which poisoning cases can be more readily diagnosed than they have been in the past. Many people have died from poisoning before a proper diagnosis has been made, and frequently children are poisoned. I understand that poison centres have been established in America and that one is being set up in Sydney. Has the Premier received representations from the National Safety Council regarding setting up a poison centre in South Australia, and if so, has he considered them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As this matter would normally be handled by the Minister of Health, I will inquire and advise the honourable member tomorrow.

#### WHYALLA HOSPITAL.

Mr. LOVEDAY—In view of the widespread public disquiet in Whyalla over the circumstances surrounding the resignation of the matron of the Whyalla Hospital, and the possible repercussions, will the Premier ask the Minister of Health to authorize the Director-General of Medical Services or some other suitable independent authority to inquire into the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I presume the honourable member's question relates to some incident that has happened at the Whyalla Hospital, which is controlled by a local board of management. The Government has had no request for such an inquiry from the local board of management, and an inquiry would have no validity. Under those circumstances, and without having consulted the Minister of Health, I think that the Minister would be extremely unlikely to act unless he were requested by the board, which is the authority with which the Government normally deals regarding such matters as subsidies. Although a prerequisite of any action by the Minister of Health would be a request from the board, I will refer the matter to him for report.

#### RAIL LINK WITH MODBURY AND TEA TREE GULLY.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on September 21 regarding a rail link from Northfield to Modbury and Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Railways Commissioner has reported that no extension of the Adelaide to Northfield railway line to Modbury and Tea Tree Gully is contemplated.

## NORWOOD SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Mrs. STEELE—Some time ago I asked the Minister of Education a question about the delay in completing the central portion of the Norwood boys technical high school, and the Minister said that arrangements had been made for its completion by labour employed by the Public Buildings Department and by letting minor contracts for specialist services. Up to the present, however, nothing further has been done. A similar situation exists at the new Norwood high school with regard to the building that houses the laboratories and domestic arts centre, on which work has been at a standstill for some months. Earthworks are still incomplete and the playground area restricted. Concern is felt by some sub-contractors who, until the completed work is passed, cannot receive payment from the contractors responsible for the construction of the school. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the situation at both schools, as there is considerable concern in the district about the delay in completing these two projects?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—J. shall be pleased to do so. I know that my colleague, the Minister of Works, has both these matters in hand through the Director of Public Buildings, and some aspects were discussed in Cabinet yesterday.

## HOUSING FOR AGED.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on September 20 about the possibility of building flats for elderly spinsters and widows?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Chairman of the Housing Trust reports:—

The practice followed under the Country Housing Act has been to build small houses in country towns. These are suitable for occupation both by elderly people and by widows with children. Where an extra room is needed to accommodate a family, this is provided by means of a portable sleepout. Thus, by building in the manner so far adopted, the scheme is flexible enough to accommodate different types of people. If small flats were built specifically for occupation by elderly ladies living on their own, the accommodation would not be capable of being used for other purposes. Consequently, it is the opinion of the Housing Trust that it should endeavour to build a more flexible type of accommodation.

It might be mentioned that at Renmark the trust expects that it will soon build a small group of flats for the Renmark Homes for the Aged Incorporated which are intended to be occupied by elderly people. The Renmark Homes for the Aged Inc. has been formed locally and will be subsidized in the usual way by the Commonwealth Government. It may

be that this form of development is capable of being carried out in other country towns. The trust will always be willing to aid any such venture by making available expert assistance.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding homes for the aged and widows in Millicent and other important towns in my district?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Mr. Cartledge, the Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust, reports:—

Consequent upon the grant of a further £100,000 for the purposes of the Country Housing Act, the Housing Trust will proceed to build additional houses as soon as may be. At present the following towns are under consideration for the erection of houses:—Berri, Clare, Kapunda, Loxton, Mannum, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Naracoorte, Nuriootpa, Pinnaroo, Port Augusta, Renmark and Waikerie.

## EGG SALES.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on September 6 relating to grading and sale of over-sized eggs?

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

I have to advise with regard to the question concerning the grading of eggs in Victoria that the Egg and Egg Pulp Marketing Board of Victoria has been contacted and they advise that, at the present time, producers are not being paid an additional amount for over-sized eggs. It has been recommended by the Victorian Board to their Minister that another grade, comprising eggs of two ounces and over, be introduced and be called "king size." However, approval has not yet been given for this and the premium at which they would be sold, if approval is given, has not been discussed. With regard to South Australia, I would advise that over-sized eggs, provided that they are of first grade quality, are not graded down to pulping prices; they are paid for on the basis of first quality hen.

## ALSATIAN DOGS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I recently received a letter from the Premier's secretary regarding the question of a pedigree German shepherd dog owned by a Mr. Hill who resides outside local government areas. The letter stated that the Premier had had the matter examined and that it was not practicable to arrive at a satisfactory solution. Can the Premier say whether the question of extending the powers of the Whyalla Town Commission to register dogs in that mining lease, in addition to the local government areas, has been considered, by amending either the Whyalla Town Commission

Act or the Local Government Act? It is rather anomalous that people in that area, which is actually part of the town, are unable to register their dogs with the local government authority.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The difficulty arises out of an amendment introduced by the Hon. Sir George Jenkins and carried prior to his appointment as Minister of Agriculture. That legislation provided an absolute prohibition on keeping Alsatian dogs in the outside areas where they were considered to be dangerous and where experiments showed that they could easily cross with a dingo and make a very dangerous animal indeed. For that reason, Parliament has prohibited keeping Alsatian dogs in these areas. By the same Act, a heavier registration fee is imposed in respect of this breed of dog. I sympathize with the owner of this dog; no doubt the dog is well kept, the owners are very fond of it, and it is not likely to be dangerous. However, the Government has no power to override an Act of Parliament. The importance of the pastoral industry is such that I doubt very much whether the House would accept an amendment that could make exceptions to what has been a long-established rule, namely, that Alsatian dogs are not allowed in areas outside district council areas. That is the general position. I doubt whether any basis of legality can be established in the way mentioned, but I will have the matter examined by the Crown Solicitor.

#### APRICOT GUMMOSIS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 21 regarding the effectiveness of spreading copper sulphate crystals in combating apricot gummosis?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Chief Horticulturist of the Department of Agriculture reports:—

The use of copper sulphate crystals as a control of apricot gummosis is brought up from time to time. It has been carefully examined by the Department of Agriculture, and it has no effect on the incidence of apricot gummosis at all. Apricot gummosis is a fungus disease for which at present no cure has been found by the application of any known fungicidal material to the tree. It can be almost completely prevented from attacking trees by the use of the modified system of pruning introduced by this department.

#### RAILWAY YARDS CAR PARK.

Mr. Hutchens for Mr. LAWN (on notice)—

1. Has the erection of a car park over the Adelaide railway yards been considered?

2. If not, will the Minister refer this matter to the Commissioner of Railways for a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

1. Yes.

2. This suggestion has been reported on unfavourably because the fumes from diesel equipment would create a hazard for railway staff and customers.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following final reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Booloroo Centre Water Supply.

Iron Knob Water Supply.

Mallala and Kimba Area Schools.

Ordered that reports be printed.

#### THE BUDGET.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 21. Page 1091.)

Grand Total, £85,516,029.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo)—In supporting the first line I pay my respects to our late Leader, Mr. O'Halloran, and state that in my opinion he was one of the greatest leaders ever sponsored by an Opposition in the Commonwealth of Australia. At all times the late Mr. O'Halloran had the wholehearted support of members of the Opposition. The State of South Australia is the poorer for his passing. I thank the Treasurer, who made it possible for members to see the Flinders Ranges and the township of Leigh Creek. If we travelled all over the Commonwealth we would not find anything more beautiful than the Flinders Ranges, and I am sure that Mr. Pollnitz has, in those mountains, one of the greatest potential tourist attractions. I am confident that in the years to come the Wilpena Pound and the adjoining ranges will be one of the draw cards of this State for visitors from all over the world. I congratulate the Electricity Trust on the creation of the lovely town of Leigh Creek. It was my first visit, and it was an eye-opener to me to see such a lovely town in the outback and the magnificent and clean way it is kept. I also take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Frank Walsh (member for Edwardstown) on being elected Leader of the Opposition, and to assure him that he will have the same support as was given to our late Leader.



Although it is the duty of members of the Opposition to criticize the Budget presented by the Treasurer, I assure him that, even though I represent a district that was neglected by the Government for some years, there will be no bitterness in my remarks, and that any criticism or suggestion I make will be made solely to assist not only the Government, but the individual and the progress of the State. At the same time, one receives a different version of this State than that received by sitting back and reading the Treasurer's Budget Speech. I do not think the Treasurer's remarks clearly indicate the true position and the sad plight that many people find themselves in through no fault of their own. I know it sounds very good to be able to stand up and say, as the Treasurer did:—

This, my twenty-second Budget, I put before the House with a greater sense of confidence in the strength of the State finances and assurance of progress in the State's economy than ever before.

It seems to me that this is quite a Party song. At the annual meeting of the Wallaroo District Committee of the Liberal and Country League, held at Kadina, a member of the Government sang the same song, only on that occasion it was the second verse, namely, that the Liberal Government faces the public with an outstanding record of progress and every confidence. Faces the public with every confidence! What a statement to make. I always thought that the people of South Australia were the general public. I do not know how the honourable member could say that his Government faces the public with every confidence, when about 50,000 more of the public referred to by the honourable member voted for the Labor Party than for the member's own Party at the elections last year. The member further stated:—

The primary producers experienced a bad season, and this had little effect on the economy of the State.

Only recently the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said in this Chamber:—

I do not think that the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) would be offended if I suggested that it is the primary produce from the country that keeps the cities going. If it were not for that produce, the cities would soon fritter away. What we get from the land affects our economy. If we forget that, our agricultural pursuits will soon decline.

As one who represents one of the best primary producing districts in the State, I say this afternoon that the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) never spoke truer words. On the one hand, the Minister says that the

primary producer has little effect on the economy of the State; on the other hand, the honourable member for Onkaparinga contradicts that. That only goes to show that there are certainly differences of opinion within the Government, that it is not unanimous as to whether the primary producers of this State do make any difference to its economy. As I mentioned earlier, it is all right and sounds good when the Treasurer says that he stands before members with a greater sense of confidence in the strength of the State's finances and assurance of progress of the State's economy than ever before. It makes good reading for those who are enjoying the better things of life, whilst the big business men will blow their chests out like pouter pigeons and crow that the ability of the Treasurer has saved the State from bankruptcy and chaos.

But I am not very happy, nor are many supporters of the Government, about the increased public debt. It would appear that the Treasurer is satisfied with the fact that the public debt has increased by £21,402,968, from £317,702,098 in 1959 to £339,105,066 in 1960. For the year ended June 30, 1959, the public debt charges amounted to £16,076,000, an increase of £1,478,000 over the previous year. For 1960 the public debt charges were £17,928,000, an increase of £1,853,000. I do not intend to deal any further with this aspect of the subject as I do not profess to be a financial expert, but to me the interest bill attached to the public debt could become top heavy and in the end could crash.

Last year I criticized the Hospitals Department for failing to distinguish in its records between establishment and maintenance expenditure at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This year, for the first time, departmental officers have shown what it really costs to maintain a patient there for a day: £11 2s. 8d. (or £77 18s. 8d. a week). This is £23 2s. 7d. a week over the cost at the next highest general hospital in South Australia; £42 17s. 6d. a week more than that at the lowest general hospital in South Australia; or £31 10s. a week more than that at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It is interesting to note that the capital cost so far for the establishment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is £7,360,000, or £5,990,000 more than was estimated in, I think, 1948. In other words, it has cost over £15,000 to establish a bed in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I want to be fair this afternoon and say that I think that most South Australians are very proud of this hospital, even though some of us are perhaps

staggered by the cost involved. I conclude on debt charges by saying that the debt charge alone on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is £3 3s. 5d. for each occupied bed.

Much has been said in this debate about last season being the driest on record and comparisons being made with 1914. With very great respect to those men on the land in 1914 who suffered to an extent that we never wish to experience, the men on the land excelled themselves last year as never before in the history of the State. Last season was the first occasion that many young producers had experienced a dry year, and in fairness to them I think the State should feel proud that they adapted themselves so well to the prevailing conditions and came through as real sons and daughters of the land, not forgetting the magnificent assistance of the Agriculture Department. The overcoming of scientific problems by the department plus the ready co-operation of the department's officers to give advice have enabled the young farmers of today to be a success. The foundation of so many bureaux is an indication that the young farmer today appreciates the advisory services of the department. I have no doubt in my own mind that, despite the dry year, last year's returns were in no small measure due to the help of the department. Nothing pleases me more than to know that the grant to the Agriculture Department is being increased this year.

The Treasurer has rightly received kudos for his efforts in encouraging secondary industries to come to our State. He bases his arguments upon the fact that Australia cannot progress without decentralization of industry. That policy gained general support and approbation until it was learned by people living in country districts that decentralization is, in the Treasurer's way of thinking, merely a scattering of industry from the eastern States to swell the already bloated gross body of our own capital city. The metropolitan area has gone on in its growth until in December, 1959, the population reached 570,700 out of a total in the State of 934,400, or 61 per cent within a 15-mile radius of the General Post Office.

Mr. Jenkins—But every capital city in the Commonwealth has been the same.

Mr. HUGHES—That may be so, but this Government always crows from the tree-tops that it is the first in doing things, and I hope it is the first in decentralizing its people to the country areas. In 1939, when the total population was 599,300, 54 per cent of the people lived in the metropolitan area and 46

per cent in the country, a difference of only eight per cent. Today, the difference has increased to 22 per cent.

Despite the industrial expansion that has taken place and business affairs generally improving, despite all this, the Government had not the ability to retain the people in the country, people who existed when we were in the trough of the depression. It therefore becomes plain that country towns are slowly but surely going into decay. With the exception of two or three provincial towns, the balance are in a state of stagnation, their people despondent, their youth scattered to gain what living might be available to them away from the home, and finally migrating to the city. The Treasurer has a glorious opportunity of rehabilitating the State as a whole through industry. I mention my own district of Wallaroo which, by its own endeavours, cannot re-establish the industry for which at one time it was noted; a district that provided so much towards the progress and prosperity of this State. The present-day students of the Adelaide University are still reaping the fruits of generous donors from my district who gave huge sums of money in the initial stages in order that the State as a whole, and not one section of the people, would benefit. They were men of vision, men who saw the need for future expansion, and were prepared to back it.

A few years ago the people of my district strove hard to coax the establishment of a country export meat works at Kadina, and just when the situation looked rosy, a torpedo was let loose and the whole thing blew up.

Mr. Hall—What was the torpedo?

Mr. HUGHES—The people of my district were very hostile, and rightly so, because much prominence was given over the radio and in the press to the fact that a modern meat works would be established at Kadina. For the benefit of the honourable member who has just interjected, the significant thing is that all this took place just before an election. In speaking to prominent business men and producers, I found that they were of the opinion that a meat works of that nature would have proved a successful venture. It certainly would have been a boon to the district of Wallaroo.

In the *South Australian Farmer* appeared the following letter headed "Adelaide Letter". It said:—

Playford Memorial.—The new power station at Port Augusta has been named the Thomas Playford power station, but the Premier had

an earlier memorial at Adelaide, in the abattoirs and stock paddocks around the city. People who have to build beyond this cattle country, and travel 20 miles or so daily to and from Adelaide to work, cannot be jubilant about the memorial. Adelaide and suburban residents ought also to be indignant to have a big suburban area given over to stock paddocks and inelegant abattoirs works. Interstate or overseas visitors are perhaps too polite to express an opinion about the city's ranch of cattle, sheep and pigs, but it might be profitable to hear their remarks. Amongst the many proposals for a new design for Victoria Square no-one has suggested cattle pens or sheep troughs. This would make Adelaide as famous as having its ranch nearby up to King William Street.

That Adelaide correspondent certainly disagreed with centralization, especially of abattoirs and stock paddocks. We all make mistakes and I think that at the time of planning no-one could foresee that the present abattoirs and stock paddocks would be required as a residential area. However, it is time these facilities were transferred to another site, and there is no better situation than the site chosen near Kadina for a meatworks.

Mr. Jennings—The abattoirs is in my area and I should be glad to give it to you.

Mr. HUGHES—And I should be glad to take it. An abattoirs must have road and rail connections to the capital city. Kadina is only 91 miles from Adelaide and is linked with a good bitumen road serving the main towns of Yorke Peninsula and Port Pirie.

Mr. Shannon—Would you favour an increase in the price of meat to the housewife as a result of having the abattoirs 91 miles from Adelaide?

Mr. HUGHES—I am yet to be convinced that the meat would be dearer. Wallaroo is only six miles from Kadina and has a natural deep water port. Two broad gauge lines on the jetty connect directly with the State's main rail system near Port Wakefield. Unlike the Adelaide correspondent, the people of my district would welcome the smell of an abattoirs just as a hungry man would welcome the smell of a hamburger shop. I realize that new industries do not grow easily and that the path of the pioneer is never easy: it is necessarily beset with risks. Unfortunately, too little attention has been given, publicly or privately, to encouraging the pioneering of industry to the country. The question is whether there is the economic incentive to justify substantial expansion of any industry to a country district. The surest way to promote and encourage industry to any country district is to cultivate confidence in the future of that district. Such confidence is necessary

not only for the industry itself, but for the financial institutions to whom the industry looks for assistance. We should budget to make money available for any industry that might be floated in country areas. Were such an avenue opened I believe the people would still retain sufficient hope for the future to try to rehabilitate themselves in the country. There is a real incentive to do this at present.

I know that the Industries Development Committee is doing a grand job in hearing appeals for assistance, but we should budget to make special concessions available for industry setting up in country districts. Then the Government could make overtures to industrialists to avail themselves of these concessions. A schedule could be worked out—so much in every £1,000 on a *pro rata* basis.

A fortnight ago I asked the Minister of Marine about a rumour circulating in Wallaroo that the Harbors Board was going to curtail allocation moneys for maintenance work at Wallaroo this financial year. I was pleased with his reply that, in his opinion, there was no foundation for that rumour. I had two reasons for being pleased; firstly, that full employment for Harbors Board employees would be maintained, and, secondly, that necessary work would be carried out at the jetty and that the belt system for bulk handling, which is one of the most modern systems in the Commonwealth, would be properly maintained and preserved. However, despite the Minister's reply, three men at Wallaroo have received dismissal notices from the Harbors Board. Every penny spent by the board at Wallaroo is warranted and much maintenance work has to be carried out each year, but I assure the Minister of Marine that nowhere in the State is a better return given for the amount spent. I will prove that money spent by the board at such outports as Wallaroo is not excessive and I will instance a few cases from other States and indicate the amounts spent there.

While in Western Australia recently, I visited Albany and was amazed at the progress there. Two new concrete piers, with one £70,000 transit shed, have been built in the last six years. I had the cost figures of the two piers, but have mislaid them. However, members know that it costs a huge sum to build two new piers. Incidentally, a Labor Government was in power during most of the time, but the present Government is carrying on the good work. Albany's trade is approximately 120 ships a year, and the cargo, in and out, averages 300,000 tons per annum.

