

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, July 18, 1962.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1963.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Supply (No. 1),

Appropriation (No. 1).

PETITION: WHYALLA-ADELAIDE BUS SERVICE.

Mr. LOVEDAY presented a petition signed by 4,954 electors of Whyalla. It stated that the present co-ordinated bus and rail service between Whyalla and Adelaide was inadequate to meet the growing needs of the residents of Whyalla by reason of the inconvenience occasioned by the time of departure, the necessity to change from bus to rail, the accompanying delays, and the length of time involved in the journey, and prayed that the House of Assembly take the necessary steps to enable the bus service to operate a daily all-road service between Whyalla and Adelaide.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS.**WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I understand that final rents have been fixed in connection with scheme "A" of the war service land settlement scheme in the hundreds of Seddon and Mac-Gillivray. Can the Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Repatriation, say whether the final valuations of the properties have been determined and, if they have not, when they will be? I do not know whether the representative of the Treasury who visited Canberra investigated this matter, but I should like the fullest information on it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This, of course, does not come within my department, although I have some indirect knowledge of it. The rentals set out, I think, relate to a limited number of properties only and are at

present being considered by the settlers concerned. In addition, this Government has been negotiating with the Commonwealth Government regarding other aspects of war service land settlement in the area concerned. As I told another honourable member yesterday, Mr. Seaman, on behalf of the Government, accompanied by the Director of Lands, waited upon the Commonwealth Director of War Service Land Settlement and placed certain submissions before him. Those submissions are now before the Commonwealth Minister for consideration, and when we receive a reply we shall be able to give effect to any decision or to any agreement reached. I point out that in this matter South Australia is an agent State and has to collaborate with the Commonwealth under the agreement ratified by Parliament. I do not say that as a criticism of the Commonwealth: indeed, we believe that our submissions are being considered most sympathetically. I hope to have a report for the Leader fairly soon.

GOVERNOR'S RESIDENCE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Some months ago when the Premier was speaking at the opening of Old Government House in the National Park in my electorate, he announced that it was intended to build a new summer residence for His Excellency the Governor. Can the Premier give the House any further details on that matter and say when it is intended that the residence will be built?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It was never intended to erect a residence such as the Marble Hill residence for His Excellency the Governor, but I know that His Excellency would appreciate a small place in the country where he could spend a week-end away from the continual pressures of office. The matter is being examined.

ABATTOIRS MARKETING DAYS.

Mr. CASEY: Last session I raised the matter of the abattoirs marketing days, and the Minister of Agriculture said then that a special committee was being formed to report on the alterations to the marketing days. Has he the report of the special committee?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have the report of the special committee. The report is being considered.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.

Mr. CUMBE: Is the Premier aware that, following the tabling yesterday in this House of the report of the Public Works Committee on the first stage of the building of the Royal

Adelaide Hospital, this morning's paper states that, as this hospital is a teaching institution, it may qualify under recent Commonwealth legislation for a subsidy towards the capital cost of establishing this new building? Can he tell the House whether a portion of this hospital, especially the teaching part of it, would so qualify?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commonwealth Government has appointed a commission to recommend assistance to universities. That commission each year makes some recommendations about financial assistance to the University of Adelaide which is provided with an off-setting amount from the State Government. This year, in addition to that, the commission made some recommendation regarding the teaching hospital, but the sum provided in South Australia was disappointing to the State Government. It seemed that the decision was largely made on the basis that the people who had done most received least. The amounts provided, for instance, for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, for all the teaching facilities provided there, were about £15,000 out of a total expenditure of about £7,000,000. The answer to the honourable member's question is that the amounts that would be provided in any case would only be strictly in relation to some special facilities required by the university.

SERVICE STATIONS.

Mr. TAPPING: I desire to refer to the apparent increase in the number of new service stations in the metropolitan area following on the demolition of many houses. A few years ago the Premier told Parliament of an understanding between the oil companies and his Government which would regulate the building of new service stations based on current needs. It is evident today that too many houses are being demolished, and this further impedes the housing of our people. The position is accentuated by the inflated prices being offered by the oil companies. Will the Premier obtain a report on this matter to ascertain whether some action is desirable?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There is no agreement at present between the oil companies and the Government concerning the building of service stations. There is an agreement between the petrol companies that applies in all States regarding the number of outlets they provide, but I believe (I am speaking now on an assumption) that that applies only to some companies that have entered into the agreement, whereas other companies have not entered into the agreement.

Mr. Hutchens: Amoco is outside the agreement.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Most of the new companies are outside the agreement. There will be, as there is at present, a surplus of oil for world markets, and Australia offers a valuable outlet for oil sales. There will be increasing competition from overseas companies to win a share of the valuable Australian market; and, of course, to win a share of the market they find that the only way is to put in the outlets for sale. So the answer to the honourable member's question is that there is no agreement and there is no law against the establishment of petrol stations in this State. There is an agreement between certain companies, and I believe it applies to them only if it rationalizes their outlets.

PENNINGTON SCHOOL.

Mr. RYAN: Some time ago I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Education from the committee of the Pennington Primary School in my district requesting that a new school be built to cater for the needs of that area. So far I have received no communication about the results of this deputation. Have the representations of the deputation been considered and, if so, is the Minister at this stage able to give me an answer to the deputation's representations?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The representations of the deputation have been considered in detail by the Director of Education and also by the appropriate superintendent, and the Director will soon place before me his first draft of proposals for the school building programme for next year. During the discussions then, the question of the building of the Pennington school will be considered but I cannot give the honourable member a definite promise now.

VICTOR HARBOUR HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. JENKINS: Some months ago the Minister of Education visited the high school at Victor Harbour and met there the high school council, which discussed with him the desirability of the purchase of some adjacent land and the question whether a new building should be erected on the high school premises. Has anything been done in this matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I discussed the proposals with the then Deputy Director of Education and he, in turn, had discussions with the Superintendent of High Schools and the Property Officer of the Education Department. I understand that one or

both of those officers visited the district subsequently. I have not yet received final recommendations in the matter, but it will come before me soon when all the submissions are made by the Director of Education.

WINE GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. CURREN: In April, during our few days of sitting, I asked the Premier a question about the tabling of the Prices Commissioner's reports on wine grapes for 1961 and 1962. He made that information available to me and, as I see nothing confidential in it, will he table those two reports?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no objection to tabling a copy of the reports. They would not normally be laid upon the Table of the House: they are departmental reports. I was not sure when the honourable member asked his question whether the reports contained information classified under the Act, but I find that they contain no such information and I suggest he can readily make the reports available to any person he desires.

OIL.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I was surprised to hear the Premier say in reply to the member for Semaphore that there was a world surplus of oil. Can he say whether this surplus will have any detrimental effect on an oil strike in Australia and can he indicate the prospects of an oil strike in Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Oil is like water: it is where it is found. It would be outside my province to make any predictions concerning the oil search in this State. However, the people engaged in the oil search here—and they have had world-wide experience—regard our conditions as favourable and are spending much money. Substantial programmes have been arranged and it is interesting that people with world-wide reputations for finding oil are coming here. Bearing in mind that information I think that Australia will have commercial oil. The old myth that we do not have oil in Australia has already been exploded and I think that oil will be discovered in Australia in more than one State. I think South Australia is a favourable place in which to look for oil.

NANGULA SCHOOL CLOSING.

Mr. CORCORAN: On June 29 the Nangula Primary School was closed and the students were sent to the Millicent Primary School. For some years Cellulose Australia Limited has provided a bus to transport its employees' children

to and from school in Millicent. It has permitted the children who attended the Nangula school to use this bus, but this has led to overcrowding and their parents have been told that this facility will no longer be available after next Friday. The Nangula School Committee made an application to the Education Department on July 5 for a school bus service. Will the Minister of Education have this application attended to as speedily as possible, if that has not already been done?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so.

RENTAL HOUSES.

Mr. CLARK: Recently some of my constituents have been disquieted by press reports that the building of Housing Trust purchase houses for low deposit would mean that rental houses would not be built in future. Will the Premier comment on those reports?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The trust intends to discontinue the erection of the double unit rental house which has been a feature of its building operations for many years. This type of house afforded some economies of building and land. In place of that housing the trust intends to build houses for sale upon a minimum deposit of £50 and the repayment will be made on a weekly basis over a 40-year period. It will use money provided under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and the weekly charges will be about the same as for the present rental houses. The difference will be that at the end of the period a person will own his own house and will no longer be involved in paying rent.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Does the Premier's reply mean that no further contracts will be let for double units and that only the present contracts will be allowed to run their course?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that to be the position. The trust requested me to make available additional finance, if possible, this year because it still had contracts running on some double rental houses to be completed. The trust is anxious to implement the new programme, but there is an overlapping of the two programmes and it seeks additional finance to meet the circumstances arising from the changed policy. That request is receiving attention and I hope to be able to supply some of the money.