In Portland, Victoria, a well publicized plan costing about £5,000,000, and comprising deep water wharves, two transit sheds, breakwaters and so forth, is being carried out. I understand it will be completed toward the end of this year. Its current trade is less than 100,000 tons annually, of which petrol accounts for 55,000 tons. The balance comprises dairy produce, meat and some wheat. In *Waterfront*, dated April 19, 1960, under the heading "Plans for Port Alma" the following appears:—

The Rockhampton Harbour Board hopes to call tenders for the construction of a new Port Alma wharf before June 30. Board chairman, Mr. M. Hinchliff, said recently that the board intended consulting shipping interests on the plans before the tenders are called. Expected to cost £500,000, the new 550ft. wharf will be of reinforced concrete. It will be designed specially for meat cargoes.

The Queensland Government is conscious of the need for outports. Port Alma is an export port for Rockhampton and its main export is meat. It does not handle any bulk cargoes and the total maximum cargo handled in any one year is 35,000 tons. In the same paper, under the heading "Port Demands Growing" the following appears:—

DEVONPORT.—"I am proud to say that Tasmanian port authorities are keeping well up with modern trends in port construction," the Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Dwyer, said last month. Mr. Dwyer was opening the biannual conference of Tasmanian port authorities at Devonport. Mr. Dwyer said that the trend was for the construction of harbours to accommodate a bigger and better class of ship. Tasmania was keeping pace with this trend, but generally it meant that State port authorities had a big task ahead of them.

BURNIE.—A recent meeting of the Burnie Marine Board was told by the secretary, Mr. H. Miller, that 28 ships grossing 98,043 tons, worked the port during February. This included 8 oversea ships with a gross tonnage of 62,241. There were 19 interstate vessels of 35,682 tons and a coastal freighter of 120 tons. In February last year 25 ships of 75,695 tons worked the port. In the eight months to the end of February, 223 merchant ships of slightly more than three-quarters of a million tons worked the port.

It was also announced that the Board is seeking £593,250 for the first stage of the construction of the new island breakwater, one of the main projects in the £10,000,000 port development scheme. It wants another £91,000 for excavation and reclamation work and £70,000 to construct a shed on piles adjacent to Jones Pier.

Devonport commenced a £1,000,000 scheme in 1957, and the main cargoes handled there are bulk petroleum products, potatoes, frozen vegetables and dairy products. Very little in-cargo is handled and most ships calling at Devonport would land less than 1,000 tons.

The estimated cargo handled annually at Devonport, including oils, is between 150,000 and 200,000 tons. Burnie has a similar trade and in 1958 a scheme costing £3,500,000 for port improvements was announced. In the September 17 publication of *Waterfront*, under the heading "£9½ Millions for Northern N.S.W. Ports", the following appeared:—

Harbour and port improvement programmes for Newcastle and the N.S.W. North Coast were estimated to cost more than £9,400,000, State Government sources indicated this month. The Government's current programme of improvements in Newcastle will cost more than £5,000,000. The State Governor (Sir Eric Woodward) said this when opening the third session of State Parliament. Sir Eric said the £5,000,000 improvement and development plan at Newcastle Harbour was being carried out by the Public Works Department. Good progress was being made on the scheme for reclamation of low-lying islands in the Hunter River estuary. (Tenders have already been called for the first of two new bridges to cross the south and the north arms of the Hunter River to link Newcastle with Stockton via the islands reclamation scheme, which will provide deep water berthing frontages for new industries.) More than 8,000,000 tons of dredged material has already been deposited on the four islands which will ultimately provide more than 6,000 acres of land for industrial development. A programme of improvement of New South Wales north coast ports now in progress would cost £4,400,000 eventually, the Minister for Works (Mr. Ryan) said. At the mouth of the Clarence River, where a long-range plan of development would cost £4,000,000, a new harbour was being constructed to provide a trade outlet for the north coast and tablelands, he said. Other north coast port improvement projects included harbour works at Brunswick Heads (£240,000) and at Evans Head (£175,000), he added. During this financial year, it is expected that the Government will call tenders to remove rock deposits from the entrance to Newcastle Harbour to increase the low water depth to about 36ft. to enable the entry of much larger ships than at present.

The £175,000 allocated for Evans Head is for the fishing industry alone. The cases I have spoken about I think have proved without a shadow of doubt that other States are spending money on their outports. Although I realize the great work being carried out under the Greater Port Adelaide Plan and I know what it will return to the State in the long run, I also stress the importance of the port at Wallaroo, which handles a terrific amount of cargo—much more than the ports I have mentioned—yet sufficient money cannot be found to carry out maintenance work. I hope the Minister will take up this matter and see if three men who have received dismissal notices at Wallaroo can be reinstated for the benefit of the port in particular and of the State in general. I support the Estimates.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—I have much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Estimates, as I consider many items are outstanding. I shall comment briefly on the general financial position as I see it and then deal with one or two specific departments. When we recall the speech with which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor opened Parliament last March, in which he envisaged a deficit of £1,800,000 and residues from the previous year of £1,027,000, we remember how grim the position was. It would have been a brave man who was prepared to say that the position as we saw it would improve to the extent it has improved. We now realize the dire effects the dry season had, both on the production of the State and on the revenue of the Railways Department and the Harbors Board. We also recall the huge cost of pumping water from the River Murray. All these were in the first year of emerging as a non-claimant State under the Grants Commission. That was only six months ago. Then, of course, we were fortunate as rains came and a wonderful change came over the country. This State has made such a remarkable recovery that the Treasurer has been able to meet the estimated deficits and present a balanced Budget. This should give much satisfaction to every member.

Mr. Jennings—Did the Treasurer make the rains come?

Mr. CUMBE—I did not say that. I suggest that the State has made such a remarkable recovery that the Treasurer has been able to submit a balanced Budget. The important things in the Budget and in the financial statement submitted with it are the Treasurer's remarks about the 1960-61 season. When one goes through the speech one can see a note of confidence. Now is the time to go forward because, as we have ridden out this drought and the dire rural position we were in, it is now the time to further the progress of the State, and any financial provisions to be made should be made in this Budget. This is the time when we should prepare for future progress. As the Treasurer has often said, nothing succeeds like success. If we go on now and succeed, this in turn will snowball. The coming year is one in which to consolidate and progress, because the years that lie ahead are those in which we should really progress.

When moving around through various parts of the State, I have been struck by the sense of confidence among people in various walks of life—a sense of confidence and security engendered by the good housekeeping, financial responsibility and honest administration of the

present Government. No member of this House or of the community could cavil at or criticize this Government for not being an honest administration, and the fact that its financing is sound, I suggest, engenders that feeling of confidence and security. This is illustrated by the fact that new industries, both large and small, are established almost daily. Many increased facilities are being offered for investment, a tremendous amount of building of private homes and offices is progressing in the city, and many multi-storey buildings are being planned and erected. All of these are placing a severe strain on the building industry and it will not be long before we will have a grave shortage of tradesmen.

Mr. McKee—Is that causing the shortage of steel, do you think?

Mr. CUMBE—It may lead to it; it may be one aspect. No doubt there is a far greater output of steel now than there has been for some years, but consumption has increased tremendously. The rate of demand for steel products has far outstripped Australia's present production.

Mr. Loveday—That was forecast by the former Director of Mines.

Mr. CUMBE—Quite so. There is no doubt that the huge demand for steel products has been brought about by the greater use of steel in home and office building. Modern building technique is to build a steel skeleton and fill it in with clay products, and this has led to a greater demand for steel. New techniques in fabrication have also increased the demand. Although output of steel is increasing, the demand is far outstripping it. Frankly, I do not know the answer. However, these activities are all fostered from the sense of confidence in the future of the State. Many multi-storey buildings are to be constructed in Adelaide. A fortnight ago the construction of two such buildings was announced, and another was announced today. In the last few months the building of two 11-storey blocks of flats was announced, and this morning the proposal to build a two-storey block was announced. I feel that there is a bright future for the building industry in this State. The only snag is that, with the small number of master builders capable of carrying out these jobs, there may be a shortage of contractors. There will be a shortage of skilled tradesmen and the building industry may have to train craftsmen. That will be necessary if this country is to build the number of houses and other buildings we will

need so urgently in the future. The trade schools are doing a valuable job, but I feel that the facilities they offer could be extended.

The figures in this Budget indicate that the Government is trying to keep pace with all this expansion by increasing services and utilities. We have only to look at the Public Works Committee's reports to see the many projects recommended. The number of projects and the amount involved this year are certainly a record. The value of projects included in the Estimates is certainly a record and indicates that the Government is aware of the necessity to expand its own utilities and accept its responsibilities to keep pace with expansion. We are expanding; there is no doubt about it. If we are to look to the future with confidence we must look to our development, as this State is far from fully developed. We have a considerable economic potential. We must develop our resources, increase our population, and get more and more people and industries to go to the country. This development for the future should be a spur and drive for all our thinking and energies for the future, especially from the Parliamentary angle. Development, if we look at it closely, means industrialization, scientific advancement, increased commercial activity, and a searching for and discovery of natural resources which are as yet unknown, but which we confidently expect to find if we search for them. In this I class mineral deposits and oil. The Mines Department is contributing a valuable assistance in oil exploration.

Mr. McKee—Who has the monopoly over the mineral deposits?

Mr. CUMBE—They are in the ground.

Mr. Ryan—The Broken Hill Proprietary Company.

Mr. CUMBE—It has not a monopoly. We must become increasingly self-supporting, especially in food and primary production, if we are to support the population increase we must have in South Australia to carry on this development. We must also pursue the development of our economic front, not only of our minerals and industrial activities. We must also have good housekeeping to keep a balance between our imports and exports. We must not allow our imports to rise too high in ratio to our exports, because if we allow these things to get out of hand we will be faced with rampant inflation, which nobody wants.

Mr. Ryan—We have no control over that, as a State Parliament.

Mr. CUMBE—The honourable member will realize that I am making a few general remarks as I see the position. The Budget is a very valuable contribution, and, of course, any inflation that occurs would affect future Budgets. I suggest to the House that we in South Australia must pursue a vigorous policy of public works—housing, schools, etc.—to meet our economic expansion, but we must avoid at all costs high and stifling taxation, because that is the very thing that will retard business and personal initiative. I believe that the Budget we have before us today will encourage this development, will support a growing community, and will succeed in raising our real standards of living.

I wish to refer very briefly to the credit position today, as I see it, in the commercial activity of our State. The Reserve Bank recently made another call on the trading banks for the announced purpose of freezing excess bank liquidity, and it has raised the statutory reserve-deposit ratio applicable to trading banks. While this may—or may not have the desired effect, what has happened is that mortgage money from banks is almost impossible to procure, while overdraft limits that are so vital to many undertakings and persons in their private activities have, in many cases, been reduced. Yet, on the other hand, private investment companies, lending institutions and hire-purchase companies, which offer a greater rate of interest, still continue to flourish.

Mr. Riches—You don't object to that?

Mr. CUMBE—I spoke on this subject earlier (I think in the Address-in-Reply debate) and I mentioned that the higher rate of interest paid by many of these companies for investment purposes was having a bad effect upon the stability of the banking institutions of the country, and also upon Commonwealth loans. We read today in the press that these companies are competing against each other in offering fantastic rates of interest. Trading bank lending has diminished remarkably in recent years. In 1938-39 the advances made by the major trading banks were 36 per cent of the national income, whereas last year they were equivalent to only 18.5 per cent.

Mr. Ryan—That is direct lending?

Mr. CUMBE—Yes, trading bank lending. That indicates that the volume of trading bank business, compared with the total income of the nation, has dropped remarkably. It would appear that investors or borrowers are being attracted away from long-established and conservative establishments by these new

undertakings which offer higher rates and quicker returns. Some of those undertakings have very doubtful security. In this regard it is very pleasing to learn that in South Australia, and in other States, too, inquiries are being undertaken into the affairs of certain vending machine promoters, and not before time, because the security being offered by those companies is practically nil. They are offering as much as 15 per cent, 17½ per cent and 20 per cent, which is daylight robbery. The effect on people on fixed incomes and pensioners is certainly severe, and it is brought about partly by this type of situation. The liberalization of the means test, announced recently in Canberra by the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Holt), to operate next year has been widely acclaimed and will be widely welcomed. Whilst inflation can be very dangerous to our future economy, this trend at times can, and has been, over-emphasized, and if harsh and restrictive measures are introduced they could impair our industrial, commercial, and pastoral industries. I therefore hope the Reserve Bank and the Commonwealth Treasurer will use their authority over bank liquidity with sympathy and prudence, so as to ensure normal and healthy expansion of our State resources, especially in banking.

It is interesting to note the operations of the Municipal Tramways Trust over the last few years, figures and details of which are given in both the Auditor-General's report and the Budget papers. The Municipal Tramways Trust was reconstituted in 1952 and was charged with the responsibility of rehabilitating the public road transport system in the metropolitan area. It was faced with an uneconomic undertaking, a worn-out tramways system which was making huge annual deficits. Members will recall the considerable controversy that raged at that time over this question of trying to make the tramways pay, trying to give a good service to the public, scrapping the old tramways system and introducing buses, and the general improvements that should be made. Quite frankly, I thought the trust's task was a very severe and unenviable one. From the figures shown in the Budget and in the latest report of the trust which is now on members' files, it will be seen that the position has changed radically. For the year ended June 30, 1960, the deficiency on operations was £265,000, compared with £613,000 12 months ago. In fact, the working surplus of £35,600 was made before allowing for interest charges, compared with a deficiency of £272,000 in this regard

last year. Even more striking than that, I believe, is the position of Treasury cash advances over the past eight years, and if members will bear with me I will read them to illustrate this point. In 1952-53 the advance was £700,000; in 1953-54 it was again £700,000; in 1954-55 it was £600,000; 1955-56, £570,000; 1956-57, £510,000; 1957-58, £490,000; and in 1958-59 it was £440,000. It then dropped rapidly in 1959-60 to £94,000, and this year the sum provided on the Estimates is only £30,000. From the Treasurer's remarks in the House, it appears that it is confidently expected that even this sum may not be required, or at the worst, only part of it. It therefore appears that the trust is now getting on top of the problem that it is faced with, and the annual cash deficiencies, which it appeared at one time would be going on and on year after year to the order of some £700,000 have now been progressively reduced to a workable figure, and the cash advances year by year may cease.

That, I suggest, is a remarkable achievement, and represents a radical alteration. The trust's fleet of vehicles is now complete, and will only have to be added to if extra routes are opened up. The figures I have seen and the Auditor-General's comments on the subject indicate that adequate depreciation and reserves are being provided for new equipment as the old equipment wears out. The capital side of the loan indebtedness of the trust also makes interesting reading. At June 30, 1960, the total of funds secured by debentures in favour of the Government was £7,127,702, compared with £7,427,385 last year. The past year was the first year since the scheme was introduced that new loans were not raised. In fact, in some years two loans were raised. The amortization of these loans on the usual 53-year term should progressively reduce this burden. It therefore appears that both the cash advances from the Treasury and the debentures that have been advanced to the trust will now diminish. The trust has done a fine job in rehabilitating the undertaking, in equipping it with a fine fleet of buses, by eliminating wasteful schemes and by introducing more efficient maintenance methods. The track removal programme, which we have seen going on in the suburbs for several years, is almost complete: only a few tracks are left in the city of Adelaide, and from what we read in the press this morning we expect these to be all out by the end of this year or early next year. That cost will reduce considerably in future financial budgets of the trust. I

feel the trust is now holding its own against the twin threats to any public transport system, especially road transport systems, that exist in all the major cities of the world. Those threats are the growing number of car users and the fact that with the advent of television in homes potential passengers stay home at night and watch television instead of travelling in the buses. As a metropolitan member, I am very pleased that this public utility now appears to be on a sound footing, and I am sure that the country members also would be pleased that this position has come about, as also would be taxpayers throughout the State. I suggest that this result supports the action taken by the Parliament and the Government eight years ago to reform and reconstitute the trust's activity. It is only a pity that perhaps the administration of other public utilities could not be undertaken in the same way.

The Education Department vote shows undoubtedly the greatest increase of all Government departments: the provision of £11,750,000 is nearly £1,500,000 more than last year. When we add to it the amount on the Loan Estimates of £4,700,000, we see the amount of money that is being spent on education in this State. I believe that every penny of it is very necessary, because all members know the importance of this field of social work. I commend the Minister of Education for the outstanding way in which he and his officers are tackling this problem of providing education for a rapidly increasing school population. It appears that the most urgent pressure at present is upon secondary education. The type of high school building now being erected is outstanding, both structurally and in the provision of teaching and recreational facilities. The new technical high school opened at Croydon last Friday by the Minister of Education is a fine example of the type of building now being erected. I am pleased at the growth of our technical school system. It provides an alternative means of education to those students who do not wish, or who are unable, to undertake the fuller academic course afforded at high schools. We must have basic training in certain subjects, but there is a limit to the number of students who can go to the University or the Teachers Training College, or undertake work which requires some academic training. Undoubtedly more students welcome the opportunity to learn a trade, and this applies equally to both boys and girls.

Mr. McKee—How many technical high schools in the metropolitan area give instruction in Leaving Honours subjects?

Mr. COUNBE—None. Technical high schools do not provide this instruction. It is given in high schools.

Mr. McKee—Wouldn't you think the Education Department would take steps to overcome that position?

Mr. COUNBE—My remarks deal with technical high schools, and I do not think Leaving Honours subjects are necessary in them. If a student wants to do those subjects he can go to a high school. Many children do not want to study these academic subjects, and some, because they are unsuited, or mentally retarded, or because of the financial position of their parents, cannot undertake the higher course.

Mr. McKee—The parents cannot afford to send the children to boarding schools.

Mr. COUNBE—Irrespective of that, many students would be better catered for at technical high schools. In all industries today there is a severe shortage of skilled tradesmen. The "Situations Vacant" column in our daily newspapers shows how many advertisements there are calling for trained personnel. In this morning's *Advertiser* the Treasurer is reported as saying at the official opening of the Furniture Trades Convention yesterday that there is a shortage of craftsmen. Undoubtedly we face that position today and we shall face it increasingly in the future. The decision of the Education Department to take all trade subjects from the Institute of Technology to be taught by the department itself was a wise move. It has provided opportunities for adult education classes and other classes in our technical high schools at night, and this serves a double purpose. Technicians and tradesmen will be needed in the future in ever-increasing numbers and if we are to fulfil these needs, to absorb our growing population and to keep pace with future development, we must provide the means to train our men and women. I should like to see more and more technical high schools established, especially in large country centres, where apprenticeship training could also be given. This is a facet of our education system which is sadly lacking, mainly because facilities are not available. In this regard the move at Whyalla for a higher course to be provided and conducted jointly by the Education Department and the Institute of Technology is a wonderful example of what can be done in country centres. I should like



to see the technical high school system expanded, especially in the country where there are few of these schools.

Insufficient credit has been given to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the truly magnificent job it did last summer in providing water supplies. It is said that in the metropolitan area 99½ per cent of the people can get water by merely turning on a tap and that 96 per cent of them have sewerage facilities. For the whole of the State 96 per cent of the people receive water from taps. This is a remarkable record, especially when we realize the position in some of the other capital cities, most of which have been established longer than Adelaide. Last year Adelaide was the only capital city that did not have water restrictions, despite the drought conditions that existed in this State. More credit should be given to the department and greater publicity should be given to the wonderful work done by its officers. The Public Works Committee repeatedly gets references for extensions of water supplies. The department is doing a magnificent job and it meets a real need by providing more and more water supplies. Water is the life blood of any State. The proposed expenditure of £3,700,000 in these Estimates and £9,130,000 in the Loan Estimates must meet with the approval of all members. This is a sound Budget. It is a forthright statement of facts and indicates clearly the remarkable recovery South Australia has made from the drought conditions of last year. As we can expect this year to get a near record harvest, there is incentive for the future. South Australia can progress and we look forward to greater prosperity and development in the future. I support the first line of the Estimates.

Mr. RALSTON (Mount Gambier)—Before dealing with the Budget, I express my sympathy to Mrs. O'Halloran in her sad loss, and I join with other speakers in expressing appreciation of the splendid and loyal service given by the late Leader of the Opposition to Parliament and to his Parliamentary colleagues.

I, like all other members, appreciate the wide scope of this Budget debate. We are interested in the many and varied subjects brought forward. Some subjects have special merit and can assist the future well-being of the State. Some matters refer to immediate problems in various electorates and they are of importance to the members concerned. When the Treasurer explained the Budget he painted a glowing picture of this State's economic strength. We were told that the strength was mainly the result of industrial

expansion and that it had enabled South Australia to emerge practically unscathed from one of the worst droughts in its history. No one will challenge the justice of that claim. We realize only too well that the State is doing its utmost to further expand secondary industry, and that in consequence this will spread the economic strength as widely as possible by not having all the eggs in the one basket. In the past Australia's prosperity has always depended upon primary production and, when climatic conditions were adverse or overseas prices fell, our economy was highly vulnerable to the conditions over which we had no control. The growth of secondary industry has changed all this and has created a vast consumers' market within Australia. It has brought about a degree of financial stability undreamed of previously. What happened in this State last year proved this beyond doubt. We know now that our economy is no longer subject to the conditions that existed when our income was derived mainly from primary production.

During this debate Mr. Quirke made some good points when he referred to the limitations imposed on essential State requirements by the strict observance of so-called orthodox financial procedure. Whether or not members agree with his remarks, they must at least agree that his argument was stimulating and thought-provoking. His was a valuable contribution to the debate, during which Mr. Millhouse said that he was opposed to uniform taxation because it was not in the best interests of all States. He advocated that they go back to the previous system of income taxation being raised by the States themselves. If that opinion were based on sound premises why, of recent years, has no State Treasurer apart from Mr. Bolte (Treasurer of Victoria) shown any real desire to accept a return of taxing power from the Commonwealth? Mr. Bolte was barking more than biting when he advocated it and perhaps the Treasurer who has shown the least desire for a return of taxing powers is Sir Thomas Playford.

South Australia was fortunate that the loss of income last year through a falling off in primary production, which in other circumstances could have proved disastrous, had but little effect on the finances of the State. Uniform taxation made this loss a risk spread over the whole of the Commonwealth. Although the amount of income tax payable from South Australian sources this year may be substantially less than usual, the amount of tax reimbursement from the Commonwealth will

not be reduced by even one penny. If ever a State had reason to be thankful for uniform taxation South Australia is that State.

I was interested in the research done by the member for Chaffey regarding various projects referred to the Public Works Committee from 1940 to 1960. He said the total value of those projects was £100,000,000 and that much work was carried out in the Mount Gambier and Port Adelaide districts. I do not know how much of the £100,000,000 was spent in the Port Adelaide district but I do know how much was spent in the Mount Gambier district in the last 20 years, and the electors also know. They do not miss those things and we are not misled by the specious statements of the member for Chaffey, statements that sound impressive but amount to very little.

Mr. McKee—Eyewash!

Mr. RALSTON—It is only eyewash.

Mr. King—My statements were based on information contained in official statements by the department.

Mr. RALSTON—Nevertheless, the member for Chaffey did say something with which I, and I think every other member of the Labor Party, agreed and that was regarding his wholehearted condemnation of the Liberal and Country Party Commonwealth Government.

Mr. McKee—You agreed with him on that.

Mr. RALSTON—Yes. I condemn the action of the Commonwealth Government regarding the South Australian dried fruit industry. The policy of removing import licence restrictions and permitting the dumping of surplus overseas goods at prices well below Australian production costs threatens the existence of the fruit industry and jeopardizes the whole economy of the Murray irrigation areas. The member for Chaffey will not dispute that.

This policy of the L.C.P. Government at Canberra is also being applied to the timber industry. Obviously industries that have taken years to establish are to become the pawns in a game of profits at all costs. That game is now being played at Canberra by the indent agents, merchants and importers of Australia. This policy is completely ruthless concerning the interests of the workers and the primary producers, and it does not seem to matter who is ruined provided that they, the parasites of Australia, prosper. If this is to be the Commonwealth Government's policy the sooner that Government is changed the better it will be for Australia.

The member for Norwood took the Government to task on the subject of water rates

and assessments and, as this matter is of great interest to the people I represent, I intend to speak on it. I believe the Minister of Works and all other members are aware of my views on water rates applying in the Mount Gambier district because I have spoken and have asked innumerable questions on this matter. At no time has the Minister been able to give an answer satisfactory to me or to the Mount Gambier people. On July 21, 1959, the Minister, answering a question about increased charges, said, "There is not a single water district, including the honourable member's district, which today pays its way". The Minister's comment was off the beam because the Mount Gambier district had been showing a profit since 1955-56. During the last five years a profit of £38,000 was made and in the current financial year the department has estimated that a further £16,000 net profit will result.

Mr. Hall—Does that include capital charges?

Mr. RALSTON—It is the net profit after provision for capital costs. The Government has been asked to provide the Mount Gambier water district with water at the same rate that applies in the Adelaide water district. It is not asked to do any more or any less than that. The Mount Gambier rate is 9.5 per cent and the Adelaide water district rate is 7.5 per cent. That request is not unreasonable particularly when during the same period (1955-56 to 1959-60) it is known that the deficit for the Adelaide water district amounted to £2,298,095, which is the greatest loss on any water district in South Australia. As my figures are taken from the Auditor-General's report, I do not doubt their accuracy.

The decentralization and expansion of secondary industry are of paramount importance and I remind the Minister of Forests that problems associated with expansion in the South-East must be faced soon because it is well-known that the annual growth of the pine forests is outstripping the capacity of the milling industry to absorb the natural production. Pine trees, like other crops, must be harvested at the proper time or wastage occurs. As further industrial expansion in the South-East is inevitable, power and water must be available at prices comparable with those applying in the metropolitan area. This is essential if full advantage is to be taken of the opportunities that will present themselves within the next three to five years in the timber industry.

Members who were present at the official opening of the Central No. 1 sawmill at Mount Gambier will recall that the Treasurer prophesied that a new industry would be established either at Mount Gambier or in Victoria. He said that Mr. Bolte was confident that the industry would go to Victoria, but he assured us that it would be established at Mount Gambier. Hundreds of people heard the Treasurer say that. It is obvious what the industry will be and I hope the Treasurer is still as confident as he was at the official opening that it will be established in South Australia. I believe that the Victorians are making every effort to establish the industry in Portland. I hope that the Treasurer will not be left lamenting because, after all, Mr. Bolte is nobody's fool when it comes to getting industries for his State. He is well awake to the possibilities of increasing industrial expansion in Victoria. If the Minister of Forests fully considers the note of warning issued by the Auditor-General on page 156 of this year's report he may have second thoughts on this matter. The Auditor-General says:—

A substantial portion of the department's dried fruit case market has been lost to the fibre board carton industry . . . . The manufacture of cases for other than the citrus and dried fruit industry involved major departures from the department's standard specifications, which did not permit the full utilization of specialized machinery and caused losses in production time. Small losses were incurred by the case production lines of the State and Nangwarry mills, mainly as the result of those factors and, in consequence, there was no stumpage return for standing timber used in case production at those mills.

That is a serious cause for concern. I think the Minister will be just as concerned as I am as to what will be the future Government policy regarding the proper, effective and economic use of the Government pine forests in the South-East.

Reverting to the question of water rates, I notice that recently Executive Council decided to abolish the water districts of Reynella, Morphett Vale, Hackham, Noarlunga, Port Noarlunga and Moana, and include them in the Adelaide water district. It was also decided to abolish the Smithfield, Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully and Modbury water districts and the Yatala country lands water district, and include these in the Adelaide water district as well. Without question, these decisions will prove very advantageous to industries that have been established or will be established within the districts now included in the Adelaide water district. I have no quarrel with this policy if it is justified on the grounds of

industrial expansion, but I am concerned about the way the Government has ignored the claims of the Mount Gambier City Council and the Chamber of Commerce for the granting of a just water rate at Mount Gambier because we, too, have expanding industries just as important to the economy of South Australia as the industries now established at Elizabeth and proposed to be established at Port Stanvac. If the Government is justified in granting them the benefit of a lower water rate by this method of abolishing water districts and including them in others in which a lower rate applies, that policy could be just as easily applied at Mount Gambier. Fair play is bonny play. I trust that the Minister will bear this in mind when he receives, as he will, another deputation from the City Council of Mount Gambier, the Chamber of Commerce and the Council of Trades Unions. They are very interested to see that the workers of Mount Gambier are charged a water rate comparable with that which applies in Adelaide. This may not seem of much importance to the Minister or to members, but to those who must pay the water rate it means £2 or £3 each year to every worker who is the owner of a house in that district.

Speaking as a member who represents a country district, I should like to say how bitterly disappointed I was to find that no provision had been made in the Estimates to grant to country pensioners concession fares on State-owned public transport. This concession was granted to pensioners within the metropolitan area two or perhaps three years ago. Why the Government persists in this form of discrimination against country pensioners is very difficult to understand. I feel sure that all members on both sides of the House, especially country members on the other side, will realize the justice of what I am saying and would approve of this concession being made State-wide, in the same manner as it applies in Victoria. I support the Estimates.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—It gives me much pleasure to support the Estimates. I listened with interest to Mr. Ralston's remarks, particularly his views on the timber industry. I consider that the Opposition has a hard job to criticize the Estimates. I notice that there has been an overall improvement in the money allocated for the various services compared with last year. This applies to such things as the provision of school buses and improvements in the water service. It amounts to an increase of about six per cent, but part of the

additional money is required to meet the rise in wages, so the actual improvement in services will amount to about five per cent. There has been an improvement in the services provided by the Electricity Trust and other statutory bodies. Although I did not agree with all that Mr. Hutchens said, I was in full agreement when he stressed that an attempt should be made to educate the public in the use of water. Undoubtedly there could be more economy in this direction, especially in gardening in the summer. Mr. King advocated a review of the Australian water resources, which is an excellent suggestion. Apart from the Mount Gambier water district, all our water districts are operating at a loss. The position is that the person who uses the most water gains the greatest benefit at the expense of those who use less. The Government should further consider the charges for excess water and make those who use enormous quantities pay more for the water used in excess of that required for household purposes. I am alarmed when I see gardeners erecting tanks for water for their gardens, thus making the reservoir supply an irrigation system. That cannot be tolerated, because the Government is too hard pressed already to provide household and stock water.

I join with other honourable members in expressing great satisfaction at the recent Parliamentary trip to Leigh Creek. The Wilpena Pound Chalet is well conducted. Leigh Creek was certainly an eye-opener with its modern machinery and the extensive work that has been undertaken, resulting in South Australia being placed on a sound financial basis as regards its industries. I am somewhat alarmed at what will happen when the trees in the areas visited complete their life span. I watched carefully for young trees in the country but, apart from a few native pines, I could see no young trees coming on in the semi-open expanses between the hills. I think the grazing of stock as now practised will eventually denude all that countryside of trees. I am not blaming anyone in particular for that, because the policy has been followed since the opening up of that country, but in future some experiments will have to be tried before the country is completely bare of trees. It applies not only to that area but to all the sheep-carrying areas of Australia. I am suggesting that something could be done in the next few years about this problem of the regeneration of tree growth in that country. If some experiments acceptable to all parties could be tried, it would be a step toward saving

that country from becoming completely bare and open to all sorts of wind and water erosion.

Mr. Quirke—Fence sections of the water-courses and regeneration will occur.

Mr. HALL—We have one suggestion. I hope that experts will look into this matter and make concrete and useful suggestions. Turning to the Budget, one item in the Revenue section that concerns me deals with succession duties. The figures there show that the collections were much higher than the sum budgeted for. There was £2,360,000 collected in succession duties, £210,000 in excess of that which was budgeted for. I suppose that typifies the buoyancy of our State. There is a point pertaining to primary production. Only last year we passed in this House a Bill to alleviate the impact of succession duties on farmlands that passed to near relatives, the intention being that they should be kept for farming purposes. I do not think that at the present time of cost pressures on the structure of primary production we have gone far enough in that direction. We are reaching the stage where country lands used for wide-scale farming activities are bringing fantastic and, as far as production goes, silly prices. Much of the reason for that is that people have sold their properties close to the metropolitan area for building purposes and have left this area with what amounts to an almost unlimited supply of money, which was paid to them as a result of the building boom in the metropolitan area. They go out into the country and can pay anything necessary to buy a property of their own choosing. I am not blaming them for that but that is forcing up the prices of country lands to an artificial level. Even though we gave a concession last year it is still based on the sale valuation of the property.

Mr. Millhouse—What do you mean by “artificial level”?

Mr. HALL—In comparison with the production figures of the property. The Agriculture Department of South Australia is now engaging economists and there is one at a station in the mid-north. Whereas land values are about £50 an acre in the area in which he is working, he says the true economic value is about £35. Based on the production figures reached each year on those properties, £35 is the actual figure, but £50, £60, £70, or even £80 is being paid in some cases by people moving out from the metropolitan area. Even though we gave a reduction by last year's legislation, the basis of that reduction is still on that sale price, or near to it.

Mr. Millhouse—But surely supply and demand have an effect on values?

Mr. HALL—No effect when a property is passed from father to son, and son again, which often happens in primary production. It is purely a capital tax that has no bearing on the sale price.

Mr. Quirke—People are selling high-priced land in Adelaide and then going out into the country and boosting up prices there.

Mr. HALL—That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. Harding—Not now.

Mr. Quirke—As late as last week.

Mr. HALL—Most certainly it is going on at this time. I know of one man who sold a property here and purchased one twice as large in the country. He bought a complete farming outfit and spent only one-third of his money. I am not saying it is wrong: I am saying it is wrong when applied to succession duties as levied by the State Government. Even though we have given this concession, it is taken down from that price paid by those people. We are fast reaching the stage when we shall have to look again at those valuations and bring them down to succession duties paid on production value as long as the lands are to be kept in production.

Mr. Ryan—Does not that apply also to people in the metropolitan area?

Mr. HALL—In the metropolitan area secondary industry can and does fix its prices according to its costs.

Mr. Ryan—You are talking about inflationary values of property.

Mr. HALL—Farming property.

Mr. Ryan—Is there any difference between farms and dwellings in the metropolitan area?

Mr. HALL—Not between dwellings.

Mr. Ralston—Or business properties?

Mr. HALL—Secondary industry fixes its selling prices according to its costs; farming production fixes its prices according to world markets. If every property went on the market, a property would not be worth two-pence. It is only the individual who can sell, not the complete countryside. Another small point is the inflexibility of Government financial measures, at least in small matters. I cite one case concerning the railways.

Mr. Millhouse—You're not criticizing the railways, are you?

Mr. HALL—No, but I draw attention to what I think is poor business practice. There is a small siding at Condowie, a few miles north-east of Snowtown. At Condowie there is a weighbridge, one of three maintained by

a small local company. This is the only weighbridge of those three that is on railway land, and the railways have levied in the past, and still do levy, a rent of £12 a year for this site on which the weighbridge is located. This was all right when the weighbridge was used for all wheat and barley rail freight, but now wheat silos have come into the picture and no more wheat is delivered to the Condowie siding. Therefore it handles only barley traffic. This weighbridge was maintained in the past without profit purely for the use of the local farmers, who are now faced with an annual loss because the wheat goes elsewhere. They have applied to the Railways Department for a reduction in rent, saying that they cannot make ends meet. Surely the department with this small plot of land could reduce the rent from £12 to a nominal figure—say, £1, £2 or £3—to enable them to keep going. The department has replied that, although there is justice in the case, it cannot give this reduction because it would create a precedent. The managing director of this small company tells me that the company cannot maintain this bridge and, if there is no rent reduction, it may have to close it.

Now comes the rather foolish part. The freight differential between Snowtown and Condowie is 3s. a ton for bagged grain so, if the Condowie bridge closes, the railways will have to convey those goods from Snowtown instead; thence they will be taken by the farmers and 3s. a ton in freight will be lost. At 10,000 bags, that is approximately £100 a year. It is rather short-sighted, for the sake of perhaps £10 or £11 a year reduction in the rent of this weighbridge, that possibly £100 or £200 is lost in railway revenue. That does not make sense to me or to the local residents. Unfortunately, because it would create a precedent, the department says, "Nothing can be done about it." I trust that some variations in these small matters can be made. In this instance a variation could be made purely because of the business sense involved. I hope that in future all requests will not be refused merely on the ground of creating a precedent. The Railways Department should be big and fearless enough to ignore that.

Mr. Millhouse—Every case should be taken on its own merits.

Mr. HALL—Yes. I hope that this case will be re-submitted and considered favourably. Regarding libraries, I notice that the Minister of Education is now present. I refer to his recent speech about libraries when he opened the jubilee conference of the Institutes

Association. I fear a somewhat unfortunate misinterpretation has been placed on his words. He criticized institute committees for the lowering of reading standards in our State community. Undoubtedly some committees warrant that criticism but perhaps he is a little wide in his application of that criticism, which some people have resented. As far as my district at least is concerned, very few institutes would deserve that criticism. They should not take the Minister's statements as personal criticism. The libraries in my electorate have done their utmost to maintain good library services and to provide halls as meeting places for local activities. It is difficult to maintain institutes when they are confronted with the many entertainments available to people nowadays—and I refer particularly to motor cars and television. Many country institutes, which relied on picture shows for finance, are suffering and will be more hard put in future. The Minister's criticism should have been directed at the public more than at the institute committees because the committees are faced with almost insoluble and insuperable problems. They cannot get the public to utilize their libraries. I do not want them to be disheartened because their efforts are being ignored by the reading public. I do not know the answer to the problem. I believe that during the next year or two television will have a further impact, but I hope that the Minister's criticism will have the effect of rejuvenating the institutes in some areas. Years ago, in the horse and buggy days, small communities became the focal point and libraries were established, but with the advent of motor cars those centres have been by-passed for towns with bigger shopping areas where good libraries and good halls have been provided.

At present there is a controversy over the repair of foreshore damage to the metropolitan beaches. Most metropolitan beaches are well maintained and are well patronized during the summer. The population in the areas north of Adelaide is growing apace and in the next few years there will be a big demand for recreational facilities there. The metropolitan beaches are somewhat distant and the traffic density on roads leading to them is, during peak hours, hazardous, and serious consideration must be given to developing the beaches north of Port Adelaide. The Government and local councils should keep a close eye on subdivisions to ensure that valuable foreshore areas are not sold and thereby lost for future use.

Mr. Quirke—The northern beaches will develop when the proposed road goes through that area.

Mr. HALL—I do not know what beaches are involved or where the road is proposed, but I stress the need for the Government and local councils to ensure that our foreshores are preserved for future use. An alarming feature of this debate has been the manner in which members opposite have actually laughed at the State's financial position. Perhaps "deride" would have been a better word. I do not think we should deride the financial system that has given us our present standard of living.