SIREX WASP.

Mr. HARDING: My question concerns the possible entry of siren wasp to this State and consequent damage to our forests. The

Minister of Forests will recall a conversation we had some time ago when it was suggested that private plantations might be inspected. Much press publicity has been given to this matter recently. Can the Minister comment on the present situation and say what the department has done and intends to do to prevent the entry of sirex wasp to South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The survey for the presence of sirex wasp in South Australia has now been completed throughout the State wherever pines are growing, except for a small area in the foothills and in the South-East. This work has taken about six weeks. In the South-East aerial surveys have been made to map and accurately locate patches of dead and dying trees which could be subject to sirex attack. Discussions are currently taking place between departmental officers and Dr. F. D. Morgan of the Waite Institute to determine the method of ground survey of these dead trees. I think the survey has commenced, but if not, it is expected to commence within a day or two. No sign of any attack by sirex has been found up to the present. Many people have raised doubts about dying trees in various parts of the State and every report has been checked.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

Mr. McKEE: In view of the action of the British Prime Minister in lopping off Ministerial heads in the House of Commons in order to put some life back into the fast-dying British Parliament people are asking whether, in view of the results at the recent State elections, the Premier is considering taking similar steps to achieve the same purpose.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like the honourable member to put that question on notice.

FULHAM GARDENS SEWERAGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I have frequently raised the question of sewerage the area of Fulham Gardens and east of Henley Beach and Grange. Last year the Minister of Works informed me that a plan, involving an expenditure of about £500,000, was being drawn up and that, when completed, it would be submitted to the Public Works Committee. I raised this matter again in April, when the Minister promised to obtain a report and forward it to me by letter. I regret that I have not received that report. As I have received much correspondence from residents in the area complaining about the difficulty of disposing of effluent and about the menace to public health

caused by the presence of blowflies during the recent dry spell, will the Minister say whether he has obtained that report and, if he has, whether he will favour me with a copy?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have, as I undertook to do, had another look at this matter and, if I have not sent the honourable member a letter, I regret this and apologize. I will attend to the honourable member's request and send him the latest information at the earliest possible moment.

BERRI FERRY.

Mr. CURREN: In view of the congestion that occurs at the Berri ferry every week, and often on several days a week, can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether the Government has any plans for duplicating this service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask the Minister concerned to reply to the honourable member through me in due course.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. McKEE: As it is about 10 months since the Industries Development Special Committee visited Port Pirie, the residents and business people are asking whether the committee has reported to the House, or, if it has not, what progress has been made. Can the member for Stuart, who is a member of that committee, report on the committee's progress?

Mr. RICHES: I am not a spokesman for the committee and I do not think it would thank me for making a statement. However, I do not think the chairman or the member for Mitcham, my colleague on the committee, will object if I remind the House that an interim report has been presented. I think this House and the members of the committee realized when the committee was appointed that its investigations, if they were going to be worthwhile, would be protracted. The committee invited the opinion of local areas throughout the State, and there was considerable delay in getting replies from some areas. Port Pirie was one of the first places visited, but some country towns are only now arranging for their submissions. The committee intends to visit Kangaroo Island in about a fortnight. I consider that it will be some time yet before a report, if it is going to be worthwhile, can be submitted, but, further than that, I do not think it would be proper for me to attempt to reply.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 17. Page 142.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The Speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened Parliament this year was similar to previous Speeches we have had from time to time. Any criticisms I make are not intended as reflections on the Governor, because the Speech is aimed at presenting the Government in the best light possible, and, as members are all aware, the Government has many shortcomings. My criticisms are directed towards these matters. In fact, I should like to place on record my sincere thanks on behalf of the Labor Party to His Excellency, who is fulfilling the obligations of the position to which he has been appointed, and, with the able assistance of Lady Bastyan, is proving himself a worthy successor to his predecessors. The compiler of the Speech had a difficult task this year because this State has passed through a most trying year, and the majority of the hardships have been caused by the actions of the Commonwealth Government in the Commonwealth Parliament, together with the endorsement of these actions by the Liberal and Country League Government in this State.

Before dealing with the financial matters contained in the Governor's Speech, I wish to refer briefly to several members of Parliament who recently passed away. I refer in particular to Messrs. Rex Pearson and Edmonds, and I join with the member for Angas in his reference to the late Mr. Ernie Stephens, who was a member of this House from 1933 until his retirement in 1959. These men all served their State well in public life, and I join with His Excellency in extending sincere sympathy to their respective families.

Reference was made to the encouragement by the Government of land settlement, but the committee with the greatest potential in this regard is the Land Settlement Committee, which, on the face of it, appears to be inoperative. To my knowledge, this committee has not met for many years, and I should like the Minister of Lands to advise me when it is likely to carry out any of its functions with the object of encouraging land settlement in this State in accordance with the statement set out in the Governor's Speech.

I congratulate the member for Light on the able manner in which he moved the adoption of the Address in Reply. He made a good contribution towards the debate from his Party's point of view. If I understood him

correctly, he advocated that the water supply in the district of Light be improved. I understood him to say that any future supply should be a charge on the revenue of this State, but I do not agree with him. If he is concerned about the Saddleworth area and is trying to obtain closer co-operation with the dairymen there, he may be interested in the underground water supplies in that area. Although I am not an authority on this matter, I assure him that unless people who engage in dairying in any of those areas join with the metropolitan milk supply there will be a great deal of trouble. I shall be interested to hear how far he will push this matter. The member for Angas yesterday appeared in a role that was quite different from that in which we had become accustomed to seeing him. Of course, that is no reflection on you, Mr. Speaker. I find myself in one of the most peculiar positions ever known in this Parliament and possibly throughout the English speaking world: one can be a Leader of a Party with greater numbers than the Party that is in Government. It seems that the decision of the people is not acknowledged in this Parliament. Therefore, your position, Mr. Speaker, may be compared with mine. It is hardly just that I should be placed in such strange circumstances.

I was particularly interested in the honourable member's remarks about the need for more trade missions, for I believe these missions must do tremendous good. Such trade missions should not be restricted from the point of view of time. What concerns me most is the transport to be used for a nationwide trade mission. Are we going to use a foreign ship or get one of our own? At present we do not have the means to transport the goods. No doubt the member for Angas, like me, would prefer an Australian shipping line of some description, for he must realize that if we are to make a success of any trade mission and get the most good out of it, we must own ships. We have had our own ships in the past, but with changing times and changes of Government, that position has been altered. I do not know whether it is possible to carry out a trade mission by some other means of transport. However, I consider that, if any value is to come out of any trade mission, it must be a national mission.

I was also interested to see that the Government intends to continue to foster forestry and mining development, and to promote the search for oil. Last year we directed the

Government's attention to the fact that the current contracts for the output from Radium Hill would be terminating at the end of that year, and attempted to obtain some information about the future prospects for the town in general and the employees in particular. However, the Government was most reticent about supplying information, and instead of there being an orderly cessation of activities at the mines, the Government took very little action until the last moment, which resulted in considerable anxiety for the people of the town over many months and eventual financial loss for those who were dismissed and were not able to obtain alternative employment. As a matter of fact, some employees with long and satisfactory service were given to understand that employment would be found for them in other departments of the Government, and that their service would be continuous for long service leave purposes. Hence it was unnecessary for them to seek employment with some other employer. However, at the last moment many were sacked by the Government, and this was at a time when unemployment in this State was practically at its peak. After we had directed the Government's attention to the pending closure of Radium Hill, it should have taken immediate action for the cessation of activities. I sincerely trust that in the future we shall have better evidence of encouragement to the mining industry than we had at Radium Hill.

In addition, the Government is significantly silent on what it proposes to do in the event of oil being discovered in commercial quantities in South Australia. Our legislation in this field is very sketchy. I know that the Commonwealth Government is also concerned, because a conference of State Ministers has been called. On this important matter, I would have thought that the Government would inform members of the stand it proposes to take at the conference. At present, if oil were discovered in South Australia there would be no immediate return to the Government. In fact, in the ultimate, the only return would be a 10 per cent royalty on eventual sales. This appears to me to be a very meagre return for the amount of Government money that is being spent to aid the search for oil. The discoveries with the greatest prospects today appear to be the Moonie wells in Queensland, and I should like to point out some of the factors associated with this proposition because the same would apply to any worthwhile strikes in South Australia. The only Australian financial interest in the present discoveries, apart from the royalty

referred to earlier, is a 20 per cent interest in eventual earnings by Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Ltd. In recent months, A.O.G. shares rocketed, but this was partly due to overseas interests entering the market in an effort to acquire even the minor portion that still remains to Australians. There are several other leases in the immediate vicinity to the present discoveries, but these leases are held by companies which have no Australian content at all. This position emphasizes the need for this Government, in co-operation with the other States, to make a determined effort to amend both our companies and mining legislation so that our State may advance rapidly and so that the profits from the advancement are spread among all the citizens of the State instead of overseas investors obtaining more than their fair share of any advance we may make.

Regarding our forests, one of the best ways to promote forestry development would be to encourage the use of local timbers in house construction. The point that is not mentioned in the Governor's Speech is the portion of the locally processed South-Eastern timber from the mills that could be guaranteed as suitable for house construction. I do not wish to argue in regard to its suitability for roofing because Oregon with its long grain has demonstrated its particular suitability in this field, but there is still great scope for the greater use of local timbers in house construction. I do not wish to criticize the Housing Trust, which is doing a commendable job with housing, but it appears a matter of Government policy not to use local timber in house construction because my information is that, in the construction of Housing Trust brick veneer houses, where there is great scope for the use of the local product, certain imported timbers were specified. If it is Government policy to give more than lip service to the forestry industry, it should give a lead to the building industry by insisting on local timbers being used for the framework of the internal walls of the Housing Trust brick veneer houses after it has remedied its administration of the forestry industry, so that the mills are able to guarantee the local product as scantling timber.

There is a notable omission in the Governor's Speech in relation to the establishment of the pulp mill that was envisaged by the Government at Mount Gambier. I am a little concerned to know why there was not a paragraph in His Excellency's Speech giving a clear indication concerning the reasons for this

industry not being established. It would be in the interests of the members of this Parliament and the people of this State generally to be informed of the present position relating to the establishment of this industry.

So far, I have had only sufficient time to make a quick perusal of the annual report of the Woods and Forests Department, which was tabled yesterday, but my conclusion is that the views I have expressed today are completely substantiated by that report. Therefore, I should like the Government to tell me when our forestry and timber industry will be in a position to guarantee its product for construction purposes.

One statement that I found difficult to reconcile with fact was that the policy of the Government provided for an expanding, strong and varied economy to ensure full employment, to establish a higher standard of living, and to improve educational services. This is certainly a clear attempt at self-praise, but it is a statement built on a very unsafe foundation. What are the facts? The unsatisfactory unemployment position is directly attributable to the financial measures undertaken by the Commonwealth Government, and the Government in this State has endorsed this policy because, over the months, there has been no criticism of the measures taken and no strong approach to the Commonwealth Government to rectify the unemployment position that it caused in this State. As regards the Government policy of establishing a higher standard of living in this State, all I can say is that the direct opposite appears to be the case. When representatives from the Government appeared before the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission in an attempt to reduce the living wage of this State in relation to that of Sydney, was that in keeping with the statement of Government policy and was that evidence of an attempt by the Government to increase the living standard of all employees in this State?

As for improved educational services, the less said about the operations of this Government the better. But, to clarify the subject, let us try to find some achievements. I am afraid that all I could find was lack of achievement, such as unsatisfactory and over-crowded school buildings, together with a long list of unfulfilled school building promises. Colossal sums are being poured into education in the hopes of improving the position but without any tangible results, and there is no evidence of a strong approach to the Commonwealth Government to bear its responsibility in regard to

education. Wherever you look in our education system there is chaos and the Government for its inadequate administration must accept the responsibility. Propaganda and colossal sums of money are insufficient remedies. We require a definite plan that is capable of fulfilment together with adequate cost control to ensure that we receive value for the colossal sums of money that are required, and also a determined approach to the Commonwealth Government to make it shoulder its responsibilities to the people of this State so far as educational commitments are concerned.

I agree that the principal industrial legislation in this State is the Industrial Code. However, I do not agree that it has proved very effective. There have been great changes in industry in the last 40 years and the change has been most marked in the last 20 years, whereas the Government has neglected the Industrial Code, which is now completely out of date. As a result of the unsatisfactory position of the Code, we introduced comprehensive amendments during the last session of Parliament, but the Government was not prepared even to consider the amendments, in spite of the fact that we proved conclusively that the Code was hopelessly inadequate for present-day business requirements. The Government has adamantly refused to accept our suggested amendments over the years and, in spite of the tremendous progress and expansion in industry throughout the last 40 years, there have been very few compensating amendments to the Code in order to keep it up to date and suitable to cope with modern developments in industry. One particular development comes to mind, and it is the failure of the Code to effectively provide for labour-only sub-contracting. This is a practice that has developed appreciably in the last ten years, and, as a result, some employers have been able to engage workmen on piecework rates contrary to the terms of the award. Let me make an explanation. In major building operations there is no one contractor sufficiently organized to handle the work from foundation to completion, and it is necessary for him to get sub-contractors who specialize in particular capacities such as floors and electrical, but we find that the sub-contractors further let the work to minor sub-contractors.

For example, take the trades of brickwork, carpentry, plumbing, painting and plastering, where sub-contractors tender to the main contractor. The sub-contractors do not carry out the work but, instead, re-let the work to further contractors and the work is eventually done on

a labour-only basis. Because of this vicious system, we are not training sufficient apprentices to provide for the continuation of the skilled trades. I will give two illustrations of how the Government can provide for the efficient continuation of the building industry by insisting that sufficient apprentices are being trained in respective trades. The first example relates to housing contracts under the Housing Trust. With a view to stabilizing the industry and to covering the training of apprentices, contractors would be classified in groups to contract for, say, one to five houses, and the succeeding groups would be five to 20, 20 to 50, and over 50 houses. Then a contractor who was classified in the five to 20 group could tender for any Housing Trust contract which called for any number of houses from one to 20, but he would be excluded from tendering for contracts which called for 20 to 50 houses or over 50 houses. In this way, both the Housing Trust and the contractor would be protected as the contractor would be prevented from taking on contracts that he could not fulfil because of, say, limited capital. The trust would be protected because it would not be faced with the prospect of re-letting contracts which had been partially finished by earlier contractors who had gone bankrupt because they took on work which was beyond their financial or managerial capabilities. As soon as the smaller contractors increased their capital, they could enter the larger groups for tendering. By this method they would be able to successfully carry on as builders and contractors and would be able to efficiently organize their personnel and staff and make reasonable provision for a quota of apprentices in all sections of trade capacities.

In other fields of building it would be possible to classify contractors in financial groups: for example, the first group could be for contracts between £1,000 and £5,000; and the following groups could be £5,000 to £10,000; £10,000 to £30,000; £30,000 to £70,000; £70,000 to £150,000; and the final group for any contracts over £150,000. This would give a classification comparable with the illustration already indicated under the housing group. It would give an opportunity to those who are setting up in the small business category—and my understanding is that there are many contracts in the range of less than £5,000—and, in all cases, contractors would be expected to have certain apprentices attached to the respective trade capacities. Above all, there must be a provision made for the contractor

to give a firm report that he employs and trains a certain number of apprentices.

Apprentices are being adequately trained in those industries which provide or install the furnishings and amenities after the buildings have been erected and, in the building industry, when a main contractor is not paying sufficient attention to apprenticeship training, his tendering could be excluded from any governmental or semi-governmental contracts until such time as he arranged to provide for the training of apprentices.

I personally know of a contractor who is tendering for work outside the metropolitan area, and who has a tremendous amount of work to do. However, he finds that when he tenders for work in the metropolitan area he is defeated in price by the firms who tolerate the labour-only system. This contractor is carrying out his responsibility to the building industry because he has several apprentices but, because his work is away from the city, his apprentices are not properly engaged in learning their trade. This occurs because, if he takes his apprentices to the country to receive practical experience in building, they miss the opportunity of attending a trades school. He is competing against the people who are sub-letting contracts for labour-only work, but the labour-only subcontractor is not prepared to engage apprentices and is therefore able to cut prices. However, it does appear to me to be a false saving because it will tend to weaken the industry as a whole in the long run when there are insufficient skilled apprentices coming forward for the efficient continuation of the particular trades.

The vicious system of labour-only is part and parcel of the Government policy to which I am opposed. I believe that we had greater harmony within the building industry when the Housing Trust was free to engage its own competent builders to do the work under the contract system that was prevailing when the contractors organized their work force to receive the benefits of the award rates and conditions that were provided by the Industrial Court. This same policy is being imposed upon the Public Buildings Department in its operations. I know that the Auditor-General in 1960 recommended that public tenders should be called for houses to be constructed by the Housing Trust in the interests of efficiency, but he made no mention that the Government should be a party to any contract which encouraged employers to evade the recognized industrial Statutes and agreements in order to obtain contracts. If this Government believes in the

constitutional authority of this State, then the constitutional procedures should be followed and it should insist that not less than the appropriate award rates as defined by the constitutional authority apply to all sections engaged in the building industry.

In addition to the effect on apprenticeship employment and training, this system also has the effect of breaking down award provisions as to hours of labour and wages. Our approach to the Industrial Code was with the knowledge that it is very much out of date, and the amendments we put forward were with the intention of improving some of the outmoded provisions as well as bringing it into line with the improved methods that are already in operation in many industries and factories.