Mr. Loveday—It is what the workers have done that has given them the present standard of living, not what the financiers have done.

Mr. HALL—I agree that the standard of living is built on the solid work and output of the people, but we measure our resources and efforts in financial terms. There must be some financial system and members opposite suggest that there should be a change of system.

Mr. Loveday—Is money a means of exchange or a commodity?

Mr. HALL—Perhaps a little of both. The attack on our monetary system is led by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke). This is my second year here and this is the second time he has led the attack so I assume he does it every year. His attack is most stimulating and causes thought. I do not resent that, because anything that promotes thought is good, but I cannot understand an attack on a system that has given us our present standard of living.

Mr. Loveday—Perhaps you should read more about it.

Mr. HALL—I have a small book on economics that I have read. I know that I am a beginner, but there are certain truths that even a beginner can understand. The member for Burra asked, "Where is the railway debt?"; "What does it consist of?"; and "Who would lose if it were wiped off?" They are elementary questions. We know that the railway debt is part of the State's public debt and that if we repudiate it we repudiate some of the public debt and therefore some of the bondholders' loans would be wiped off. We would say, "You will no longer receive any interest."

Mr. Loveday—Have you read what Viscount Vickers, a former Governor of the Bank of England, said about the system?

Mr. HALL—Various individuals have had their say, but I am dealing with those who have had a say in this Chamber. I could quote at length from a book that I have but I am sure there is no generally accepted set of rules.

Mr. Loveday—Do you think that a Governor of the Bank of England would be an authority on finance?

Mr. HALL—I do not think that he has always been right.

Mr. Loveday—Would he be a fair authority?

Mr. HALL—He might be. How long ago was this one?

Mr. Loveday—Comparatively recent. I will tell you about him later.

Mr. HALL—I shall be glad to hear his views. We have two schools of thought on this matter and the member for Burra is caught between them. His is a dreamboat type of thought. In New Guinea some natives believe that their riches will arrive by some type of canoe. Mr. Quirke proposes a complete change of our financial system whereby we will do away with the public debt because, he suggests, we are at present an unbalanced State. He says that we are unbalanced in debt. I think I can safely refute that. We have borrowed so much money from the citizens of this country (and there may be a few millions in foreign debt, but that would be small in comparison with what the general public has subscribed) that each year we can meet the interest payments on that borrowing.

Mr. Quirke—Quite so.

Mr. HALL—And so we are balanced.

Mr. Quirke—You are not!

Mr. HALL—Year after year we have met these payments and we expect to be able to meet them next year.

Mr. Quirke—Your total taxation collections are about £11,000,000 to £13,000,000 and your total debt payments are £17,000,000, so how do you balance?

Mr. HALL—With all due respect, that is wrong. We get back £30,000,000 from the Commonwealth and our total tax collections would be about £41,000,000.

Mr. Quirke—Wait a minute, you are confusing Commonwealth debt and State debt.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. HALL—Our total taxation would be about £41,000,000. We get £30,000,000 from the Commonwealth and £11,000,000 from services. It is quite obvious that we are meeting our debt in a balanced State.

Mr. Quirke—An unbalanced State.

Mr. HALL—There is no unbalance about it at all. The honourable member is caught between two fires. We believe in reward for enterprise and in savings. Members opposite do not believe in savings.

Mr. McKee—How do you reckon the workers are going?

Mr. HALL—Members opposite believe in public ownership.

Mr. Ryan—So do you up to a point. How about Leigh Creek?

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. HALL—Where was I?

The CHAIRMAN—Order! There are far too many interjections. The member for Gouger is speaking.

Mr. Clark—Don't let them discourage you.

Mr. HALL—It isn't that I am discouraged, it's just that I have forgotten.

Mr. Lawn—Did you ever know?

Mr. HALL—Members opposite believe in the public ownership of production.

Mr. Ryan—Don't you?

Mr. HALL—Just a minute! Follow this through. They do not believe in public debt. Let us take those things that it applies to. They do not believe we should pay any interest. The member for Burra does not believe in public debt, does he?

Mr. Quirke—No.

Mr. HALL—They do not want to accept bonds or pay interest, so they do not want to accept money from the public.

Mr. Quirke—I think the State, like the individual, should pay its debts.

Mr. HALL—Interest is one of the things Socialists do not like. If we are not going to accept money from the public as their savings, they cannot have savings.

Mr. Quirke—Of course, it is adding to the price of your land.

Mr. HALL—You cannot have savings without investment. You can have something in your savings bank account, but it must be invested. If you do not pay interest you will not have savings. The member for Burra is caught between the two—having no savings or having savings.

Mr. Quirke—Did I say you should not have savings?

Mr. HALL—No.

Mr. Quirke—Do not confuse me with others. I did not say you should not have savings.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member is out of order in interjecting.

Mr. HALL—By not accepting money from the public, of course, we are creating credit and the public will have extra money to spend

on the same resources. The member for Burra is getting away from the fact that money is just a convenient term for the production of our resources. He said we could do a lot more with a lot more money. Are we to have a 44-hour week, or reduce hours to 35 a week?

Mr. Quirke—Do you agree that you should pay for what you purchase?

Mr. HALL—The honourable member advocates repudiating the debt of the railways, for instance.

Mr. Quirke—I did not advocate anything like that.

Mr. HALL—Of course the honourable member did. He has got off the track. What he meant was that the State should take the railway debt into its general debt.

Mr. Quirke—I want to know who would be hurt if you wiped out a big proportion of the railway debt.

Mr. HALL—Does the honourable member mean that we should just not pay it or that we should transfer it? The railway debt is part of the complete State public debt.

Mr. Quirke—It is not.

Mr. HALL—The Railways Commissioner's report states:—

Funds provided by the State Treasurer for capital purposes from loans raised by sales of Commonwealth Government Securities on behalf of the State and subject to interest and National Debt Sinking Fund charges, £56,567,742.

Mr. Quirke—What has that to do with the argument?

Mr. HALL—How is it that wiping off that debt will repudiate our contract to people investing in Commonwealth bonds?

Mr. Quirke—How would you do that?

Mr. HALL—It is part of the State public debt. We are committed by an Act of Parliament to maintain our bonds.

Mr. Quirke—The debt is increasing at the rate of £25,000,000 a year, yet only £3,000,000 a year is paid off.

Mr. HALL—We are meeting interest payments on our public debt easily—perhaps more easily than in the past. We have not yet reached the optimum amount of investment or use of our resources. No doubt more land will be utilized because of the provision of water, people will live more easily because of more sewerage services and, with more modern railways and so on, life will be made easier and industry will progress. This will be accomplished by increasing our public debt, which is nothing more than a redistribution of income within this country.

Mr. Quirke—Nonsense!

Mr. HALL—It is a redistribution of income. People invest in loans and are paid interest. It is purely an internal financial arrangement that does not impinge on our overseas resources.

Mr. Quirke—Is it necessary?

Mr. HALL—It works well and has provided for us the highest standard of living in the world. It is continuing on a balanced scale, and I see nothing wrong with it. I support the Estimates.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler)—One of the most saddening thoughts that comes to members who have been here for some time (I have been here for only nine Budgets) is that as they look around the Chamber they find seats occupied by new members that were formerly occupied by members taken from us, in most cases, by death and not by defeat at the polls. That is a saddening thought indeed. I am, of course, led to it by my feelings for our late lamented and beloved friend, Mr. Mick O'Halloran, former Leader of the Opposition. Often the great poets—not those whose verses one finds in "In Memoriam" notices—have something suitable to say. As my humble tribute to the late Leader I wish to read three or four lines of Browning that I think are most suitable. They are:—

One who never turned his back but marched  
breast forward,  
Never doubted clouds would break,  
Never dreamed, though right were worsted,  
wrong would triumph,  
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight  
better,  
Sleep to wake.

We all miss Mr. O'Halloran. I offer my best wishes to his successor. I think that in Mr. Frank Walsh we have a man who will not dim the lustre of the high office of Leader of the Opposition. I believe that ere long he will be crowned possibly in an even higher office.

Mr. Loveday—Premier?

Mr. CLARK—That is what I suggest. I listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the member for Gouger. I enjoyed his remarks on the Budget far more than his speeches on any other subject. To be honest, that is not saying much, but I am also honest in saying that I believe the early part of his speech was thought-provoking. I was also interested when he mentioned the problems associated with the huge population north of the city. However, when he dealt with finance I thought he should perhaps take a little advice from me. I realized a long time ago that my forte in this place was not



finance. If he were prepared to keep off finance he might find himself in less difficulty—and I could not say this more kindly, if I am allowed to use the expression “more kindly” in a comparative degree—and this applies particularly when he is arguing with someone who has made, shall I say, a hobby of the subject. To be honest, I enjoyed his remarks.

We were told that this was the Premier's twenty-second Budget, and he said that it was his most confident Budget. I think that 22 Budgets are too many for one man. When I heard him presenting his confident Budget—which it was—the thought occurred to me that if this gentleman had been such a wonderful Treasurer he would have been a wonderful asset to the State as Leader of the Opposition. I think that would be the feeling of a number of people on this side of the House, and possibly many outside the Chamber. Members of the Opposition would like to have the opportunity to look at him from the other side while he was sitting happily in the front seat on this side of the House, which I am sure he would adorn. I now wish to refer to two sentences in the Budget speech, one of which I mention in passing and the other on which I will comment in some detail. I refer to the numbers that have been coming into my district, as mentioned by the member for Gouger. The Treasurer said:—

The Government has no present proposals for any special increases in taxes and charges. I was a little doubtful about that statement because I wondered whether it foreshadowed increases in the future or whether they would come out of the blue, as is usual. The next quotation, which I shall deal with at some length because it affects many districts, and particularly mine, was:—

Some modest adjustments were made in rail charges.

I suggest that in many instances the total is not now modest, particularly in districts such as mine, from which so many people travel to the city to their employment by the railways. Thousands of workers travel to the city daily from my district. These people come from Gawler, Salisbury, Elizabeth and Smithfield and they come to the city not because they wish but because they are forced to do so to get to their employment. Many of them have had to do this for many years. I think I mentioned here a year or so ago that an ironworker that I know had travelled the equivalent of twice around the world since he commenced work. For people like this the increases are

not modest, particularly when they have other commitments. I know that Gawler is an established town, but I refer to people living in other parts of the district, such as Salisbury and Elizabeth. Many of these people are making new homes, and some are making new homes in a new land. The problems of many of these people could be described as enormous in view of their commitments. If any member doubts that, I advise him to speak to the local clergymen, after which he would realize some of the problems that face these people who, to obtain the necessities of life, have to meet big commitments. To these people a few shillings added to their normal bills are not modest adjustments. Most of these people have been forced to work away from their home towns because of Government policy or lack of it. I think the Treasurer might have some difficulty in trying to convince those people that these charges are, in fact, modest. Many of them have become a real burden, just for the glorious privilege of having to travel on crowded trains.

Let me refer in particular to the problems associated with travelling in what eventually, of course, will be the city of Elizabeth. As most members who have been through this town will know, many parts are some distance from the railway line. Some people, of course, are handy to the line, but many parts of the town are a long way from the line and as the area expands some people will be further away. It appears that this fact should have been anticipated in the first place. I am not the only one concerned about this matter: the residents of Elizabeth and the area are most concerned about it, and, in addition, the men working the trains and the members of the various railway unions are concerned about a problem that apparently, as far as we know at the moment, seems to have been overlooked. A letter I received recently from the Divisional Manager of the South Australian Division of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen states:—

For some time I have talked with a large number of Elizabeth residents about transport facilities in the area, and, apart from those living close to the railway lines, there appears to be general dissatisfaction. While the provision of a bus service appears to be a temporary answer to the problem, particularly for those on the eastern side of the town, future development of the metropolitan area indicates that the public transport needs will have to be met by rail services which will not add to the existing road congestion in the city and industrial areas. Although even now it is rather late, provision should be made for a circle rail service extending from Smithfield along the

present eastern boundary of the town and back into Salisbury. An alternative to this is a duplication of the main north line from Gawler along the edge of the foothills to Northfield and thence to Adelaide.

I submit that all that is stated in that letter is very true indeed. I have not been informed, nor has the general public, of any possible solution of the problem, and to me it indicates lack of foresight by the Government. Frankly, I hope I am wrong in this, and that some plan exists to cope with future requirements. However, we have not yet heard of any plan. If a person lives close to the line at Elizabeth he may find transport simple and easy, although certainly not cheap. If a person does not live near the line he sometimes finds it very awkward indeed, particularly at night; this will be accentuated as the town grows, and we certainly know that it will grow. I am not belittling the existing private bus services that cope with passengers from the train, but, after all, we could readily assume that they cater mostly for peak periods. In fact, it is very difficult for people, particularly at night, to get transport cheaply to their homes.

Is it too late to consider the two possibilities that I have suggested for assisting railway facilities in that area? Let me enumerate them again. The first possibility I mentioned was a circle railway service from Smithfield around the outskirts of Elizabeth and back into Salisbury. This, of course, would cover the town from both sides and provide alternative services. Surely this could have been thought of long ago when it would have been a good deal less costly to provide, and I am still wondering: is it too late to consider it now? The second suggestion I mentioned—and here again I see no reason why this should not be practicable—was the duplication of the railway line from Gawler along the edge of the foothills to Northfield, connecting up with the existing railway there and thence into Adelaide. Again I ask: is it too late to consider this scheme, or has it already been considered? If it has been considered, the people in that area and I should very much like to know. I fully realize—as most of the members who are taking the trouble to listen to me will realize—that the schemes I am suggesting will be very costly. The Treasurer, when speaking in my area, stated—and I am not denying it for one moment—that in a very short space of time 250,000 people will be living in that area, and we must remember that. Thirdly, let me suggest another alternative which could be a tremendous help. I refer to bus services between that area and the city. People in

Elizabeth and I have made continual attempts in the last 12 or 18 months in this direction, but unfortunately the Transport Control Board finds that it cannot agree to our proposal. For some people in that area it probably is the only answer, unless either of the two schemes I have mentioned earlier is put into practice. Indeed, I feel certain that even if an additional railway line is provided, bus services will still be necessary. In addition to the letter received from the A.F.U.L.E., I have also received a letter from the State Secretary of the Australian Railways Union, South Australian Branch, which states:—

I am directed by my State Council to request your co-operation in arranging and leading a deputation to the Minister of Transport on the question of improvements in the existing rail passenger service between Elizabeth and Adelaide. The deputation, when arranged, would consist of yourself and officers of the union, and the question would relate to some form of road service to act as a feeder to rail in the locality to cater for those residents who are domiciled some distance from the railway. A co-ordinated road and rail service may meet this position.

We see that two unions representing men who are covering this area are concerned about the rail facilities to carry people backwards and forwards. Now that the Minister of Railways has returned from overseas I hope to arrange this deputation that has been requested by the Australian Railways Union. It is not only the unions that are concerned about this matter. I have had requests from people in Elizabeth who are members of very many different bodies, and they are concerned about it also. A number of the progress associations of Elizabeth, the Elizabeth Progress Council, sub-branches of the Australian Labor Party in the area, the Elizabeth sub-branch of the Returned Soldiers' League, and the local governing bodies in that area are all concerned. We know that there is a very big population in the area and that it will be even bigger because of the activities of the Housing Trust, which has already built many hundreds of homes. We must remember also that in addition there has been a spate of subdivision in the area which will increase the population even more than can be estimated from the trust's figures. I wish to know if there is some plan for the future public transport of this area, and if there is not, I offer my humble plea for it.

We have heard much in recent weeks about inflated land prices. I know of people whose families have been virtually struggling for generations but who now

suddenly find themselves plunged into the lap of luxury, though through no effort of their own. We have heard a condemnation by the Treasurer in recent months of the inflated prices that have been caused by over-subdivision, but if we stop to think we may well ask: just who is responsible in the main for these inflated land prices? I do not want to go into that aspect just now, but I think the question is worth leaving for the Committee to consider.

In the last week or so I have been most interested to receive a copy of extracts from the interim report of the Town Planning Committee regarding the metropolitan area of Adelaide, which was apparently made available on July 5, 1960. Let me urge honourable members, if they have not already done so, to obtain a copy of this report and read it thoroughly, because this fine committee has done a large amount of preliminary work. The information it has already gathered is most illuminating, and I look forward with much interest to receiving its final report. It states:—

Due to the rapid expansion of the metropolitan area, the committee at the outset had to make a number of basic decisions. It was felt that an assessment of the needs of the metropolitan area should be made for a population of 1,000,000, and in outline for a population of one and one-third million. These figures could be reached in about 20 and 30 years respectively. The committee then found it necessary to base its examination on the area likely to be affected by this expansion. The committee's terms of reference apply to a metropolitan area comprising 22 local government areas, which include Salisbury and Elizabeth. The metropolitan area of 1,000,000 people will, however, affect 29 local government areas. The additional district council areas affected are Munno Para, Tea Tree Gully, East Torrens, Stirling and Noarlunga, and parts of Meadows and Willunga.

I find on studying this report that the estimated population of the statistical metropolitan

area, that is, including Salisbury and Elizabeth, at July 30, was 586,050, which means that the population has grown by 94,810 since 1954. One-third of this is due to natural increases and two-thirds to migration. The average annual increase has been 18,060, which represents an annual rate of growth of 3.38 per cent, and it is worth while comparing that, as the report does, with the growth in other States. The annual rate of growth in Melbourne is 3.02 per cent, in Brisbane 2.43, in Hobart 2.42, and in Perth 2.23. It is obvious that Adelaide, including Salisbury and Elizabeth, is growing faster than any other capital city in Australia.

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

Mr. CLARK—Before the adjournment I was talking about Adelaide's metropolitan area, including Salisbury and Elizabeth, growing faster than that of any other capital city in the Commonwealth. The following is an extract from the interim report of the Town Planning Committee:—

Nevertheless as the future provision of dwellings, schools, public services and recreational areas is dependent on population estimates, a forecast must be attempted based on a study of past trends and the adoption of realistic assumptions for the future. There are various forecasting techniques, but the most satisfactory method is to forecast the future population of Australia as a whole, apportion the share which seems applicable to South Australia and then allocate a proportion of the State population to Metropolitan Adelaide.

It is estimated that the future population of the metropolitan area of Adelaide will be 1,038,000 in 1981 and 1,333,000 in 1991. I have a table setting out the Australian, South Australian and Adelaide metropolitan area populations, and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Year.	Australian population.	South Australian percentage of Australian population.	South Australian population.	Percentage Metropolitan population of State.	Metropolitan population.
		%		%	
1957 .. .. .	9,354,985	9.16	873,123	63.05	550,600
1961 .. .. .	10,450,000	9.31	973,000	63.72	620,000
1966 .. .. .	11,590,000	9.50	1,101,000	64.49	710,000
1971 .. .. .	12,780,000	9.69	1,238,000	65.26	808,000
1976 .. .. .	14,150,000	9.88	1,398,000	66.02	923,000
1981 .. .. .	15,430,000	10.07	1,554,000	66.80	1,038,000

Mr. CLARK—The interim report further stated:—

An approximate check of this population forecast is provided by assuming an annual rate of increase of .3 per cent compared with the existing rate of 3.38 per cent. At an annual rate of increase of 3 per cent the population in 1981 would be 1,088,000.