Other State Governments have continually amended their comparable legislation to keep it adequate to meet present-day business requirements, but this Government has always rejected the amendments we have submitted. As the Government states that it now intends introducing amending legislation this session, it will be interesting to see whether it does carry out its promise and, if it does, whether the legislation will be completely remedial and adequate to lay down a proper blueprint for the orderly conduct of industry. I regret to say that it has been my sad experience in the past to find that some of the Government's promises have been a little unreliable and I sincerely trust that, as we have already given the Government a very strong lead as to what is required by way of improvements, it will now accept the responsibility of honouring its promise and introduce remedial legislation which we will consider on its merits.

Another industry that is being sadly neglected in its provision of facilities for the training of personnel is what might be described as the hotel industry. Hotels are obliged to provide food to patrons and must have a staff of waiters and cooks.

Mr. Speaker, when is the Premier going to stop yarning? I have just about got tired of competing. I do not mind if he goes outside to yarn.

On one occasion a young man, aged about 16, sought my assistance. He was anxious to become a chef. I told him I would make inquiries but that I doubted whether there was any place where he could be trained as such. He subsequently was placed in industry, but my point is that there are no training facilities—no apprenticeship classes—for persons seeking employment of that nature in the hotel industry. From observations I have made in places where

food is supplied, I consider that, but for the migration programme, it would have been difficult to find people to engage in this work.

Mr. Hutchens: This would have affected the tourist trade.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes, but for the influx of migrants this State would not have been as highly regarded as it is for the tourist trade. I think there is a need to train waiters and waitresses, not only personnel for the building industries. There should be greater co-ordination of effort so that we can provide proper training facilities for people engaged in the food supply industry.

From the point of view of water supply, the River Murray has become our lifeline because it is the only continuous source of adequate water available to us. Naturally, closer and cheaper sources of water were developed first but, because of our climate and terrain, these sources are limited in extent and we are now being forced to go farther and farther afield for our supplies. Because of the necessity for pipelines and consequential pumping costs, it is becoming an increasingly expensive operation as the years progress. We notice the additional expense particularly in prolonged dry seasons such as this year, when pumping costs alone for the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline were approximately £600,000. There is a point of interest, however, in this figure, because I understand that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is paying to the Electricity Trust only about one penny a unit for power used in the pumping of water whereas the overall cost to the Trust for each kilowatt-hour sold is about 2½d. In other words, it appears that the Electricity Trust is subsidizing the Water Supply Department up to a maximum of 1½d. a kilowatt-hour of power used. These seem only small figures but, when one has a colossal consumption of power—and Mannum-Adelaide pumping consumption varies from 25,000,000 in the good seasons to 150,000,000 kilowatt-hours in the very dry seasons—they could influence the cost by between £500,000 and £750,000. I am not referring to off-peak pumping, because any additional use we can make of electric power during off-peak loading leads to economies, but last summer the Water Supply Department was on 24-hour pumping from October 9, 1961 until April 12, 1962 (that is, six months of the year), and prolonged pumping such as this occurred in several earlier years.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Leader realizes that we pump only during off-peak periods except in emergencies.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: But the Government is still subsidizing the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Surely the Premier will not say that electricity can be supplied during the day at the same price as it can be supplied during the night?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It depends on the load factor.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: If water is pumped during off-peak hours, that is not harmful to the State, as the power is there and it cannot be stored. I would be the first to agree to financial assistance being given to anyone who could enable electricity to be stored.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You do not have to generate it if you do not want it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: What do you do if you have it and you do not want it?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That does not happen.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I beg to differ. Surely it is about time the Government did some spring cleaning in its finances and made legitimate charges for services instead of token book entries. There is no valid reason why electricity consumers should be subsidizing excessive water users. If possible, the Government should attempt to relate charges to the cost of supplying the service and, if the appropriate charges were made to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Electricity Trust should be able to give all-round reductions in tariffs to the rest of its consumers. I thought the member for Light was giving a lead in that direction in relation to his district when he spoke yesterday.

In addition, in the last 20 years, water consumption per capita in the metropolitan area has approximately doubled. If supplies were adequate in the early 1940's, then the consumption per capita should remain approximately stable. As it has nearly doubled, it would appear that the responsibility is with the Minister of Works to ascertain why. Is it because the cost of water has been falsely kept low by the Government for political prestige with the result that people tend to be careless with this valuable commodity? If this is so, is it not about time that the Government allocated the correct charges to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and also investigated the system of rating so that the persons who are responsible for the erection of colossal dams on the Murray, together with expensive pipelines, are the ones

who would bear the major financial responsibility? Therefore, it would appear to me that excess water charges should be in the form of a deterrent to the wasteful use of water. Consequently, the Government is wrong in its financial approach when its charges less for excess water than for rebate water. Instead of the charges being 2s. 3d. for each 1,000 gallons of rebate water and only 2s. for each 1,000 gallons for excess water in most districts, the Government should encourage economical users by reducing the price of rebate water but substantially increasing the cost of excess water. In my view, this would have many advantages. It would encourage the population in general to be economical and it would discourage waste if it were known that substantial charges were being levied on excess water. Both these factors should tend to reduce consumption overall, which would tend to reduce the heavy demand for additional mains and dams. It is all very well to have expensive proposals for expansion to put before the people but, if our State is to progress at the best possible rate, we must avoid waste on all occasions. The advancement of a State is just the same as the advancement of a business or a family. The one that operates efficiently and avoids waste is the one that advances most quickly.

Naturally, on the face of it, I favour the Chowilla Dam proposal but, as far as I am aware, negotiations between the States are still at a tentative stage, and I am sure that we are going to hear much about this proposal as well as the alternative Teal Flat proposal for many years before the Government gets down to the task of actual construction. Members will notice that the reference is delightfully vague, namely, that there is hope for agreement "within a reasonable time". This Government has apparently not yet reached agreement with its Liberal counterpart in Canberra on the standardization of railway gauges in this State, and these negotiations have been proceeding for more than twelve years. If this is an example of a reasonable time for negotiation, then the much publicized dam on the River Murray would appear to require heavy negotiation when the South Australian, New South Wales, Victorian and Commonwealth Governments are all involved. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to let us concentrate our efforts on a programme based on actual plans for the present rather than on publicity of possible ventures for the future.

With the rapid increase in motor transport, there is plenty of opportunity for the Government to engage in major road construction. There has been considerable development around the Port Stanvac area in the last couple of years, with the result that the South Road, which was seriously congested previously, has now become a bottleneck to free moving traffic. The worst congestion occurs in the Tonsley Park area. I have mentioned this matter to the Government on several occasions, and I should like it to seriously investigate this particular section of the South Road this year with the object of overcoming the problem.

In the past I have sometimes doubted whether the Town Clerk of Adelaide was doing all that could be done in the interests of free moving traffic and other things. However, I have closely examined what has been taking place in the city of Adelaide in recent times, and, although I do not comment on the financial aspect, I pay tribute to the Town Clerk for what has been achieved. The Town Clerk went overseas and brought back valuable information, and as a result many improvements have been effected. The recreational facilities provided throughout the park lands are a credit to the council. In addition to those facilities, the council has performed a fine engineering feat in improving the junction at South and West Terraces and the Anzac Highway. People can now use that junction safely. The same can also be said for the junction where North Terrace and West Terrace meet the Port Road. I pay a tribute to the council for the improvements that have been effected.

I notice that the Government still intends to proceed with the standardization of railway gauges in this State, but it is disappointing that this is still a matter of proposals rather than some definite activity during the coming year. If the Premier had utilized the full provisions of the Railway Standardization Agreement for railway standardization during the term of the Chifley Government, this State would have been much further advanced on this project than it is today. As a small step in the right direction, the Government has mentioned that it intends acquiring additional diesel-electric locomotives and ore waggons, but it is significantly silent as to what proportion, if any, of the work is to be carried out in our own railway workshops at Islington. Instead of sending contracts to other States and overseas for the construction of diesel-electric locomotives, deliberate action should be taken to reorganize the Islington workshops so that

it could undertake the construction of all work that is necessary and also be in a position to tender for other railway work and the supply of equipment that may be needed. It has proved that it is capable of constructing diesel-electric locomotives, but it appears to be definite Government policy at the present time to strongly discourage this type of work being done in our existing railway workshops. In addition to the prefabrication at Islington, there is great opportunity for assembly work to be done in the country centres where railway workshops already exist, and it is incomprehensible to me that the Government claims to promote a strong and varied economy but at the same time denies its own railway employees the full opportunities and rewards for the skills that they have acquired over the years in their particular crafts and which are being wasted because of the maladministration by the Government which dictates that contracts must be let in other States and overseas.