I give these figures and quotations from the report because I submit that they show the urgency to plan now for transport, particularly public transport, in the area which I represent in this place. It is obvious that the facilities for the movement of people and goods by either public or private transport must eventually have a great influence on development, and therefore it must not be neglected. The interim report sets out that at present in the metropolitan area on an average week day nearly 1,000,000 trips are made covering an aggregate distance of 3,000,000 miles, and this excludes commercial vehicles. It also says that about £65,000 is spent every week day in the metropolitan area on various forms of transport, and that in September, 1958, three trips in every eight were made by public transport. On this matter the interim report said:—

Surveys show that Adelaide's road traffic and public transport must be speeded up as travelling times are long for relatively short distances. In future new facilities designed for fast movement must be provided to counter the inevitable increase in travel distances.

If this is not done, more and more public transport will be lost to private transport and private forms of transport. The railway men are worried about this matter and that is why I quoted extracts from two letters. These men are doing a good job. I fear that sometimes they are not always encouraged and at times perhaps the job they are able to do is not the job they would like to do. Let me give a simple example of what happens. Normally I catch a train from Gawler, unless I want to be in Adelaide earlier, at 8.44 a.m. This is a Bluebird train which comes from Peterborough. It is possible that Gawler passengers were never permitted to board that train, but as it stopped at Gawler they did so. A few weeks ago an ultimatum went out and the Gawler staff were told that no passengers were to board that train at Gawler. The position now is that the train stops at Gawler but the gate is padlocked so that no-one is able to board the train.

Because of the ultimatum the next train must be caught and it becomes overloaded because the Gawler passengers must catch it as they are prevented from boarding the earlier train.

This seems to be ridiculous. Surely people could board the train at the discretion of the station master. The Gawler staff consider it to be an absurd situation, and I agree.

Mr. Heaslip—You believe in decentralization?

Mr. CLARK—I do not connect decentralization with the matter I am mentioning. Unfortunately my mind does not work with the ease and facility of the honourable member's mind. I would have to stop and think about his interjection but I want to get on with my speech. If the honourable member were to meet me privately later I should be only too happy to try to understand what this matter has to do with decentralization. There may be a reason, but it is not obvious. I give these figures and information in the hope of getting a revised and an improved plan for future public transport in my area. We should aim to reduce travel distance, time and costs, but not necessarily in that order. We must remember that travel between home and work accounts for 41 per cent of all passenger movement in the metropolitan area, including Salisbury and Elizabeth. At present trips by motor car are more expensive than by public transport. Surely we must admit that public transport should have speed, comfort, convenience, and competitive costs. Every increase in fares reduces the last factor. Even a slight increase is a great increase for people who have other commitments. A further quote from the interim report states:—

Transport is a costly but vital factor to the community, and failure to make timely provision can have a serious effect on the whole community.

That is why I put forward these suggestions. There will be an immense future population, one almost impossible to estimate at present, because in my area not only has there been much building by the Housing Trust but a tremendous amount of subdivision has taken place, which must swell the population considerably. To a lesser extent, of course, this applies to other areas. I raise these matters in the hope that a definite plan will be announced, so that the people will have the satisfaction of being certain that their transport requirements will be fully recognized in the future.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the matter of Gawler sewerage. Recently Gawler people had the pleasure of a visit by the Treasurer. He came there to open the local Show, and he did it admirably, as would be

expected. The Treasurer gave me the opportunity of announcing on his behalf that the school children could have a holiday, and I thought it very decent of him to do that. Whilst at Gawler he said that if ever he could do anything for the town of Gawler he would be only too pleased to do it. I was pleased to hear that because there have not been many signs of it up to the present. I have constantly advocated the extension of the sewerage system to Gawler.

I have previously mentioned that a number of industries (and I could quote them if necessary) have been prevented from coming to the town. As soon as they learned that there was no sewerage to dispose of effluent and waste matter they were no longer interested. Existing industries have been hindered in their development because of the lack of sewerage facilities. Last week-end I learned that one industry is having a difficult time because of the problem of getting rid of sewage. Gawler is an old town with great historic traditions. It is the centre of a fine agricultural district, perhaps one of the finest and richest in the State, but it needs industries to keep more local people employed. Parents are concerned because their children must leave home in order to get work. If that could be avoided it would be a great blessing to them. Gawler people have been heartened by the planned new Bolivar scheme and I hope that before long Gawler will have a sewerage scheme as a result of a Public Works Committee inquiry. I do not know of anything that would gladden the hearts of the people in that district more.

Mr. Quirke—Sewerage rates may be a burden.

Mr. CLARK—Yes, but the benefits derived from such a system will far outweigh any additional burden imposed. I, and many hundreds of my Elizabeth constituents, have been concerned with the lack of fire precautions in the town. On November 24 last I asked:—

Will the Premier obtain a report on future fire precautions at Elizabeth, particularly regarding the establishment of a fire station with adequate fire alarms?

The Treasurer replied:—

The Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board is financed from three sources, the insurance companies, the local government authority, and the Government each paying a certain percentage. The Government is quite prepared to carry on with the arrangement as far as Elizabeth is concerned. Some discussion has taken place regarding the fact that many of the houses at Elizabeth are owned by the

Housing Trust. The insurance companies are not very anxious to incur any additional expense in that instance, as they have not a very large premium coming in from that area. The Government believes this matter should be dealt with on a wide interpretation. There are plenty of suburbs in South Australia where the Government has paid its percentage of the upkeep although it has no direct interest as far as the owning of any substantial amount of property is concerned. The Government is not prepared to break down at Elizabeth the long-established percentage basis. It is prepared to meet its normal percentage of expenditure, as it does in other areas where the fire brigade protection has been given. I think that is the only point in issue at this stage. I will endeavour to see whether some agreement can be reached in this matter, and I fancy that is possible.

The people of Elizabeth were most concerned following that reply and in a worthwhile effort to make progress a petition was drawn up, circulated, and promptly signed by 700 people. I was requested to present the petition to the Treasurer and I did so. The petition stated:—

We, the undersigned residents of Elizabeth, respectfully draw the honourable the Treasurers' attention to the fact that the safety of life and of property at Elizabeth, is being, and will be threatened so long as the parties concerned cannot agree to a formula for financing a permanent fire station at Elizabeth. Accordingly, we humbly petition the honourable the Treasurer to increase the State Government's grant to the South Australian Fire Brigades Board to the extent necessary to offset the reduced contributions which the insurance companies are prepared to pay towards financing a permanent fire station in a district containing so many houses owned by an instrumentality of the State.

Obviously, the parties could not agree to a formula for financing a fire station at Elizabeth because the Treasurer told me so in a previous reply. A few weeks after presenting the petition, having heard nothing on the matter, I decided to ask for an interim report because, I thought, the Treasurer might have had some time to consider the matter. I asked a question of the Treasurer on September 7 and his reply appears on page 971 of *Hansard*. Members may read the reply but it did not answer the question: it assumed that certain ideas were contained in the wording of the petition that the petitioners had not intended to be there. The Treasurer placed a wrong construction on the wording but that is not an unusual thing for him to do. I hope that the Treasurer will further consider the petition and give an early considered reply that will satisfy the many people in the area who are now concerned with this urgent matter. The people are most anxious that their town receive the necessary fire precautions.

I was amazed when the member for Mitcham assumed that because 98.5 per cent of the money required for education had been allocated in the Budget only one and a half per cent of the things necessary remained to be done in the Education Department's schools, in teaching and so on. Surely the honourable member is not so naive that he really believes that. I do not know exactly how the Budget is worked out but the most likely and sensible way is for the department to be told that the State can afford to budget so much for it.

I congratulate the Minister of Education on his ability to get 98.5 per cent of his requirements but surely no-one in his proper senses could think that statement means that 98.5 per cent of everything that was necessary for education in this State is contained in this Budget. The Minister of Education would have no difficulty in spending 50 per cent of the total State Budget on education on necessary and worthwhile things and still find other necessary things to do. Recently the press and radio gave prominence to a statement by the Minister of Education relating to school book allowances. I believe the Minister of Education is indeed a lucky man to get the publicity he receives. However, good luck to him if he is fortunate enough to be picked out for that additional publicity.

Mr. Ryan—There may be an ulterior motive.

Mr. CLARK—I do not know whether there is, but he certainly receives publicity. The cost of school books is a heavy drain on the family purse and the slightly increased book allowance will mean an improvement. The new allowance will be nearly, but not quite, as good as that promised by the Treasurer in his 1959 policy speech prior to the last election. The Treasurer then made the pledge that "the education budget provides for the subsidy of books to all secondary school students." When the Government, aided by that pledge and the gerrymander, returned to power it showed that the pledge did not mean "all" but it meant "some". The new scale does not apply to all children and is very much short of the ideal. It is short of what would be provided under a Labor policy and it is short of what is desired by anyone who has considered the matter. Our policy is to give free books to all children in all schools. If some members claim that that could not be done I remind them that it has certainly been done in the United Kingdom, New South Wales, and part of Queensland. In the remaining States the book allowances are similar to those in this State. Surely it is logical that boys and girls who are compelled

to go to school until a certain age should be provided with free school books. I believe that two important things in education are free books and a school leaving age of 15. Legislation to give effect to the latter has been passed in this State but not proclaimed. I should like to see the school leaving age eventually raised to 16 years. I support the first line.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria)—I support the first line. I endorse the remarks made by the honourable members relating to the late Leader of the Opposition and I congratulate the present Leader and other members opposite who have been elevated to responsible positions. The Leader of the Opposition and other Labor members have an important role to play in this Chamber.

I intend to speak mainly about land settlement, but first I shall deal with the recent Parliamentary visit to the north. That visit was worth while. I say that for I heard one member tell another that he thought a lot more than he had previously of a certain person. In other words on a trip of that nature members get to know one another. I believe that is very important because all members are here to do something for the welfare of the State. During our trip north we saw the town of Leigh Creek and members of this House were pleased to see the amenities provided to assist people there. I was pleased at the air conditioning of their homes and that water had been laid on, enabling the people to undertake gardening. This is an encouragement for them to stay at Leigh Creek. I was impressed with the Angorichina Hostel, which was established after World War I, in which some 67,000 of the cream of our nation lost their lives. The hostel was established for soldiers afflicted with tuberculosis, which in those days was a very dreadful disease. Members were impressed with the amenities provided for the comfort of present inmates. It is pleasing that medical science can now cope with this disease and there may be a time, and we hope it will be in the near future, when there will be no further need for this hostel because science may have eliminated this scourge. I understand that the Tubercular Soldiers Aid Society has received through voluntary contributions during its life-time about £250,000.

I was also impressed with the Flinders Ranges. Like some other honourable members, I have seen the Dandenongs, the Blue Mountains, the South Coast of New South Wales, the Gold Coast and the scenery around Cairns, but I consider that the middle Flinders Ranges have something which probably is not

to be found elsewhere in the world. The only place I can compare it with is Central Australia, but the great obstacle there is the distance which tourists have to travel. I regret that we had only three days for the trip. This was not sufficiently long to enable members to see all the scenery in the middle Flinders Ranges.

Whereas most honourable members may have been familiar with the problem of land settlement some 10 or 20 years ago, many of them have little idea of the major problem at present facing the men on the land, namely, the cost problem. I would endorse any land settlement scheme undertaken by the Government provided that it was practicable and had every promise of success. Such a scheme would need financial support from both the Commonwealth and the South Australian Governments. More than £100,000,000 has been spent on war service land settlement throughout Australia during the last 15 years, more than £50,000,000 of this being in the three agent States, namely, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania. In Western Australia the amount exceeded £32,000,000 to settle 1,000 settlers and in South Australia more than £20,000,000 has been spent. I do not know of any better project to aid decentralization. Mr. King mentioned that half of the settlers included in this scheme in South Australia had been settled on the Murray River irrigation blocks. I hope that their efforts will succeed, but they have a hard row to hoe. Present-day production costs of primary products almost price us out of world markets. In war service land settlement schemes it was originally agreed that individual holdings should carry at least 1,200 dry sheep or 800 ewes, but in those days the price of wool ranged from 144d. to 240d. a lb., whereas today it averages 44d. Because of present-day high costs, even those settlers who were generously assisted are having a difficult time and many of them must receive considerable further assistance to enable them to get on their feet. Possibly it will be necessary to grant them a year or two free from any contributions to the Government.

On the trip to the north members saw the old Kanyaka Station, which was settled in 1856. It was then a large pastoral holding. After it was resumed, I understand that it was cut up into blocks of about 640 acres for agricultural purposes. However, since then there have been disastrous droughts and the men and women who had worked so hard

had to walk off their blocks. Now the houses are falling down and the machinery has been abandoned. I understand that individual areas are now about five or six square miles each. The success of any land settlement scheme is not a matter of just waving a wand. There are instances where people from the city have sold their homes and purchased some 5,000 or 6,000 acres of scrub in the South-East, but are hard up against it. Last year we had a severe drought and some of these people desperately need assistance from the Government. Some time ago the Treasurer made a statement that shook me. He said that he believed that producers in this State could not economically increase their production more than 30 per cent. I think that what prompted him in saying that was that in South Australia 96 per cent of the total area has less than a 20-inch rainfall, and also that terrific costs were preventing small farms from being a success. In the last four years the increase in primary production had been 11 per cent, but the income received by farmers decreased by 11 per cent. Five years ago in this House I said that 8 per cent of the 4,000,000 Australian workers were responsible for the production of 80 per cent of our overseas funds, but the latest statistics show that 5 per cent of the Australian population produces 80 per cent of our overseas funds. The total value of rural exports is valued at about £740,000,000 of the £926,000,000 of all goods exported. Mr. Adermann (Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry) has said that the annual increase in rural production should be 25 per cent, or £250,000,000, during the next five years, but I fail to see how this can be achieved.

I should like to quote something from Commonwealth statistics dealing with primary industries. To me it is alarming and disturbing. In Western Australia in 1947-48 rural holdings numbered 19,140 and in 1957 they had increased to 21,593—an additional 2,452. In Queensland the respective figures were 42,070 and 43,457, an increase of 1,387. We hear much about Victoria, which enjoys a good rainfall, and for that State the respective figures were 70,910 and 69,590, a decrease of 1,320. To me this is almost unbelievable, because Victoria boasts about its position. I believe that that State has settled more ex-servicemen on the land than the three agent States—South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. Yet during those 10 years there has been a decrease of 1,320 holdings. South

Australia, which has spent £20,000,000 on soldier settlement and settled 1,000 soldiers, during 1947-48 had 27,901 holdings, and in 1957-58 27,971, an increase of 70. Secondary industries have flourished so terrifically and the wages there have been so remunerative, while the responsibility and the anxiety have not been as great as in running a farm, that the people have congregated in the cities. These figures are alarming, particularly in view of the £100,000,000 spent on war service land settlement.

In today's *Advertiser* Sir Thomas Playford is reported as saying:—

In the next five years new industries will invest about £100,000,000 in South Australia. The State Government will have to invest the same amount in housing and other amenities. He anticipated that the South Australian population would reach 2,000,000 during the next 20 years; in general terms, we would have to duplicate everything we had now. If the Treasurer were here, my question would be: does that include primary production? I cannot visualize that sufficient money will be invested in primary industry to increase our production 100 per cent.

During the September 1960 series of sales, the average wool price was only 44.85d. per lb., the lowest for years. In other words, it is an entirely uneconomic position at present beyond the inside areas, where you can use a bag of superphosphate to the acre to grow wool on country priced at about £40 an acre.

I turn now to apiculture, bee-keeping. I have spent many years in the bee-keeping industry and am sad to note its desperate plight today. The honourable member for Chaffey (Mr. King) mentioned the dried figs industry, but on examination I find that dried figs as a sideline do not run into many thousands of pounds a year—less than £20,000. True, it is a sideline important to the people who depend on that subsidiary to assist them in their livelihoods. I think the figure is £19,000.

Mr. King—It is more than that.

Mr. HARDING—It is £19,000 a year. We want to assist the man on the land. If the export embargo is lifted to countries with a lower standard of living, we cannot see such an industry as dried figs, or, for that matter, canned fruit, increasing in value, thereby keeping the man on the land. This is the position in the bee-keeping world. Figures show that in 1948-49 in South Australia there were some 1,302 registered apiarists, and that during that same period there were 108,349

hives of bees registered in South Australia. In 1959-60 there were 1,052 registered apiarists and 70,126 hives of bees registered. In other words, during the 10 years there was a decrease of 250 apiarists and 38,223 hives of bees. The apicultural industry is the only line of primary production in which something is not robbed from the soil. In any other primary industry the soil is denuded and its value lessened, but with bees the reverse applies. The value of the honey is probably 20 times less than the actual value of the bee as a pollinating agent.

In 1956 there were 78,514 hives of bees registered, 17,000 of these being owned by hobbyists keeping a few colonies of bees in their gardens. This matter has been seriously investigated by the Waite Research Institute. Apiarists in South Australia are most fortunate to have the institute to assist them. They hold their annual conferences at the institute and are greatly assisted by the institute and the Agriculture Department. I take this opportunity of thanking the Agriculture Department which, at one stage, set up on Kangaroo Island a sanctuary for bees known as Ligurian bees, which are bees brought 80-odd years ago to Kangaroo Island. It was believed that they had very special qualities. The Treasurer spoke to me 20 years ago about it. I went over and handled those bees which had some desirable characteristics, one being their docility: they are very quiet bees to handle. The Treasurer asked me what I thought of them. I said, "I believe they have characteristics and that by select breeding we could establish on that island a valuable sanctuary. The chief problem will be to get some hermit prepared to bury himself three miles away from anywhere". That was during the war years when money was scarce. I said, "It will depend wholly and solely on whether we can get a person to go there and devote his life to the improvement of these bees." After many years of testing the bees, it was found that their productivity was insufficient. The department has now decided to relinquish the sanctuary on Kangaroo Island and the bees will be brought to the mainland, so no Government man will be left on Kangaroo Island to care for these Ligurian bees.

I have been chairman of the South Australian Honey Board and also chairman of directors of what is known as the Australian Honey Producers' Co-operative Society Limited, which is wholly and solely owned by the producers themselves. It is a packing and



blending house. It exports honey to Western Germany, the United Kingdom, and other places overseas. During its operations it has exported £1,600,000 worth of honey. I am sorry to say that in this State the honey industry, like the fruit canning industry, is in a sad and desperate plight. No industry in Australia has received, or asked for, less support than the apicultural industry.

I recommended to the Minister of Agriculture that, when he attends the next agricultural council, he press for the setting up of an Australian honey board. This matter was brought up at Darwin some little while ago and I believe the Minister is familiar with the difficulties of the honey industry. Nothing can save the honey industry here unless we have some assistance in the way of an Australian honey board. Such a board would not be something to hand out; it would merely

regulate and assist the export of honey by stopping unnecessary cutting of prices.

Mr. LAWN—Don't you believe in free enterprise?

Mr. HARDING—I do. I have already mentioned how interested the Waite Research is in apiculture. It has experimented and closely tabulated the value of the bee as a pollinating agent. Although I have said that the honey industry of this State is worth only about £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 a year, as a pollinating agent the bee is worth many times that. I have a table drawn up by the Waite Research Institute, after testing. It is too long for me to read now. It concerns South Australia, Victoria, Western Australia, Queensland, New South Wales, and Tasmania. I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

APPROXIMATE VALUE OF BEE POLLINATED CROPS IN AUSTRALIA.