I examined the Government's announcement relating to the promised power station on Torrens Island and, as has been my sad experience on many occasions, I found that the premature announcement was based on very shaky foundations. No mention has been made as to how long it would take to complete the proposed scheme and how it was to be financed. When making announcements such as this, the Premier must accept full responsibility for the repercussions throughout industry, because at first there is a general impetus to industry because of the anticipated prospects of immediate large governmental works, but as soon as business managers find that the promised works are not forthcoming immediately, and in some cases will not be forthcoming in their lifetime, naturally they are very wary about any future expansion proposals of their own. This wariness soon spreads throughout industry, leading to idle machines and generally depressed business conditions, and the Premier must accept the responsibility for his contribution towards the creation of uncertainty in the business world. Instead of hindering the progress of our community by these booster announcements, it is the parliamentary responsibility of the Premier to keep the public fully informed of what his Government is doing to encourage an advancing economy and a return to full employment. It is preferable to know where you are going for the present rather than shadow-sparring with the future with hazy plans that may or may not progress past the designer's drawing boards. It is very easy to

destroy business confidence; in fact, it is much easier to destroy it than it is to restore the economy to a buoyant position. The Government does not need any further reminder on this score other than to examine the destruction of confidence in our community in the last 18 months. Therefore, let us try to establish a few financial facts on this latest proposal.

As at June, 1961, the funds employed in this undertaking amounted to £87,000,000 and they have been increasing at the rate of about £6,000,000 a year over the last five years. This rate of investment has had to cope with administrative buildings and transmission and distribution lines as well as the provision of additional generating plant, and only approximately £3,000,000 a year has been allotted to power station expansion. At this rate of spending, it would appear that at least 50 years would be required for the construction of the proposed power station at Torrens Island.

Let us trace through the history of this promised station at Torrens Island. Like most projects of this Government, one has to go back a long time to see when it originated. In this instance, it would appear to start from about 1950, because the following is a statement that appeared on page 11 of the annual report of the Electricity Trust in that year:

The trust has had in mind for some time the necessity of establishing a new power house, which it is estimated will be required for initial operation in about eight years' time. A possible metropolitan site for this power house is on the eastern side of the Port River adjacent to the North Arm where the South Australian Harbors Board intends to develop coal unloading plant. A power house with an ultimate capacity of 500,000 kilowatts is envisaged. The major problems involving a station of this size are coal supplies, availability of ample circulating water for condensing purposes, and the transmission lines for delivery of power to the load centres, and careful consideration is being given to these problems in their relation to possible sites. Members will notice that at that time a 500,000-kilowatt station was envisaged. What happened to that scheme? Apparently it was scrapped, for actual events have shown that the only new power station to be erected and equipped since 1950 (or, rather, it is still in the course of construction) is the Port Augusta B power station which is due to reach its ultimate capacity of 240,000 kilowatts in 1964. Osborne B and Port Augusta A power stations were brought to ultimate capacity in 1958, but these were under construction in 1950 and, therefore, cannot be accepted as part of the 500,000-kilowatt station envisaged at that time.

The 1955-56 annual report of the Electricity Trust, on page 15, states:

The settlement of negotiations over the freight rate for the delivery of Leigh Creek coal to Port Augusta has determined that work will proceed uninterruptedly on the construction of Port Augusta B power house. This station is scheduled to be completed with 180,000 kilowatts of generating plant by 1962. Detailed investigations have therefore been started to determine where the next power station will be located and what fuel it will use. The amount of work to be done from the initial design stage to the actual operating stage of a new power station is so great that an early decision on this question is necessary. The Port Augusta B power station was originally designed for 180,000 kilowatts installed capacity, but a decision was made later to increase the capacity to 240,000 kilowatts.

In February, 1957, the Chairman of the Electricity Trust (Sir Fred Drew) said:

The next major power station to be built by the Electricity Trust will cost more than £30,000,000 and will be erected on a site on the Port River about half a mile north of the Osborne power station. It will use black coal and oil.

Continuing, he said:

Preliminary work on the site of the new station would have to start next year so that the first turbo alternator would be available to generate power by 1964. The station would probably have a total capacity when completed of 400,000 kilowatts. . . . It is obvious that the phenomenal growth in demand for power which has occurred in the post-war years will continue, and make the first output from the new station a necessity by 1964. . . . Indications from overseas were that future designs of nuclear stations would enable them to be located close to centres of population. A nuclear power station could therefore be established on the eastern side of the Port River even as far north as the North Arm or it could be constructed near one of the towns with shipping facilities on the eastern side of Spencer Gulf.

These statements were made by the Chairman of the trust in support of a three-year £25,000,000 development plan for the Electricity Trust which has just been announced by the Premier. You will notice that the proposed establishment of the plant at Port Adelaide which was mentioned in 1950 was resurrected.

Let us compare some of the achievements of the Government with their promises and also with the recommendations made over the years in the Annual Reports of the trust:

- (1) In 1950, a 500,000-kilowatt plant was considered necessary and 12 years have elapsed, but there has been little progress other than publicity

- announcements from time to time of bigger and better stations required or envisaged.
- (2) A 240,000-kilowatt plant is being established at Port Augusta, but the initial installation was behind schedule and, even if the target for 1964 is kept, it will only achieve approximately 48 per cent of the original recommended expansion over a period of 14 years.
 - (3) Either little or no work appears to have been done on the £30,000,000 expansion proposal recommended in 1957, which means that the programme has not been kept or the work has been abandoned.
 - (4) Capital expansion during the three-year period 1957-1960 was only approximately £18,000,000 instead of the promised approximately £25,000,000, which achieved only 72 per cent of the target and is evidence that funds have not been spent in accordance with recent promises.
 - (5) Inadequate expansion appears to be causing difficulties for the trust because it is in the process of staggering off-peak loading times in order to cope with the power load.
 - (6) When considering the latest £150,000,000 proposal, it must be borne in mind that the annual capital investment by the trust is about £6,000,000, of which approximately one-half (£3,000,000) is spent on power stations. The Assistant General Manager of the trust put the figures in the proper perspective when he indicated that there will be only approximately £15,000,000 expenditure on the Torrens Island project by 1967, which is approximately £3,000,000 per annum and, therefore, more in keeping with the current capital expansion of the trust.
 - (7) Several years ago, the indications were that nuclear power potential would be capable of replacing conventional fuel systems by about 1965, but capital costs are still a limiting factor. Relevant factors change quickly as evidenced by the rapid fall in coal prices in recent years, and the present indications are that nuclear power will become an economic proposition about 1970. I know that the trust intends to keep the examination of nuclear power potential to the fore and it is to be commended for this.

- (8) The only conclusion possible from this analysis is that the officers of the trust have repeatedly informed the Government of the needs of the State for additional power stations together with a comparison of trends between conventional and nuclear fuel costs, but that the Government has not the ability to ensure that the well-considered recommendations are put into practice. Rather than admit failure, it attempts to confuse the people with grand announcements and schemes, but the schemes are always for the future and not for the present.

Mr. Jenkins: Shame!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The Government should be ashamed.

Mr. Jenkins: Shame on you!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member would deny people the right to have their say. He would deny us our right to seek investigations. I do not know where he gets off. He has not paid attention, and if he does not have the time to listen I will give him a copy of what I am saying so that he can take it home to read. He can refer to the same papers from which I obtained my information and he will discover that my statements are accurate. What else has he to say about this?

The Governor's Speech was very subdued in its reference to the Government's education programme, and it certainly should be because education is vital to all South Australians and actual results are proving that the Government is not measuring up to its responsibilities. During 1960-61, 62 new schools were put on the Estimates to be commenced during that year, but, due to lack of planning by the Government on its education needs, not one penny piece was spent on 30 of these schools, which means that the Government achieved only approximately 50 per cent of its promises during 1960-61 regarding new school buildings. We still have over-crowded classrooms and unsatisfactory buildings, yet the Government was able to do work on only 50 per cent of its promised programme.

The Government has not yet made the figures available relating to school building construction during 1961-62, but during the last session of Parliament I challenged the Premier that it was not possible to spend the money during the financial year in conformity with the Estimates presented regarding the amount of £6,000,000 for school buildings and associated

works. He probably knew better than anybody that he had not the plans provided nor the specifications drawn up, let alone the contracts signed to use this amount. It was deliberate kite-flying inflating the building potential and creating false impressions amongst the building fraternity and was purely attempted face-saving for him and his Government.

However, there can be no excuse for the inflated building programme put forward by the Premier, because when the Government fails to carry out its exaggerated building promises the impact is upon all sections of the community through the destruction of business confidence generally, and many small business organizations are forced into bankruptcy and many more employees are thrown out of employment, with which is associated suffering, degradation and hopelessness. As well as Loan expenditure on development, there are also the ordinary annual running costs of providing education, such as administration, teachers' salaries, and maintenance. When these costs are converted to a cost per pupil instructed, they should either remain fairly stable from year to year, or, at worst, they should not increase any more rapidly than the general level of prices.

What do we find with this Government? Over a period of four years, 1956-1960—and these are the latest figures that have been published by the Education Department—the average cost per pupil instructed increased by approximately 33 per cent whereas the consumer price index increased by only 15 per cent. The Government cannot claim that increased teachers' salaries are the reason for the disparity in the increases, because the adjustments were made only recently, and even so the payments now being made are still lower than those operating in the other States. Therefore, the Government has not measured up to the challenge of controlling the upward spiral of the ordinary annual running costs.

Instead of this kite-flying by the Government, which only misleads the building industry, it should institute a special inquiry into the Education Department to ascertain why we are not receiving value for the colossal sums being spent. It should urge the Commonwealth Government to meet its educational commitments by grants specifically for education of sufficient magnitude to enable this State to meet in full the educational requirements of the people. If it achieved these objects, it would then be in a position to

extend free education to all citizens of the State up to and including the university—books and requirements being free to all schools.

In recent months, the Government has been adopting, piecemeal, Labor's policy in other directions, and even though it would be in the best interests of the State to fully implement our policy, if the Government accepts my recommendation regarding education it will at least be a step in the right direction.

His Excellency's Speech states that the Government believes it has conducted a successful housing policy. However, I wish to illustrate that this is purely wishful thinking because the facts, when examined, do not substantiate the Government's belief. Let me cite a few examples of exorbitant rents which were mentioned by a spokesman from the Housing Trust recently:

- (1) £4 a week for one room occupied by a husband, wife and three children.
- (2) £5 to £6 a week for 3-roomed or 4-roomed hovels.
- (3) £8 to £10 a week for 4-roomed or 5-roomed houses of average standard.

He said that such cases were common and that £4 a week for one room is not uncommon with multiple lettings. He went on to say that the demand for premises at a reasonable rent was almost as great as it was immediately after the Second World War.

Whilst these conditions exist in our community, surely that is proof that the Government is out of touch with the needs of the people in regard to housing when it indulges in unjustified self praise for a successful housing policy. As the position is no better than it was just subsequent to the Second World War, the Government has not met the challenge of rental housing requirements over a period of more than 15 years. Surely this is sufficient evidence to prove whether the housing policy is adequate or not, and therefore my question to the Government is, just how far does the housing position have to deteriorate in this State before it will admit that its housing policy is ineffective? In order to allay criticism of the unsatisfactory housing position, the Premier has been giving much publicity to so-called new proposals on housing, but the misleading housing promise put forward by the Government has little except propaganda value, and even that is becoming very doubtful. For example, some persons, believing the promise to have substance, applied for housing finance

under the improved terms, but, to their dismay, they found that no finance of the type was available.

The hasty action was forced on the Government by our statement of policy that a Labor Government would use to the full the existing legislation to provide sufficient houses. This legislation has not been fully utilized over the years by the present Government. For example, the loan period on the Thousand Homes Scheme after the First World War was for a period of more than 40 years, but the Premier and his present Government are responsible for the shorter terms that have been in operation for a number of years.

The Labor Party obtained an amendment to the Advances for Homes Act in 1958 which extended the loan period to 50 years, but the Government has not been prepared to put this existing Statute into practice. Similarly, it has not been prepared to guarantee terminating building societies to lending institutions, which would have provided additional housing. The Government tries to imply that its plan is something new. Instead, it should accept responsibility for the chaotic housing position that has emerged under its administration.

I assume the alterations envisaged by His Excellency are the same as the recent press promises by the Government which had all the appearances of political fraud, because an applicant had to be under 25 and had to find the difference between the advance of £3,000 and the cost of his house. This could be about £1,500. In addition, the applicant required a surplus of not less than £15 a week after he had paid his mortgage repayments of about £4 a week, any other insurance, rates and taxes, any payments due under second mortgage, and any hire-purchase charges to which he was committed. How many young couples could comply with these stringent financial requirements?

Because of heavy criticism, and even before the promise has reached the stage of being submitted to Parliament, it has been amended. Now it is proposed to extend the plan to applicants up to 35 years of age, but there is no necessity for any age limit at all. The insurance fund at present run by the State Bank is in a sound financial position to make coverage for all houses to become freehold in the event of death of the breadwinner; therefore, the Government should amend its latest promise to make provision for all who desire insurance coverage without any imposition of age limit.

Because of the justified criticism of the foregoing misleading proposal, Sir Thomas

Playford has now put forward the scheme of permitting persons to purchase houses on a £50 deposit. On the face of it, the proposal has appeal, but it is like all propaganda, because, once it is closely examined, it is found to have little substance. In fact, it is only an attempt by the Government to evade its responsibility of erecting rental houses in accordance with the original intention of the Housing Trust. When the Housing Trust was created in 1936, it was created specifically to build low-cost rental houses for two low-income groups of persons. One group was of persons whose incomes were slightly in excess of the basic wage, and the other was of persons whose incomes were slightly less than the basic wage. The people in these groups are now in desperate need of rental houses at rents they can afford. They are earning insufficient either to pay low deposits or to make repayments of capital.

Let us examine the financial commitments of a couple under this scheme who earn the basic wage of £14 3s. a week and have, say, two small children. The commitment to the Housing Trust is about £4 a week for 40 years, to which must be added £1 a week for water, sewer, and council rates, £1 a week for maintenance and £1 a week for power, fuel and light. A family of four would need to be fairly economical to keep its food bill to about £8 a week. Therefore, even to that stage, about £15 a week is required, whereas the income is only £14 3s, and nothing has been allowed for furniture and furnishings, clothing, medical expenses, medicines, hospital, fares to and from work, insurance, superannuation, hire-purchase commitments, school books and family entertainment. An analysis along these lines soon reveals that few persons indeed will be able to participate in this latest housing promise.

Instead of coming forward with so-called remedial legislation, the Government should re-align its administration and put into practice the existing legislation to provide houses in sufficient numbers for the increasing population. Let me illustrate what is happening in the other States. By guaranteeing building societies to lending institutions, the Governments of other States are channelling millions of pounds of finance each year into the housing field in addition to the funds being made available *via* the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. We have legislation on the Statute Book in this State which empowers this Government to guarantee building societies

to lending institutions and thus foster the building industry, but the Government has neglected this pool of finance which would be available to the building societies. Since the inception of the scheme in New South Wales in 1937, the New South Wales Government has given guarantees to the extent of £153,000,000, and the guarantees in the last few years have averaged about £8,000,000 a year. I ask members to bear in mind that this sum is in addition to the funds provided under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

Comparable figures for Government guarantees in Victoria are just over £66,000,000 in total, and £4,000,000 last year. Since 1958, Queensland has participated in a similar scheme, and building societies have obtained finance from lending institutions to the extent of nearly £5,000,000, of which £2,050,000 was obtained during 1961, and of this latter figure £1,450,000 was subject to guarantee by the State Government. I also emphasize to members that this has cost those three State Governments practically nothing in terms of finance, but has been the means of co-operative building societies obtaining substantial sums from recognized lending institutions in addition to Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement funds in order to proceed with an effective housing programme in those States.

How does the record of the Government of this State compare with the operations undertaken by the Governments in the Eastern States to encourage home ownership and the building industry generally? As far as I am aware, no Government guarantee is in force guaranteeing one building society to any recognized lending institution, and this is despite the fact that the legislation has been on our Statute Book for well over 20 years. Should not the Government operate under this legislation to encourage the building industry as well as to foster the building of additional houses before it thinks of introducing further legislation which, even when it is placed on the Statute Book, could remain inoperative for any number of years?

Let us face facts. If the Government operates under the existing legislation to the full, sufficient finance should be available for those who desire to purchase a home and have adequate deposits. For those who are not so fortunately placed financially, let the Government accept its responsibility and provide rental accommodation through the Housing Trust on an economic rental basis. This is what our legislation provides, this is what we promised we would do when returned as a Government,

and this is part of the policy that was overwhelmingly endorsed by the people. Therefore, let us have effective action under our existing legislation before we think of introducing amendments that have the sole attribute of doubtful propaganda value.

It has been said that the Government is considering a variety of legislation, and I should like to refer in particular to company law. All other States of the Commonwealth have already considered this subject, and all of them have introduced legislation operative as from the beginning of this month, whereas our Government is still in the process of considering a Bill which may or may not see the light of day this session. Events connected with recent failures of several private companies in South Australia indicate the need for some urgency in the presentation and passing of legislation relating to the adequate control of these companies. For example, by the time these companies had reached liquidation, they had been milked so finely by the promoters that the realization of assets did not justify the expenses of winding up, let alone make any worthwhile return to the creditors of the companies involved. As far as I can ascertain, the actions taken by the promoters were consistent with our present legislation. However, the effect is to destroy confidence in the particular section of industry or commerce in which the failures occurred, and this is harmful to the advancement of our community. Therefore, it is essential for the Government to give prompt and serious consideration to the workings of its present Companies Act with the object of introducing amending legislation as soon as possible in keeping with the uniform legislation already in operation in all the other States, so that it may be considered by all members and become law.