Crop.	S.A.	Vic.	W.A.	Qld.	N.S.W.	Tas.
	1954-55.			1953-54.	1954-55.	
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Lucerne seed . . . . .	437,117	—	160	33,366	128,044	30
	1954-55.	1955-56.	1955-56.	1952-53.	1954-55.	1956-57.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Apples . . . . .	871,697	2,980,000	2,348,179	502,011	1,476,980	3,817,720
Pears . . . . .	367,892	2,743,000	206,308	—	475,100	356,760
Apricots . . . . .	736,656	295,000	98,716	—	356,760	35,820
Plums . . . . .	155,104	113,000	159,125	—	{ 114,140 }	10,270
Prunes . . . . .					{ 359,760 }	
Cherries . . . . .	180,033	211,000	12,560	—	522,870	8,760
Peaches . . . . .	584,854	1,201,000	143,220	163,999	1,058,900	3,620
Nectarines . . . . .	46,248	—	47,817	—	53,370	620
Quinces . . . . .	7,247	—	3,901	—	11,780	1,260
Nuts . . . . .	192,371	44,000	3,256	—	13,490	—
Small fruit . . . . .	—	116,000	—	—	—	515,220
Other orchard fruits	—	73,000	9,589	—	86,040	650
Passion fruit . . . . .	—	—	6,479	—	157,610	—
Raspberries . . . . .	4,544	—	—	—	—	—
Strawberries . . . . .	19,529	—	—	—	—	—
Other plantation and berry fruits . . . . .	—	—	4,492	—	—	—
Cucumbers . . . . .	—	—	—	100,632	—	—
Pumpkins . . . . .	129,341	—	82,529	443,061	—	—
Tomatoes . . . . .	—	—	758,854	1,663,171	994,790	—
Totals . . . . .	£3,731,633	£7,786,000	£3,885,185	£2,906,240	£4,911,014	£4,750,730
Complete Total . . . . .	£27,970,802.					

Mr. HARDING—Finally, I should like to thank the Minister of Lands for setting aside some land for flora and fauna reserves. We have in the South-East almost 3,000 acres set aside for that purpose. The matter is before the Minister for his consideration. An area of 14,000 acres was purchased by the Commonwealth for war service land settlement, but no

more ex-servicemen will be settled and some land will be available. I am grateful to the Minister for setting aside some of it for flora and fauna. I have much pleasure in supporting the Estimates.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—Firstly I join with other members in paying respect to the late Leader of the Labor Party,

Mr. O'Halloran. He was Leader of my Party when I entered this House 11 years ago. It is tragic that so many members should pass away while they are members of this House, and I can recall the deaths of about eight since 1950. I thank those members who have wished our new Leader, Mr. Frank Walsh, well. I have not the slightest doubt that in him we have a fighter who will carry on our battle for the people just as vigorously as in the past. In wishing him well the Treasurer, this afternoon, said that should Mr. Walsh make any suggestions from time to time, the Government would give them every consideration and accept them. We are making suggestions all the time. I did not interject when the Treasurer said that, but I immediately thought of the gerrymander. For years we have asked him to remove that.

We are always making constructive suggestions and I hope that it will not be long before the Treasurer pays more heed to our representations than he has done in the past and that he will concede that when we request him to make this State democratic we are making a constructive suggestion. Quite apart from our condemnation of the gerrymander and our plea that the people should be given the right to elect the Government of their own choosing, there are many other matters that we have suggested, some of which I shall refer to later. In many respects our legislation lags behind that of other States, and I need only mention our workmen's compensation and scaffolding legislation. We will continue to make suggestions and it will then be up to the Treasurer to keep his promise of this afternoon.

Today we heard an address (and I do not know whether it could be described as interesting) from the member for Gouger on high finance, but I do not know that he is an authority on this subject. As a matter of fact the Opposition should like to hear a debate between him and the member for Light on this topic. We are all awaiting an address from the member for Light.

Mr. Ryan—Do you say that they are both experts?

Mr. LAWN—I would not say that the member for Gouger is an expert, but I believe the member for Light is.

Mr. Bockelberg—You mean the member for Burra, don't you? The member for Light has not opened his mouth.

Mr. LAWN—That is what I am referring to. The member for Eyre, who seldom opens his mouth, has opened it too wide this time.

What I said was that we, on this side, are awaiting the first speech from the member for Light. He has been here for some months, but we have not heard him yet. We believe he is an authority on finance. I should like to hear a debate between the members for Gouger and Light on the question of high finance, and I hope that the member for Light will speak before this debate concludes. We should like to be able to assess his qualities. The Government may have something in the bag. I do not know whether the Treasurer will have any competition from the member for Light. This afternoon the member for Gouger said that members of the Labor Party do not believe in public debt, do not believe in interest, and do not believe in public savings. I know that the honourable member is young.

Mr. Ralston—And innocent?

Mr. LAWN—I do not know how innocent he is, but he was never further from the truth than when he made those statements. It is true that we do not believe in a public debt, and I shall come to that in a moment. However, it is not true to say that we do not believe in interest or in savings. We believe in controlled interest rates, which is different from saying that we do not believe in interest at all. I do not know whether the member for Gouger does not understand our policy, but we have advocated that there should be controlled interest rates. We have never said that people should not save: we have said that they cannot save. The member for Gouger does not want the workers to save. He does not want them to be paid enough to enable them to save. We do not mind if the people who can save put their money into the Savings Bank. We do not mind if the bank invests that money in various ways at reasonable interest rates. We have never opposed that, but we do say that the Government, in its borrowings, should not have to go to the trading banks or on the market to raise loans at high interest rates. We have advocated the use of national credit. Our policy is totally different from the wide charges made by the member for Gouger.

We believe that instead of the Governments of Australia incurring this huge annual debt (and this afternoon the member for Burra interjected that the public debt is increasing by about £25,000,000 annually and that we are paying off about £3,000,000 annually) the Commonwealth Bank should be able to finance the Australian Governments with national credit, which is totally different from saying that we do not believe in a public debt. We would naturally have no interest to pay if the Labor

Party's policy were adopted. We believe that the workers should be paid sufficient to enable them to save and to pay money into the Savings Bank and to draw reasonable interest thereon. There are many ways in which a bank can invest its money, such as in housing, at a reasonable interest. We have never suggested that that policy should be changed.

Let me give the member for Gouger an example. I should like to refer to the construction of the East-West railway. I do not know whether he has ever been taught or told about this, but just before I was born last century there were some bank crashes in this country. The reconstruction of those banks, following the crash, was a scandalous affair. In exchange for the deposits that they had appropriated, the banks gave the depositors either shares in the bank or deposit receipts redeemable in the future. However, the people who had invested their money by way of deposits could not wait for an unforeseeable future because they required their money to meet their current obligations, and consequently they were forced to sell their shares or their deposit receipts upon the Stock Exchange. We know what happens upon the Stock Exchange. When these depositors were offering their shares and deposit receipts upon the Stock Exchange these very banks came in and bought them for a few pence.

As a result of the bank smash, the subsequent reconstruction, and the consequent distrust of the public of the private banking system in those days, the second Andrew Fisher administration came into power in the Commonwealth in 1910 bringing with it a mandate from the people to review the Australian banking system. This was carried out in two phases. The first step consisted of removing the note issue from the private banks and placing it, as well as the coining of the metal currency, in the hands of the Government. The Commonwealth Government then constructed the East-West railway from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie. Between 1914 and 1920 the Government increased the note issue by about £50,000,000 and the notes were put into circulation in the following manner: (a) some were given to the banks in exchange for gold; (b) some were lent at interest to the State Government; (c) some were placed on fixed deposits with various banks at different rates of interest; and (d) more than half of the notes were invested in interest bearing securities. Categories (c) and (d) formed the Australian Notes Account—the nation's own property—which in 1920 amounted to £37,808,770, and returned an

annual income to the Government of slightly more than £1,500,000, known as profits on the Australian Notes Account. I refer members to the Commonwealth Year Book No. 14 at page 691.

We are now in a position to understand where the money came from to pay for the East-West railway line. It was paid for in the following manner: (1) from levying taxation, £1,205,651; (2) from profits on the Australian Notes Account, £3,428,519; and (3) from the sale of some of the securities held by the Australian Notes Account, £2,335,372—a total of £6,969,542. The reference to that is found in *Hansard*, volume 129, at page 1930. For bookkeeping purposes (2) and (3) were treated as loans from the Australian Notes Account to the transcontinental railway. They appear as loans in the Commonwealth Year Books, but were really transfers from one Government account to another. There would have been no money to transfer unless there had been increases in the note issue. The interest charges of these loans were merely bookkeeping entries between the two departments. What the Government paid out of one pocket (the transcontinental railway) it put into the other (the Australian note account). It is quite correct to say that most of the money used in the construction of the railway was obtained by printing notes, and that none of it involved the people of Australia in debt or interest charges. If the member for Gouger had been a member of this House in those days he would have said just what the people of that day said. He thinks the same as those people, who condemned these notes as "Fisher's Filmsies."

Mr. Fred Walsh—He thinks the same as they do.

Mr. LAWN—He thinks the same as the people who described the notes as "Fisher's Filmsies."

Mr. Hutchens—It is unusual to find a young man with such antiquated ideas.

Mr. LAWN—I have a high regard for democracy and for the people who elect their own representatives, but just think that the people should elect as their representative a member such as the member for Gouger! This was not solely a socialistic venture; it was supported by the nobility. I now refer to a report of the opening of the eastern division from Port Augusta, about which the following is recorded:—

The morning of September 13, 1912, broke clear and bright at Port Augusta, after a night of rain and fierce wind. It revealed that

little town *en fete* and 3 Australian destroyers gay with bunting in Spencer Gulf. The Governor-General—

God bless him! That was not his name: it was Lord Denman.

—and the Prime Minister (Mr. Fisher)—  
an ordinary Labor member.

—some 30 prominent politicians and more than 2,000 people had assembled to witness the ceremony of the turning of the first sod of the Commonwealth Railway, and the King—

God bless him!

—had sent a cable wishing success to the enterprise.

I do not know what the member for Gouger would have thought, as the King had sent a cable wishing success to the enterprise. Here was the King of England in 1912 sending a cable to a Labor Prime Minister of Australia wishing him success in the building of the east-west railway line out of natural credit!

Mr. Ryan—He must have been a man of wisdom compared with the member for Gouger.

Mr. LAWN—He must have been much wiser, because he sent that cable at a time when many people were calling the notes that were to pay for the railway “Fisher’s Flimsies” and saying that they could be picked up for a bob a bushel. However, the King, who had not witnessed the success of a socialistic enterprise, sent this cable, yet the member for Gouger should know because of subsequent experience that it was successful. Of course, we do not believe in national debt; we believe that these public works can be carried out in the manner I have just described. To show the trouble the Labor Government had in those days over the building of this line I will show how big business, which is now represented by the member for Gouger, ganged up. I will indicate what they tried to do to stop the people from building this railway line or any other public works without building up a huge debt. The member for Gouger represents people who want to see the Government build up huge debts and pay huge interest bills, and I should like him to listen to this:—

This railway line was estimated to cost £4,000,000 and to take about four years to build.

Mr. Jennings—He is listening to you now; he is here.

Mr. LAWN—I do not know if he is listening, or if he can listen. The report continued:—

It actually cost, inclusive of buildings and rolling stock, about £7,000,000 and its construction took five years. The reason for this can be summed up in one word: materials. On August 8, 1912, King O’Malley said, “I am up against the trusts of the world who

have laid themselves out to make this railway so costly that it will be a failure. Before a single rail was laid the steel magnates raised their prices and, as they controlled the world’s market, their prices had to be paid.”

Mr. Ryan—They are doing exactly the same today.

Mr. LAWN—They are the business interests represented by the member for Gouger. He condemns the people for attempting to carry out public works on their own credit. He wants us to borrow credit from the people he represents and to pay high interest rates. He agrees with those magnates who bumped up prices.

Mr. Hall—Why not deal with the present time?

Mr. LAWN—I dealt with the honourable member’s remarks of October 4, so I am up to date. If he had been in the Chamber a little earlier he would have heard me say that the King of England sent a cable blessing the enterprise yet he, who was not even born then, condemns the enterprise 40 or 50 years later. He was as wide of the mark as the two poles are apart when he said “They over there (meaning members on this side of the House) do not believe in public debt, interest or savings.”

Mr. Hall—I said that some of you did not.

Mr. LAWN—I know what the honourable member said, but perhaps he wants to correct it now. He was not here when I said we had never said there should not be any interest or that people should not be able to save. We believe that people should be able to earn enough to enable them to save and that they should be able to put their money into the Savings Bank to earn interest. However, we believe in a controlled interest rate, not in the abolition of interest. The honourable member was correct in saying that we do not believe in public debt as we know it. We believe national credit should be used in the manner I have described. History has proved that it can be done, and we say it can be done again.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The Bank of England prevented the same method from being used in 1931.

Mr. Hall—Is this the official attitude of the Labor Party?

Mr. LAWN—The Bank of England sent out Sir Otto Niemeyer and another in 1931 to stop national credit when Mr. Scullin, who was then Prime Minister, wanted only £18,000,000 of national credit, of which £6,000,000 was to help the farmers and £12,000,000 was to help workers in secondary industry.

Mr. Jennings—He asked if this was official. Tell him—

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. LAWN—Unlike the Liberal Party, we do not carry resolutions that do not mean anything. A fortnight ago a convention of Liberal Party members carried resolutions but they were not given effect to. They call that democracy! We have a policy and we believe in it. It has been practised only to a limited extent, however, because we have not had the control of the Commonwealth for very long. Every time we attempted to reform the Commonwealth Bank and the monetary system the member for Gouger and his supporters were against us and brought cases to the High Court and Privy Council with a view to getting judgments that we were acting illegally. As the member for Burra pointed out, there is no reason why we should be increasing our public debt to the extent of about £22,000,000 a year. We hear members opposite talking about their Don Athaldo and all he has done for South Australia. This afternoon they were saying, "God bless him." The member for Torrens said that we had a near-record harvest and a sound Budget. We hear them boasting about the Budgets their Don Athaldo has been bringing in for 22 years.

Mr. Harding—Who is Don Athaldo?

Mr. LAWN—A strong man who bends things, just as the Treasurer bends members opposite to his will.

Mr. Clark—Does he twist things?

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. LAWN—Like a corkscrew, whenever it suits him. Members opposite get up and talk about their strong man, yet they have to rely on orthodox finance. They cannot think of giving people a better financial system. We have to borrow £25,000,000 a year to give effect to our big public works programme and we can pay back only £3,000,000, so we have to increase interest rates to encourage investors to lend us their money. Why do we want to plead with these people to lend us their money? Their money is not worth anything unless the people of Australia are prepared to accept it. It is the people's credit that is being used. The private investors are bludging upon the people of this country; it is the people's credit that is creating everything in the community. All the public works and the wealth of this country are created by the people, and every cheque that is written can only be circulated so long as the people back it.

Mr. Hall—What would you think the people would say if they could not get a decent interest rate?

Mr. LAWN—I am talking sensibly and do not want to drag in the tripe the honourable member mentioned. We believe that people should be paid a reasonable wage that will enable them to save and invest at a reasonable interest rate. If the honourable member cannot understand that, I cannot explain it any further. If he has anything else he wants to say, let him write it down and give it to the member for Light, whom we are all waiting anxiously to hear. Surely he is not going to say that his light has gone out too! Before concluding my remarks about the Commonwealth railway, I should like to quote the following poem:—

*The Witnesses.*

When children ask, in time to come,  
Saying: "What mean these stones,  
These rusted rails where grows the gum,  
These mounds of bleaching bones;  
"This broken bridge where tidewaves flow,  
These dams where the dingo whines,  
These cuttings deep, where deserts go—  
Tell us, what mean these signs?"

We shall reply: "In days of old,  
When bankers ate the earth,  
When nations sold their souls for gold,  
And, in plenty, died of dearth;  
"Some men arose in the land and said:  
'For this we schooled our kings,  
For this we bled and toiled and sped—  
To serve these money-things!'"

"'Nay, money-things shall serve, for best  
It is that men command.'  
They made the East to join the West,  
And Fortune fill the land!"

I commend those words to the member for Gouger and to other thinking members, for their meaning is this: instead of us toiling and serving money, and making money our god, let us see that money serves.

Mr. Ryan—It would not suit the Government members' policy.

Mr. LAWN—No. Ours is a humanitarian policy. We want to see that money is used in the interests of people instead of people being used for money. I was not going to speak about money or the East-West railway line tonight, but when I hear the member for Gouger in all his innocence say that the Labor Party does not believe in public debt I think I should take the opportunity to explain why the Labor Party does not believe in the public debt and to correct his incorrect statement that we do not believe in interest or savings, because we do. During this debate the member for Edwardstown, who was then

the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, referred to the State Bank's lending £250,000 for the building of the Hotel Australia. I do not know whether it was he or the member for Barossa who referred to it as a white elephant.

Mr. Laucke—Certainly not I.

Mr. LAWN—I am not criticizing the transaction. The manager of the bank came back with a public statement pointing out that the State Bank has a general banking section in addition to the credit foncier section. The latter section receives its money from the Government, and that money is directly ploughed into the financing of house building. I have nothing against the State Bank; in fact, I subscribe 100 per cent to it. I do not condemn the bank for lending £250,000 towards the building of the Hotel Australia, or lending money as it does in many other ways in carrying out the functions of a general bank, but I fail to see why the same policy cannot be carried out by the Government in financing housing. If private enterprise wants to build a big hotel like the Hotel Australia or some big factory it can go to the State Bank and borrow £250,000 or £1,000,000 in the normal way in which private banks carry out their banking policy, yet the bank cannot lend the State Government £250,000 to build houses for the people. No-one can tell me that that is a commonsense policy, and that this Don Athaldo cannot alter that—

Mr. Ryan—The Government can if it wants to.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. The policy of the Government, including the member for Gouger—

Mr. Clark—And the member for Light.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and the policy of all the rest of the Government members is not to assist the people but to represent a certain section of the community which has money to invest, or large landowners. We saw them last Session pass legislation in Parliament giving the large landowners substantial rebate conditions. I pointed out then that the very same thing applied to me personally and to many other people in the city. Many people who years ago bought a block of land for £10 find today that it is worth £1,000 or £1,500, but they do not get any special rebate of succession duties. However, because there were inflated land values the members opposite gave the country people special rebates of succession duties, in some cases in respect of land worth more than £100,000. Let us be honest, as much as members opposite can be. The member for Gouger believes that the State Bank should

have the right to carry out the functions of lending money at an interest rate to build hotels and factories and other things.

Mr. Laucke—It certainly should, too.

Mr. LAWN—The member for Barossa agrees with me, but why should the same bank not be allowed to carry out the same banking functions in financing the Government to build houses?

Mr. Laucke—It does a magnificent job in the same direction of administering the Government funds, but don't confuse the activities of the bank.