However, there were two omissions from the list of proposed legislation changes which should have received serious consideration by the Government. The first was the Succession Duties Act. Several cases have been brought to my notice where hardship and worry is being caused by heavy succession duty commitments. One particular case concerned two elderly sisters, both pensioners; one died and bequeathed the house in which they were living to the surviving sister. For probate purposes, the house was valued at £3,500, and there were no other assets. This lady wishes to continue to live in the house where she has lived all her life, but for this privilege she is required to pay the State Government about £425. The only advice I could give her was that she would

have to raise the money in some way or arrange with the Commissioner of Succession Duties for an extended repayment. The Commissioner has power under the Act to extend time for payment and to charge interest at 6 per cent per annum on the amount due, but even if he is willing to extend the time for payment, this lady will have to pay to the Government about 10s. a week in interest alone for the remainder of her life for the privilege of living in her own house. In cases of hardship such as this, the Commissioner should have power clearly laid down under the Act to permit the duty to remain a charge on the property, and there should be provision for remission or at least the postponement of interest charges. I sincerely trust that the Government will seriously consider my suggestion.

The other omission was that of land tax. Therefore, I move to insert in the Address in Reply the following new paragraphs:

2a. We express regret at the failure of Your Excellency's advisers to make any reference to the need for a review of land tax.

2b. We desire to inform Your Excellency that in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission consisting of five members of the House of Assembly should be appointed to conduct such a review and to inquire fully into the incidence of the land tax legislation.

During the discussion on the amending Bill last year, I pointed out clearly some of the anomalies to the Government, but it was not prepared to do anything. At the outset, I pointed out that we would only support the Bill on the firm understanding that in the Committee stage we would submit certain amendments. The first amendment I sought proposed to grant the same preferential treatment to all small landholders in this State, whether the small section of land was held for the purpose of primary production or not.

The second amendment I sought was the reduction of the land tax rate in the pound from 4d. to 3d. on all land which had an unimproved value of £5,000 or less. The Bill presented by the Government has destroyed the basis of the original Act, because clause 5 cancels the absentee land tax provisions of the existing Act and also grants a halfpenny reduction in the land tax rate on all land which has an unimproved value of more than £5,000, but comparable preferential treatment is not granted to the small landholder. Despite the fact that the valuations have been increased three to four-fold by the latest assessments, it is intended to leave the rate in the pound unaltered for these small properties, whereas the larger properties are being granted a

reduction in the rate of one halfpenny in the pound. In other words, the Bill introduced by the Premier undoubtedly provides selective treatment for those owners with either large or valuable holdings. On my second amendment, the Government argued that it would not provide any increase in the revenue from suburban lands, and therefore I offered the compromise of reducing the rate of tax from 4d. in the pound to 3d. in the pound instead of my original suggestion of 1/2d. in the pound, but the Premier rejected the compromise. If the compromise had been agreed to, the taxation levy on this group would have increased by 100 per cent over a five-year period or 20 per cent per annum, and surely that is sufficient increase for any Government to impose. However, the Independent members voted with the Government, and my two suggested amendments were lost. The explanations I made when presenting our proposed amendments last year would now appear to be substantiated by the excessive increase in land tax payments which small landholders are being called upon to pay.

Certain concessions were promised to genuine rural landholders, but in view of the number of complaints the concessions do not appear to be operating satisfactorily under the legislation as amended last year. There should not be any doubt. Land that is genuinely used for primary production should be subject to a special rate, but I would stipulate the one condition that when the primary producer wishes to make a capital gain and sells to a speculative investor, then both should lose any concession granted under the Land Tax Act. I understood this was one of the intentions of the amendment last year, but apparently it is not working out in practice. Only last week, twelve primary producers' organizations added their objection to the method of land tax assessment by means of a deputation to the Premier, but he refused their request that a committee of inquiry be appointed to investigate the method of assessing land values and rating those assessments. Last year, when speaking on this subject, you, Mr. Speaker, said that the whole Act should be completely overhauled by a committee that would make recommendations for a new approach to land tax assessments.

The public generally are complaining bitterly about their new land tax assessments because, in addition to the exorbitant amount of land tax involved, they fear that these inflated values will be used as a basis for future council and waterworks assessments. Some of the increased assessments are due solely to the rapid industrial expansion in

commercial areas in close proximity to domestic dwelling sites. The sites, as such, have great commercial potential for industrial sites, but many of the people living in these areas do not wish to be forced to sell the house in which they have lived for many years solely because of excessive land taxes being imposed. The Labor Government in New South Wales realized this problem several years ago and introduced an amendment to the Local Government Act, to give discretionary powers to councils to remit municipal rates where hardship was falling on small house owners in industrial areas who had no intention of selling. I have personal knowledge of hardship being caused by rates based on artificial values and there is a grave doubt in my mind whether the position will not be further aggravated when future council and waterworks assessments are based on the inflated land tax valuations, which were introduced as a result of the Government legislation last year.

The Premier has used the Land Tax Act amendment as a two-edged sword. First, he has used it for propaganda purposes by saying that it would discourage land speculation, but, in actual fact, it has been used only as a means of raising additional revenue to meet his mounting commitments. Because of the unsatisfactory features and the widespread dissatisfaction throughout the community I recommend the adoption of the Address in Reply as amended.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?
Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): Yes.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as originally submitted. I would at once warmly congratulate the honourable member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) on the splendid manner in which he moved for its adoption. The young gentleman's ability is clearly apparent, and I wish him well indeed in the political career that lies ahead of him.

In seconding the motion, my friend the honourable member for Angas (the Hon. Mr. Teusner) maintained the high standards we have come to expect in all that he does. I wish to express my pleasure at noting that Her Majesty the Queen has approved the retention of the title "Honourable" by our former Speaker. His tenure of office will go down in local Parliamentary history as one in which the exacting requirements of the Speakership were met with scholarly and meticulous correctness, and great dignity and impartiality.

As the mantle falls on your shoulders, Mr. Speaker, I tender to you my congratulations and wish you well in the discharge of the duties of your high office. I am sure that you will worthily maintain the high traditions of your predecessors.

I was delighted to note the recent conferment of knighthood on our very worthy Minister of Education (the Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson) in recognition of outstanding and dedicated services rendered to the community through many years. The portfolio of Education in recent years has been an extremely exacting one, demanding in cash requirements but equally demanding on the time and energies of its incumbent. The personal touch that Sir Baden has maintained in his huge department is nothing short of amazing and indicates his dedication to his work. If I may presume to say, a well-merited recognition of outstanding services has been given. I heartily congratulate Sir Baden and wish him and his gracious Lady every happiness for the future.

It is with deep regret that I must refer to the passing of distinguished former members of this place and other places, in the persons of the late Senator Rex Pearson, the Hon. E. H. Edmonds, the Hon. Ernest Anthony and Mr. Stephens. I wish to pay my humble tribute to the memory of these good men whose public services were real and whose friendship I valued. I tender my deepest sympathy to the families of the late gentlemen.

I have previously had the opportunity of referring to the passing of late Hon. Mr. Frank Condon, whose memory I shall always respect. I wish to take this opportunity, Mr. Acting Speaker, to pay homage to Her Majesty's representative here. We have been singularly blessed in the Vice-Regal appointments to South Australia, but never more so, I feel, than in the person of Sir Edric Bastyan. His intense interest in the welfare of the State and its citizens in all walks of life and his kindly and understanding manner have given him a very warm place indeed in all of our hearts. May such as he and Lady Bastyan ever grace the Governorship of South Australia!