Mr. LAWN—That is not an answer to the question. We know what the State Bank is doing. We know that it will create credit in a ledger, as it did with the loan of £250,000 to the Hotel Australia. There was no £250,000 created or invested in the bank or anything else; it was a book entry indicating £250,000 on loan, and the bank claims that was a deposit of £250,000. The Treasurer, when he wants the State Bank to assist the people of this State to buy houses, has to give the bank hard cash before it will pass that money on. Why? It is no use members' trying to laugh that off. I am putting that question in all sincerity, and I want an answer and, if the Government cannot answer, it proves my claim that the banking system and the old monetary system as they want it is wanted by them not for the benefit of the people as a whole, but only for the benefit of a section. They want interest rates, and they want high interest rates; they want to see the Government's having to borrow money from the people who have money before it can spend it. We must not use credit, but they themselves can work on credit. If they want a loan they can go to the bank, have it written up as a loan, and go on and draw cheques against that loan, but the Government must not do that. That is being done every day of the week, and members opposite cannot deny it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Who do you mean by "they"?

Mr. LAWN—I said that the members sitting opposite me can go to the bank if they want money.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—A person must have security, though.

Mr. LAWN—Haven't the people of this State any security? The Minister ought to have been here earlier when I referred to the building of the East-West railway.

Mr. Ryan—They went to sleep when that was on.

Mr. LAWN—The Minister was not here, yet he talks about security. Let me tell the Minister that he has no security unless the people of this country accept it. It is the people who give the Minister the credit that he works on and claims he has got. The people create all security and all wealth: there is nothing without the people. All the cheques in circulation are not worth the paper they are written on unless the people are willing to accept them. It is only the fact that the people will accept those cheques that makes the cheques valuable.

Mr. Laucke—Backed by securities and assets.

Mr. LAWN—Backed by the people. I suppose the member for Barossa would say that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's iron ore deposits at Whyalla are privately-owned by the B.H.P. Company, but I say that the people's assets are being exploited by the B.H.P. Company. Why does the honourable member talk about the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's assets? They are the people's assets, but the company regards them as its assets. I should like to know why the State Bank cannot help in the building of houses in the same way as it helps in the building of hotels. I do not condemn the bank for lending £250,000 for the building of the Hotel Australia. The State Bank should be allowed to carry on its banking business, but it should do more than it does, although I have no complaints about what it does.

Mr. King—You don't know that it is not doing that.

Mr. LAWN—Parliament makes money available to the bank for the building of houses.

Mr. King—It would handle that business with money in the bank.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and I want to know why it does not do so. I hope the Don Athaldo of the Government will answer the question.

Mr. King—Haven't you got the answer?

Mr. LAWN—If we were the Government, we would have the answer.

Mr. King—Do you believe that the State Bank should be politically controlled?

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member did not raise the query when I mentioned what the Commonwealth Government did between 1910 and 1920. Australia prospered in those years. As far as we know, the Commonwealth Bank was the only bank to keep its doors open every day during World War I. We saw the East-West railway line built without incurring any public debt and having to pay interest. It

was done whilst the Commonwealth Government had control of the finances of the Commonwealth Bank, but in 1920 William Morris Hughes placed the control in the hands of a board. The State Bank should be under Government control, but I do not think the Government should conduct the operations of the bank from day to day. Cabinet Ministers would not have the time to spend in running the bank and the other undertakings for which they are responsible. The Minister of Education could not go to all the schools and do all the teaching. We believe that the direction of State Bank policy should be in the hands of the Government. If we had a Labor Government in South Australia the Electricity Trust would not be run by the Government in its day to day operations, but that Government would have the control and it would see that the country people had the same tariff as people in the metropolitan area. We would not say that it should be accomplished in 24 hours, but perhaps over two or three years.

Mr. Loveday—We would make the interest rate easier for the farmers.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. We would tell the bank to make interest rates as low as possible for farmers, but we would not be in the bank every day conducting its operations. In answer to the member for Chaffey, in 1910 the Commonwealth Government took from the private banks the right to print notes and make metal coins so that it could do that work itself. From that time onwards the Commonwealth prospered. I make no apology for saying that the Government should direct policy. The Government is really the people, but that does not always apply, because it is not so in South Australia. Why shouldn't the people have the right to direct bank policy? With other members, the member for Chaffey visited Leigh Creek recently. Almost all members who have spoken since that visit have referred to what is being done at the field. The member for Burnside, in a question today, asked the Premier to accept her thanks and the thanks of other members for making possible the visit to Leigh Creek. Government members do not say that the Leigh Creek coalfield is a socialistic venture.

Mr. Loveday—And far superior to similar private enterprise shows.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and two miles away there is Copley, a private enterprise show. They do not say that it is a socialistic enterprise begun by the Government—the people of South Australia. The mining of the coal and the transport of it by rail is

another socialistic undertaking. The transport is undertaken by the Commonwealth Railways at a cheap rate. Private enterprise could not bring it down so cheaply. The Electricity Trust has its own power stations and makes electricity available throughout the State. Nothing like that was possible with the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. Government members are full of praise for what they saw at Leigh Creek. They are pleased with the amenities provided for the employees. I remind them that it is a socialistic enterprise. The Government should have the right to direct policy in regard to the Leigh Creek coal-field, but it should not be on the spot managing the operations. During this debate the member for Torrens said he wanted the Reserve Bank and the Commonwealth Treasurer to use the resources of the bank to curb inflation. Then he referred to the high interest rate on hire-purchase finance. What is the use of the Commonwealth Government having the right through the Reserve Bank to control bank interest when hire-purchase companies are free of interest rate control? The Commonwealth Reserve Bank fixes bank interest rates. If I understand Mr. Coumbe correctly, this afternoon he made the same plea as the Opposition has been making for a long time. We say that the Commonwealth Constitution should be altered to enable the Reserve Bank to control interest rates on hire-purchase finance, in the same way as it controls bank interest rates.

Mr. Clark—Would Don Athaldo agree to that?

Mr. LAWN—I do not know. His attitude would determine the attitude of his colleagues, because if any member on that side had a different opinion he would soon change it to agree with the view of his leader, as is done in all other matters. I want now to mention several matters in the Auditor-General's report. The Electricity Trust is referred to on page 184 of the report and it makes interesting reading. This is a Government undertaking: it is not complete Socialism, but little legislation would be required to make it completely Socialist. The Auditor-General states:—

The result for the year reflected the sound financial position of the electricity undertaking which has enabled the Trust to meet living wage and marginal increases in salaries and wages without increasing tariffs.

That was the position 12 months ago. There had been a ten-shilling increase in the basic wage, but the Trust still showed a surplus of £469,000. It absorbed all the increased charges and was still able to show that surplus.

I said that a Labor Government could, in three years, give the country people electric light and power at the same tariff charged in the metropolitan area. The then member for Light (the late Mr. George Hambour) continually asked the Treasurer about Electricity Trust charges to country people. He was largely responsible for the alteration in the surcharge to country people and he agreed with me that in three years this Government, or any other Government, could give country people electric light and power at the same tariff as that applying in the metropolitan area. Members of the Labor Party pointed this out to country people during the recent Light by-election campaign and it got back to the ears of the Government or to the Treasurer (it is the same thing) and Don Athaldo said that the charges to country people were to be cut. The canvassing by Labor members caused that announcement. The Auditor-General's report continues:—

Notwithstanding increases over the past four years in operating expenses of £4,122,000 (55 per cent) and in debt charges of £1,377,000 (73 per cent), the average price per kilowatt hour (K.W.H.) charged to consumers for 1959-60 was lower than that charged for 1955-56. Features of the 1959-60 operations were:—the surplus for the year was £469,000 (the same as for the previous year) after providing for depreciation (£1,926,000) and meeting debt charges (£3,265,000). That surplus brought the total funds earned by and retained in the undertaking to £2,497,000.

The report states that operating expenses and debenture interest increased. Despite that, the surplus for the year was £469,000 after providing for depreciation of nearly £2,000,000 and meeting debt charges of over £3,250,000 and during that period there was an increase of 15s. in the basic wage and a marginal increase of 28 per cent. The 15s. increase operated over the whole year and the 28 per cent increase operated for about six months, but this Government or Socialist undertaking absorbed the whole of the increased cost and interest and was still able to show a surplus of £469,000.

If the people of South Australia would only realize it a change of Government to Labor would give light and power to country people at the same rate as that applying in the city. However, while Don Athaldo has the ear of the press there will be no statement from members on this side of the House published about the building of the Commonwealth railway or the taking over from private enterprise of the printing of paper money and minting



of metal coins now invested in the Commonwealth Bank. The people will not read that country people would receive from Labor power and light at the same rate as city people. They won't read that the Labor Party will give pensioners free transport on the railways.

Not even one member on the Government benches, either by question or in discussion, has asked the Government to give country people free travel or even concession rates on the railway system. The only agitation on behalf of country pensioners has come from this side of the House, but the public will not be told that by the Adelaide press. They won't be told about the working of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the Woods and Forests Department and other departments, but they will all know about the losses on the railways and the tramways. The press will print one gloomy side to show that Government enterprise is working at a loss. However, the railways work at a profit and the tramways showed a surplus of some £35,000 this year. This was stated by the member for West Torrens. That position applies until interest charges are considered, and that is why the railways and tramways show a loss. Their losses are not losses on actual working and that is what I have been trying to argue all the evening in reply to the member for Gouger. The Labor Party does not believe in the public debt and in having to go to the people it represents to borrow money on which it has to pay huge interest rates. It believes that the State Bank and the Commonwealth Bank should be able to finance the ventures in the same way as they finance those people if they want a loan.

When dealing with the Leigh Creek coalfield the Auditor-General's report states:—

The funds employed in the undertaking at June 30, 1960, amounted to £4,956,000 (up £181,000 compared with 1959) and included an accumulated surplus of £119,000.

The amount over all the years has been repaid, plus a surplus. Trans-Australian Airlines is another enterprise that has paid off all the money invested and has shown a surplus. The report continues:—

The operations for 1959-60 show that the surplus after providing for depreciation and interest charges on Loan Funds was £71,000, a decrease of approximately £1,000 compared with the previous year.

After all the eulogistic comments passed by members this afternoon about amenities provided for employees the trust is still able to show a surplus of £71,000. That is a State enterprise. Why shouldn't the people have

£71,000 coming into the Budget as revenue instead of private enterprise having that money. The Woods and Forests Department is contributing £240,000 to our Budget each year. At the same time it is investing money out of profits in its undertaking. Why should private enterprise have all the profits from the forests? The Auditor-General's report further states:—

Funds employed at June 30, 1960, amounted to £8,291,000. Of this sum the State Treasury has provided £5,562,000, including additional Loan funds of £662,000 during the year, the balance, £2,729,000 being provided from the earnings of the undertaking.

The department has ploughed back funds into its own industry, as is done by General Motors-Holdens. In this respect the department has ploughed back £2,729,000. The report further continues:—

The surplus (as defined above) from plantations increased by £27,000 to £493,000. Of that amount, £300,000 (£60,000 more than in the previous year) was appropriated and paid as a contribution to consolidated revenue.

That speaks highly of this socialistic enterprise. Why should not the people have the right to invest in such undertakings and reap a reward? That is the system which Christ taught. He was the greatest Socialist the world has ever known and as far as I know he was the first who preached Socialism. What he advocated then was that there should be a greater share for all the people instead of for only a few. There is much interesting reading in the Auditor-General's report concerning other departments, but I shall not refer to them now.

I know that it is provided in legislation that any assistance given to widows by the Children's Welfare Department may be recouped by the department and I can understand why the Act provided for that. However, I do not think it was ever intended by Parliament that the Act should be used as it is being used. Recently I wrote to the department on behalf of a constituent, who is a married woman with five children. She reported her husband to the police for a certain offence, for which he was gaoled and she subsequently divorced him. For a time the department assisted her while her husband was in gaol to the extent of about £6 a week. Later the amount was reduced to £4 5s., then to £3 5s. and when one of the boys started work he contributed £3 a week towards his mother. The department then reduced the assistance to £2 5s. a week. When the husband was released from gaol the department said that the woman would have to take action against her husband for maintenance,

otherwise it would have to discontinue assistance. When she asked what she had to do, she did exactly what was suggested, as a result of which an agreement was negotiated under which the husband was to pay £6 a week to the department. However, the Government deducted £3 15s. out of that £6 to reimburse itself for the money advanced to this woman and her children.

In another case, when a man was released from gaol he bought a motor car valued at £2,000 and he was asked to reimburse the department for the money advanced to the wife and children while he was in gaol. That is why there is provision in the Act that the department "may" reimburse itself, because on occasions it should have the right to claim reimbursement, but not in the case to which I referred. The department is now making this woman pay back all the money advanced to her. Is that the Government's policy? It blows its trumpet about Don Athaldo and the wonderful Budget he has presented and the expected record harvest and all that kind of thing and then takes away from our widows and children the little pittance given them in their hour of need. Yet the Government will not give our country pensioners transport on the railways at half fare. It wants its pound of flesh. However, the Government agreed about 12 months ago to permit pensioners living in the city to travel on tramway buses at concession fares—I believe they are similar to those paid by children. But there are private bus owners who will not make the same concession. They also want their pound of flesh. I believe that one bus owner said he was prepared to grant a similar concession to pensioners, but I understand he was told that if he did so he would lose his licence. The Tramways Trust was written to by the Pensioners' Association, and it has replied that it will not discontinue the licence of any private bus owner who grants this concession. One bus owner said that he and bus owners generally under no circumstances would agree to carry pensioners at concession rates unless the Government provided a concession towards the cost of fuel and tyres. Here is a case where private enterprise wants the right to operate for profit, but is prepared to give away nothing, although it is claiming the same concession on sales tax on tyres as a public institution like the Tramways Trust.

M.T.T. buses carry people to and from work at what they consider is as cheap a fare as possible. I ask the Government to look into this question and see that private bus owners do the

same as the Government is doing. I would make it a condition of their receiving a licence from the Tramways Trust. Private bus owners should play some part in the life of the community, and the Government should not have to carry the whole burden. The Government is providing a transportation system to carry workmen to and from employment. It is assisting our secondary industries. The fare is as cheap as it can be, the result being that it helps to depress our basic wage here. Why should not the private bus owners play some part in carrying pensioners? We are not asking, and the Government did not agree, that the pensioner be carried by the Municipal Tramways Trust buses at peak hours. The M.T.T. fixes its own hours. The same principle would apply to the private bus owners as applies to the M.T.T.: they would be carrying pensioners only during the time when they were not carrying very many other passengers. I appeal to the Treasurer to consider this matter and to see that the private bus owners play ball and, if not voluntarily, it should be a condition of their licences from the M.T.T. Why shouldn't they? The travelling public have to pay on the private buses the fares fixed by the M.T.T. As the private bus owners have to charge the same rate as the M.T.T. charges, why should not the M.T.T. also fix the rate of the pensioner on privately owned buses that the M.T.T. is charging? I hope the Government will consider my representations in that regard, to see the private bus owners play some part in carrying our pensioners. Private enterprise should not always be after its pound of flesh. Surely there is something we can give the community in some way or other.

Mr. Ralston—Country pensioners cannot get concession fares.

Mr. LAWN—They cannot get them on our railways system in the country. I see no reason why they should not get the same concession fares on the railways as they get on M.T.T. buses. Recently there has been a "blitz" by the police on S.P. bookmakers. In this morning's press there appears a letter by somebody—I forget the name of the writer—which commends all those who are lucky enough to be able to afford go to the racecourses and pay their entrance fees and so forth. I sympathize with the racing clubs in their requests for stamping out S.P. bookmaking, but I should like to draw the Government's attention to the fact that there are people in the community unable to go to the races, who may like to go to the football and see North Adelaide or Norwood, or maybe

to some other sport, or who may have some physical disability that prevents them from going. I do not see why they should not have the right to bet.

Whilst I am not asking for betting shops, I think we could have facilities, a State totalizator or some other facilities for betting, the same provisions applying to that betting as apply to betting on the racecourse in regard to the tax, a portion of which goes to the Government and a portion of which goes to the racing clubs. I do not think the racing clubs would disagree with this. They disagree with S.P. bookmakers because they receive nothing from them. They do not receive any tax from the S.P. bookmakers but, if there were licensed bookmakers or off-course bookmakers or a totalizator system throughout the State whereby the public could place their bets if unable to go to the course, and the same principle were to apply to that type of betting as applied to totalizators on the course, the racing clubs would receive some proportion of the betting tax and the Government itself would increase its revenue. I suggest to the Treasurer that, if the Government cannot do this, it might appoint some committee, as has been appointed by Governments in the eastern States.

I note that the Minister of Roads has recently returned from a visit overseas. Not so long ago the Minister of Health, Sir Lyell McErwin, also returned from a visit overseas. I have no doubt that Sir Lyell and Dr. Rollison, who accompanied him, learned much about hospitalization overseas. I hope that the Minister of Roads, too, learned much overseas. In South Australia, however, apart from a visit by the Treasurer to England for the Queen's Coronation, and a short visit to America for a specific purpose, no Cabinet Minister from the House of Assembly, to my knowledge, has been overseas; but their departmental officers go. For instance, I think the Director of Education has been overseas, but the Minister has not. Some officers of the Minister of Works have been overseas, but the Minister has not.

I do not say that all should go every year but I believe that occasionally a Minister from this House should pay a visit overseas. Not necessarily should the visit only be by Ministers, but representatives from the Opposition should occasionally go overseas. I think this Parliament would be better for it. I do not know what opportunity the Treasurer had (I think he is the Minister for the Agent-General) when he went to the Queen's Coronation to visit the

Agent-General's office to see our set-up there. There is much controversy over those officers in England. Some people claim that the States are carrying the Commonwealth Government. There are all sorts of complaints, to which I do not want to refer now. There may be nothing in them, but the Minister should see for himself what is going on in some of his own undertakings in other countries. There are other ways in which he could inspect things overseas. Such visits are made with the idea of putting into effect in this State ideas gathered overseas. I am not sure, but I believe that officers in the department of the Minister of Agriculture have been overseas. I fail to see why departmental heads should be sent overseas, while it is apparently the policy of the Government that the Ministers should not go, or, if they do, that they should be only the Ministers from one House.

Mr. Ryan—Members of the Police Department who come under the Chief Secretary's administration have gone overseas.

Mr. LAWN—The departmental heads go overseas. Of course, the Chief Secretary has recently been overseas. I do not know what study he made apart from hospitals, but he has been overseas. The Police Commissioner is overseas and other departmental heads go there. I think that Parliament and the people would be better off if periodic oversea visits—not every year but within reason—were made by our Ministers together with, possibly, a representative of the Opposition. I have had that in mind for some time but have not voiced it because I thought I might have been ridiculed. According to our press, the New South Wales Government is adopting such a policy. Representatives of the Government and of the Opposition there will pay occasional visits overseas. I am not saying that visits should be on a large scale, but some of our Ministers are sending officers overseas while they themselves have no idea of what is going on overseas. As I have already mentioned, I doubt whether the Treasurer, who administers the Agent-General's Department in London, has any personal knowledge of that department's functioning. I support the first line.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide)—I express my regret at the passing of our late Leader, and I agree with others who have expressed opinions about Mr. O'Halloran's worth to this State. Naturally, as a new member, I have not had the experience of a long period of guidance from such a worthy public figure, but from my short sojourn in this House I can readily understand how new members could

easily get off the rails were it not for the guiding hands of wise and experienced members like the late Leader. I pass on to Mrs. O'Halloran and other relatives my condolences.

As one of the participants in our Party election this morning, I congratulate those members who have been elected to office. I have no doubt that they will live up to the high ideals that have been established by their predecessors. They will receive the full support of all Opposition members and, I hope, of members opposite when such assistance is necessary.

It has been said that we would find it difficult to criticize the Treasurer's twenty-second Budget. Although that may be true of the deliverance of the Budget, I wonder what would be the public outcry if the Treasurer, through circumstances, were forced to deliver a Budget indicating that it was absolutely necessary to increase water rates, hospital charges and rail and tram fares. What would be the public hostility? Those charges have actually been increased, but by different means. They have been inflicted on the public at times other than when the Budget was presented. Many have been imposed by regulation when this Parliament—the supreme body in this State—has not been in session. The Treasurer and his colleagues knew that had these increased charges been introduced when the Budget was delivered, this would have been his second last Budget. We know that the ulterior motive was that if charges were increased one at a time the public would probably forget. Let us hope that the public will not forget some of the inflictions of the last 12 months. It may be all right for members to say that during the last 12 months the finances of the State were stretched as never before, but it is appropriate to bring to the notice of this House the Treasurer's statement recently that the effects, if any, of the drought would not be felt until during the course of the next financial year. After the Treasurer delivered his Budget an announcement appeared in the press that the Government had no present proposals for any special increases in taxes and charges. That was true then, but members will remember that the Treasurer inflicted heavy increases on public services during the past 12 months.

The Treasurer called for savings to aid the State. People in big business with big incomes and earning exorbitant profits may be in a

position to comply with that request, but how can the majority of the people be asked to do so when on every occasion they are being fleeced of what they have? It is no good saying that they have not been fleeced, because they have. I asked a question today, but I was told I would receive a reply later. In referring to this, it is interesting to mention a booklet entitled "What the L.C.L. means to you", which is handed to people who may contemplate joining that Party. It states that the objects of the L.C.L. are to foster a spirit of political and industrial co-operation amongst those engaged in production and in industry throughout the State. The question I asked the Treasurer this afternoon was whether Mr. Wells was appearing in the Arbitration Court as the representative of this Government and to implement the Government's policy in opposing the workers. On numerous occasions this question has been asked in the Legislative Council of the Attorney-General who administers the Crown Solicitor's Department, and he has replied that the Government is not asking for a reduction in wages in South Australia, that it is not even supporting the employers' application, but that as it is a respondent to the award it is putting in an appearance in the court in that category. I do not know whether some members honestly believe that if one tells a lie long enough people will believe it, but the truth must come out sooner or later, and I refer to the Metal Trades Case heard on August 9, 1960, when Mr. Wells said:—

If the Commission pleases I entirely support the application by my learned friend Mr. Millhouse—

I think he might be related to the member for Miteham, who advocates that we cannot have price control, yet says that we can have all the control we want on what people can earn—

and for the reasons that he has given. I might perhaps just add that an examination of the grounds of the respective claims in these applications suggests that the following matters will be common to both, or that some aspects of them will be common to both: an examination of the whole differential principle and its application to what is a just and reasonable basic wage; the effect of a series of flat rate increases, the significance of geographic and economic differences between various centres of population—

Decentralization comes in there—

and the effect of those differences on the various basic wages; a very important one—the effect of relative living costs as between various centres of populations and also the question of their desirability of avoiding excessive centralization of industry;—

I have heard that in this House on numerous occasions—

and lastly, the questions relative to the distribution of population throughout Australia and throughout the various States. I merely mention those in addition to the reasons already advanced by my learned friend Mr. Millhouse. I support the application in all its aspects.

The Liberal and Country League platform, policy, or whatever you might call it—the undemocratic system under which it operates—is to foster a spirit of industrial co-operation of those engaged in industry throughout the State. Its members want to receive the co-operation of people in industry yet they want to fleece them on every occasion they have the right to do so through the courts. If that is the way the democracy of the L.C.L. wants to work, the sooner the people of this State realize who is on their side the better the Government of this State will be. The Treasurer has asked the people to offer their savings to the State, but who is going to offer them? The average person is not in a position to save anything. He is in the same position as the State Government and, for the enlightenment of the member for Gouger, I point out that the further each year progresses the further the public debt burden on each individual is increased owing to the policy of the Government. On October 29, 1959, the Liberal and Country League sent out a circular, the first sentence of which was:—

The increasing cost of our operations has made it necessary for us to widen our field of appeal and your organization has been recommended to us as one which we may confidently approach for assistance.

Even the L.C.L., through the medium of this circular signed by Mr. I. D. Hayward (President) and Sir Phillip McBride (Chairman of the Finance Committee) has admitted in black and white that increased costs of operations demand that they should get further revenue, yet they want to go into Court and tell the worker that he is not entitled to increased wages. That is surely a one-way ticket democracy. To prove that that is not an isolated case, I shall now read a circular sent out on June 7, 1960. I wish the members for Onkaparinga and Mitcham were here, as the former gave us a terrific oration about the downfall of the Labor Party and said that the Socialism of our policy was doomed. His speech was followed by a brilliant outburst by the misrepresentative of Mitcham, who also said when the doom of the Labor Party would come about. The L.C.L. sent out this further

circular, once again signed by Mr. Hayward and Sir Phillip McBride, which said:—

Because of the increasing costs of our organization and the urgency of the situation we are this year making our annual appeal for financial support somewhat earlier than usual.

Mr. Wells, as the mouthpiece of the State Government, today asked for a reduction in wages, yet the L.C.L. admitted that costs of running its organization had increased and appealed for people to donate voluntarily. The second paragraph, which I shall read in the hope that the member for Onkaparinga, who is absent from the Chamber, will take time off to read in *Hansard* when he is awake, stated:—

Labor is greatly increasing its activities with the object of winning the next elections and it is very necessary that we step up our organization if Liberalism is to retain its predominant position in State and Federal Parliaments.

Mr. Loveday—What are they afraid of?

Mr. RYAN—The Labor Party, and that the people of this country will bring about the doom of the L.C.L. Government. They realize, of course, that once we get control in this State we will not have to gerrymander the electorates but will ask for a fair and more just system. When that is implemented it will be the downfall and death knell of the L.C.L. for the next regime at least. The circular continues:—

The extent to which we are able to organize for victory depends upon the support we obtain from residents and business organizations operating in the State, which constitutes our only source of income.

They must have a white elephant on North Terrace! It continues:—

At present in the State House of Assembly, the Liberal Government is dependent upon the support of two Independents who pass its vital legislation whilst, in the Federal field, Labor holds six of the eleven South Australian seats in the House of Representatives. This position is dangerous.

I emphasize this for the benefit of the member for Onkaparinga and the member for Mitcham; the latter appeared in the Court. According to the member for Onkaparinga, Liberals are a dying race. Apparently the only one out of step is the member for Onkaparinga, but he does not know it until he is called back into step. The circular states that the position is dangerous. It goes on:—

But given sufficient support, we are confident that it can be improved. In fact, if we are to make ourselves safe from Socialism, it must be improved.

The members for Mitcham and Gouger have said that Socialism is no good to anybody.

Mr. Loveday—Bogy, bogy!

Mr. RYAN—Yes, anything to hoodwink the public. Admittedly, members opposite have the freedom of the press. As the member for Adelaide said, tomorrow morning's press will blare headlines relating to what certain members said. The member for Gouger did not say much that was constructive but tomorrow morning, because he is on the Government side, he will probably hit the headlines. Members opposite have no time for Socialism, but Mr. Ian Hayward and Sir Phillip McBride say that the position is dangerous, and that the reason it is dangerous is that members fear the policy of socialization. That is vastly different from what some members opposite speak about in Parliament: they speak with their tongues in their cheeks, and hope that people do not actually hear the truth. The member for Gouger said that he has no time for socialization, and the member for Mitcham has even a greater hatred of it.

Mr. Millhouse—I don't hate it.

Mr. RYAN—Yes, the honourable member does. I have often pointed out to the honourable member that he believes in absolute freedom of prices but absolute control over the capacity of the person to receive wages. He was advocating that in the court only a few weeks ago.

Mr. Millhouse—I think you are under a misapprehension.

Mr. RYAN—The honourable member is sliding downhill fast. What does socialization mean in this State? We now have before us the Auditor-General's report, which discloses that the two largest instrumentalities operating in the State are Government instrumentalities. They are therefore socialistic concerns. Some Government members voted against the State's acquisition of the old Adelaide Electric Supply Company, and had it not been for the policy of the Opposition, which favoured the acquisition, there would not have been an Electricity Trust.

Mr. Millhouse—Don't look at me like that. I was not here.

Mr. RYAN—But if the honourable member had been we know how he would have voted. The Electricity Trust, since its operation as a trust, has employed funds to the extent of £80,766,000, and the Leigh Creek operation has employed funds to the extent of just under £5,000,000. One is absolutely necessary to the success of the other, and no member opposite will dispute the fact that, had it not been for the acquisition of the old Adelaide Electric Supply Company, Leigh Creek would never have been a success, for it was doomed

to failure unless the acquisition were achieved, and it was only achieved by the support of Opposition members.

The other instrumentality I refer to is the South Australian Housing Trust, which since its operation has employed funds of £61,009,000. Can members opposite, with all their hatred of Socialism, deny that the Electricity Trust and the Housing Trust, if those members had their way, would be private organizations? They would be run as private concerns at extreme and exorbitant profit to the shareholders. Yet we find that the total funds employed by those two semi-Government instrumentalities—and they will become Government instrumentalities in the event of a change of Government in this State—total more than £141,000,000. That is bigger business than any members on the Government side that represent big money can ever boast of representing, yet the member for Gouger says, "I have no time for Socialism in any shape or form." He referred to democracy, but in my opinion he would not know the meaning of the word.

I read in the press recently a report to the effect that the policy of the L.C.L. was being decided on North Terrace, but that after the members had formulated the policy the members of the Government did not have to abide by the policy decided upon by the supreme body of their organization. That is what the L.C.L. does to members opposite.

Mr. Hall—That is freedom, and you don't understand it.

Mr. RYAN—The only freedom members opposite have is what they decide in this House in defiance of the Party policy and they control the finances of this country. I distinctly remember the member for Gouger speaking about Leigh Creek. He was about to say what a wonderful concern it was, but he soon stopped when I asked him if the conception of that wonderful concern was in conformity with the policy of the Australian Labor Party and against everything the L.C.L. or some of its members stood for. He soon dropped that topic as though it were red hot, yet it has been said that red herrings are only dragged on this side of the House.

It is also good to refer to the Auditor-General's comments on page 27 regarding assistance to secondary industries. Since 1941 the amount guaranteed by the Government or lent to private industry for the purpose of assisting and setting up secondary industries in this State under the Industries Development Act is £3,563,900. Members opposite do not

want anything to do with Government control of private industry. We saw their attitude when members on this side supported the Government's recommendation only the other day for the acquisition of shares in Cellulose Australia Limited. We believe in that legislation and we therefore supported it, but some Government members hotly opposed it, yet we find that the Government, since the passing of the Industries Development Act, has lent or guaranteed more than £3,500,000 to private concerns. Members opposite do not believe in socialization, but they take the credit when any credit is due to socialization in any shape or form.

Mr. Laucke—Those advances promote industry, but privately.

Mr. RYAN—True, but when the Government guarantees finance or makes a loan to secondary industry it appoints a member on the board to safeguard the money it has advanced.

Mr. Laucke—Fair enough!

Mr. RYAN—Is that not interference with private industry? Members opposite do not want Government interference, but when they lend the State's money to the little man in South Australia they want to see that the last ounce of blood is protected, so they appoint somebody to the directorate of every one of those companies.

Mr. Laucke—To protect the taxpayers' money.

Mr. RYAN—Yes, in accordance with a socialistic programme.

Mr. Loveday—Fancy going to the Government for help.

Mr. RYAN—Yes, fancy going to a Tory Government for assistance!

Mr. Laucke—They received it.

Mr. RYAN—Yes, and Opposition members will support Don Athaldo when he brings the matter down for ratification by Parliament, although he does not always have the support of all members on his side. We shall have the opportunity to ascertain the attitude of some of the members interjecting when legislation is dealt with later to curb the activities of big business people.

Mr. Hall—Name the legislation.

Mr. RYAN—The Hire-Purchase Agreements Bill. No doubt some members interjecting have shares in these big concerns. I have a paper which says, "What does the L.C.L. mean to you?"

Mr. Millhouse—You will be converted if you are not careful.

Mr. RYAN—The Treasurer realizes the benefits to be obtained from Labor Party

policy and he frequently implements some of it as Liberal policy, and makes it binding on all his supporters. What happened when rural areas were supplied with electricity? Consumers got a shock when the light went out and they got something different. They were led to believe, as they are always led to believe by statements of fantasy by the Premier, that they would get something else. They received a shock when they were told that the tariff promised would not operate for some months.

Mr. Millhouse—Could you let me have a copy of the constitution of the A.L.P.?

Mr. RYAN—The honourable member has had it on a number of occasions. Earlier he said that he had read a copy of the platform of the Labor Party.

Mr. Millhouse—It is the constitution I want.

Mr. RYAN—We have nothing to hide.

Mr. Millhouse—Let me have it then.

Mr. RYAN—A paper I have says "What does the L.C.L. mean to you?" The answer given is "Educate the electors to understand that the prosperity of the State depends on the success of production and the encouragement of private enterprise."

Mr. King—Shall we sing the "Red Flag"?

Mr. RYAN—Is there anything wrong with that? I have been accused of being one of those on many occasions. If members on the other side were accused of doing something affecting Tory interests they would deny it. How is this encouragement given to private enterprise? It is given under legislation providing for Government guarantees.

Mr. Laucke—That is a good thing.

Mr. RYAN—Yes, but when members opposite are accused of doing something different they hang their heads in shame.

Mr. Laucke—Aren't you in agreement with assistance to industries?

Mr. RYAN—Absolutely. The member for Adelaide pointed out that a committee investigates this matter.

Mr. Laucke—Don't you think that is what should be done?

Mr. RYAN—I am glad that the honourable member asked that question because he will have an opportunity later to show his sincerity in the move to curb inflation by preventing exorbitant profits being made by uncontrolled business. Our week-end paper is always full of ways in which investors can get returns of 12, 18 and 20 per cent on their investments.

Mr. Laucke—Are you opposed to profits?

Mr. RYAN—No. Reasonable profits will not hurt anyone. We are opposed to exploitation.

Mr. Laucke—We are opposed to it, too.

Mr. RYAN—I hope the honourable member will remember that when the vote is taken on the legislation I mentioned earlier. We shall see then whether the honourable member is opposed to exploitation. I have heard it said that one man who was in a high financial position in Australia was the first to leave it and become one of the leading lights in a company that is now one of the creators of inflation because of its speculations in land. He is a titled gentleman. He gave us all the remedies to cure inflation, but when he left Parliament he created means to increase inflation. That is something that members on this side think should be dealt with in order to avoid exploitation. Our Leader today asked the Treasurer to consider this important matter in order that we might have proper financial stability. Two years ago the amount of money lent by private trading banks was 36 per cent of their income, but last year it was only 18 per cent. I asked whether this was by direct loans from the banks concerned and I was told that it was, but we know that banks have created investment companies and advertised that returns from investments can be as high as 18 to 20 per cent. If members opposite are sincere they must see that this is exploitation and creates inflation in its worst form.

Some time ago I asked the Treasurer whether he would consider granting concessions to war widows who had made a terrific sacrifice in the past. Many other social service and repatriation pensioners receive concession travel benefits, and I have often been approached by representatives of war widows, Legacy and similar bodies, asking for similar concessions. The Treasurer promised to consider this request, and, if necessary, to bring down a concession when the Budget was being considered. I have seen the various recommendations of the committee set up to consider this matter, and part of its report said that these unfortunate people were not bound by any means test, therefore they were not in the same category as those receiving further assistance from the Government.

War widows from the first world war would not be in a position to supplement their income. Most of them would be approaching old age and, indeed, so would many widows from the second world war because that war ended 15 years ago. Those people have made sacrifices and we have received some benefit from their sacrifices, so they should receive any benefit that the Government can give them.

I also refer to concession fares for pensioners because these people consider that to be important. Many representations, most of them through members on this side of the House including our late Leader and the member for Adelaide, have been made for concessions to be granted to them on the metropolitan public transport systems. Unusual circumstances exist in parts of my district where no public transport is provided. No railway system is available unless people are willing to walk miles, and the only bus system operating is a private system that goes through Woodville Park, Ferryden Park, and part of Islington into Adelaide. Yet these poor unfortunate pensioners, who are in the same category as pensioners living in Hanson Road, are forced to pay full fare. This imposes an affliction on most of them and they cannot afford to pay. The Treasurer, for some unknown reason, has been very long-winded in replying to the representations made to him on various occasions and, as yet, no answer has been given by him and no reason has been advanced for his silence. These people are eagerly awaiting his decision, which is urgently required by them.

In my opening remarks I said that the Government was not game to announce various increases about to be imposed on the rate-payers of South Australia. The Treasurer announced, and his remarks were supplemented on each occasion by the Minister of Works, that it was not necessary to increase water rates in South Australia. It is all right trying to hoodwink some of the people some of the time, but one cannot hoodwink all the people all of the time, and some of the people woke up with a 240 volt shock in the last few weeks when they received their water rates for this financial year. They had read in the papers that there was to be no increase in water rates, but all the people are interested in is the amount they have to pay to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and that amount in many cases, by manipulation of words so far as the Treasurer is concerned, has risen by at least 50 per cent.

I object to the manipulation that has taken place by the Government in trying to hoodwink some of the people and to the further affliction that has been caused by the adoption by municipalities of the water rate assessment. Last week-end my telephone rang continuously because of people wanting to complain. If they could have got hold of the Treasurer and the Minister of Works we



might have had another two by-elections. Some council rates have been based on the water rates assessments and have increased by 100 per cent. Last week-end a pensioner approached me in tears and told me that his rates had risen to £59 for this financial year. That state of affairs was brought about by this Government's manipulation of water assessments. It is all right to tell the people that the rates are not going up, but if one wants to increase the revenue one increases the assessments. If that is not increasing the rate, what is it?

We have now reached the position where there has been a terrific increase in water assessments and this has resulted in increasing the amounts payable by individuals and in further repercussions for local councils. It has increased the amount of council ratings and, naturally, the amount for which the rate-payers are liable and it will also increase water rates. I bring this matter to the notice of the Committee in the hope that it will receive some publicity. How can people save, as suggested by the Treasurer, when the Government is going to increase rates and charges? I have often said that I do not know how some people can save, because each time they receive an increase in pay it is taken away from them. In the courts the Government

claims, through the Crown Solicitor, that the wages at present being paid are not warranted. It has often said that South Australia is getting new industries because conditions here are stabilized. If it told the truth and said it was trying to allow private enterprise to exploit the workers to the utmost, there would be an awakening among the public. It is all right for Mr. Millhouse to say that members on this side of the House would find it extremely difficult to criticize anything in the Budget, but I consider that members of my Party could continue for hours and even days in criticizing what has led up to this so-called magnificent Budget.

Mr. Millhouse—Why don't you?

Mr. RYAN—If the honourable member was attending to his Parliamentary duties in the House he would probably have heard what has led up to this so-called magnificent Budget. I consider that councils have passed the buck in accepting the water assessments and thus have inflicted further punishment upon rate-payers. I oppose the Estimates.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.43 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 5, at 2 p.m.