I wish to approach my remarks relative to His Excellency's Speech from possibly an unusual angle. This afternoon the honourable member for Edwardstown, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Frank Walsh), has raised criticisms of the Government. That is quite in order; it is the rightful province of Oppositions to criticize, but there are always two

sides to a question. I am going to invite the honourable gentleman in a moment to accompany me on an imaginary trip from my home town, 42 miles north of Adelaide, to Adelaide. I want to ask him to come with me on a little excursion from Greenock to Adelaide and note certain things *en route*. Before embarking on this little imaginary excursion, I wish broadly to comment on His Excellency's Speech. My assessment of it is that it is a steady portrayal of a basically sound economy. Progress and development are the keynotes of the Speech. It has a forward look, and its contents appeal to me because of that. Typically Playfordian in character, there is no "living in the past" touch to it. On the foundations already laid, greater production and a stronger and more varied economy is the firm objective. I shall indicate a little later the constructive approaches that are being persistently and continuously made by this Government, based on sound foundations laid previously, giving us a future in this State that would not have been possible had we not had sound, common-sense, down-to-earth direction of this State's affairs through many years.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I think it is a good thing at times for us to realize that South Australia is the least naturally endowed State in resources of any State in the Commonwealth. We have to realize that. As we look at the growth in South Australian primary and secondary industry and note the distribution of water and power, our transport systems and so on, in the face of difficulties and obstacles not confronting the other States of the Commonwealth as surely as they confront us, we must realize that we have, against a difficult background, built to a condition that has given South Australia a place high among the most prosperous States in the Commonwealth. It has been a wonderful achievement, and not an easy one. I sometimes think that the very character of the South Australian people is, in its strength, superior to most because of the difficult background against which we have operated. It has brought out the best in the people, and this State's citizens generally can be proud of what has been achieved during the State's history, more especially in the last two or three decades. We can look to a stronger and more varied economy which can be achieved by extending and increasing research and scientific services, by exercising every effort to hold costs at the lowest possible level, and by pursuing new markets with all vigour. Later I shall give

an outstanding instance of cost savings being achieved with governmental co-operation and assistance when I refer to the bulk handling of grain in South Australia. I shall give a parallel instance of the laudable pursuing and gaining of markets when I refer to the operations of the Australian Wheat Board. In the secondary industry sector of our economy further strength and variety will be undoubtedly achieved through the establishment of the proposed new department, the purpose of which will be to secure new industries and assist them in their initial stages and to generally promote production within this State of commodities that we now import.

The basic solidity of South Australia's economy is evidenced in its overseas balance of trade. At the end of May we had a favourable trade balance with overseas countries for the preceding 11 months of £65,639,946. This compares with £20,550,318 in the previous year. The State's exports increased during the 11 months ended May by almost £25,000,000 and imports dropped from £69,912,000 to £45,249,260. The export of wheat increased by almost £9,500,000, barley by well over £6,000,000 and oats by £747,000. The value of greasy wool exports also showed a considerable increase from £120,600,000 to £144,600,000. I have no doubt that the buoyancy of rural production in South Australia is in no small measure due to the consistent encouragement by this Government of the application of scientific findings—findings from the various research establishments that are transmitted to the producers through our agricultural bureaux system. I believe there is a direct connection between our highly productive rural economy and the services this Government has for so long provided for agriculturists generally.

Mr. Jennings: This is the imaginary excursion you were talking about!

Mr. LAUCKE: In this State we have had a very real background of modern research and its application. Our extension of services is unequalled in Australia and I pay my humble tribute to the Minister of Agriculture for the maintenance of his department in full health and vigour in the interests of the rural producers.

Before embarking on the imaginary excursion, I wish to reply to a few of the Leader's statements. He criticized our educational achievements, but I remind him that school enrolments in South Australia are climbing at a faster rate than anywhere in the Commonwealth and that on no occasion has any student

ever been turned away from a school through lack of accommodation or lack of teaching staff. Our secondary school enrolments have almost doubled in five years; from 21,686 in February, 1956, to 41,720 in February, 1961. At present they are about 45,000. In the last five years the number of students in our teachers' training colleges has risen from 742 to 2,018, and the total number of trainees has increased from 1,340 to 3,680. Figures reveal that during the period 1946 to 1960 the increase in the total numbers in our primary and secondary schools was 144 per cent, compared with 109 per cent in Victoria, 107 per cent in Western Australia, 104 per cent in Tasmania, 87 per cent in Queensland and 76 per cent in New South Wales. In 1944 our primary school enrolments were 57,704 and secondary school enrolments 11,568, a total of 69,272 students, but as at August 1, 1961—and I have not the latest figures—we had 135,542 primary students and 41,281 secondary students, a total of 176,823. I understand that at present about 183,500 students are attending our departmental schools. I stress that on no occasion has any child been turned away from school when he or she desired to enter it.

When I heard the Leader refer to oil search I thought he implied that we had to be careful of overseas investment in Australia. My reaction was that we are prone to become a little bit too big for our boots when we criticize overseas interests building up investment here. We need overseas investment. It is good that we are to provide next financial year a contribution of £450,000 for capital machinery and £350,000 for annual operating expenses in the oil search, but we just have not the cash in our young and growing economy to exploit our resources as quickly as we must without investment from overseas.

Mr. McKee: Our economy is in reverse at the moment. You said it was growing.

Mr. LAUCKE: It is growing, and I guess we will always have growing pains from time to time, but the plain fact is that Australia has advanced in a way that rivals the advance of the Americas in a similar stage of development. I welcome the investment of overseas capital in Australia as much as possible so that we can build up the population of our nation and so that the population will have a moral and natural right to its vast area towards which the teeming millions north of Australia look. We must develop; we must populate. We can do so only if we have the wherewithal to provide those things necessary

for development. Criticism of overseas investment in Australia is bad; we should not do or say anything that will tend to dry up the flow of investment money to Australia. We need it all, and we need it quickly. For 10 years our total earnings on overseas markets have been down and we have had an adverse balance. It has been only the flow of capital into this country that has enabled us to go ahead as rapidly as we have done.

The Leader mentioned the need for trade missions, and I agree with him. We need persistently and consistently to look for new markets, and we should show our goods overseas to endeavour to extend sales in all of our products. Some excellent trade ships have left Australia—*Straat Banka* is one that comes to mind immediately—but I do not like the Leader's suggestion that we as a nation should own a ship to go around the world to display goods. I believe that shipping is best left in the hands of competitive owners rather than that it should be under State or national ownership.

The Leader said it was desirable to increase the charge for excess water, but I believe such an increase would be an indirect tax—a form of taxation that would be undesirable. It has been the policy of this Government for many years to hold down the incidence of taxation in the limited field in which it operates, having in mind the requirements of the State for money to do certain things. It has always endeavoured to leave in the pockets of the individual as much as possible, and this is right. Last year this State raised £3,000,000 less in its limited field than the tax would have been under existing taxation levels in other States. I believe that is a good achievement, and that it indicates the Government's firm desire to reduce taxation where possible and to hold taxes as low as possible, having in mind its responsible approach to its requirement, as a Government, of money for certain purposes.

The Leader said that this Government was prone to destroy business confidence. It has never done other than create confidence. It has attracted industry here in a way that no other State has experienced. Industry has been attracted here through the years in a remarkable manner, and it has been the confidence engendered by a sound and stable Government that has led to that flow to this State. I suggest that members opposite are the callers of gloom. Pessimistic talk serves no good purpose whatever; optimism in a young country is what we require, not the calling

of "stinking fish" and so on. There is no future in that. I repeat that this Government has done more to create confidence in the minds of overseas investors and of local people, be they on the land, in industry or working, than any other State Government.

Mr. Fred Walsh: What became of the industry in the South-East?

Mr. LAUCKE: It was unfortunate that certain alterations in the set-up of an overseas company led to a change in plans.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It did not have confidence.

Mr. LAUCKE: It had confidence, but an internal re-organization, I understand, led to the deferment of this industry.

Mr. Clark: Do you say the people of South Australia have confidence in this Government?

Mr. LAUCKE: I am certain they have. I pay a tribute to this Government for what it has done in meeting the demand for houses in this State. Its record is excellent; it is the best record in housing in Australia, and the Government has come nearer meeting complete demand than has any other Government in the Commonwealth. In its proposals to encourage further house ownership, the Government is acting in the right way. Everything that can be done to encourage house ownership is to the good. If a person can have a little stake in the country, he is a much happier person. Home life is the very basis of our community, and we should do everything we can to assist to facilitate house ownership. I think what is being done in this State is in the direction of enabling more and more people to own their own pieces of land and their own houses.

My reason for asking my honourable friend to join me on a run-down from Greenock to Adelaide was so that I could indicate to him and to all members the beneficial effects of good and sound Government through the whole gamut of Government responsibilities. We see the great improvement that has been made to the Main North Road, such as double traffic lanes, bridges and so on, and I think we should look at those. Leaving Greenock early in the morning one can see two trucks laden with milk cans going to a pasteurization plant set up at Greenock with Government assistance in various ways. There the milk is pasteurized, and it is then sent to northern areas in the State, such as Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla. This plant is operated by the Barossa Dairymen's Co-operative Association, which works in conjunction with Golden North. The factory is built of locally produced brick made at a brickyard that

originally received assistance through the instrumentalities of this Government. Then one passes on down the road, noting that the village is completely supplied with electricity and water, and that Housing Trust houses, with well kept gardens, are provided.

Mr. Quirke: They are well kept up.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. About two and a half miles down the road is a little village called Daveyston, where the Education Department has just completed a new residence for the teacher. I admire the department for having built a residence there because that indicates that where small communities desire to retain their own schools the Government is prepared to erect good buildings. *En route* we will pass two school buses conveying students to the Nuriootpa High School, and the school buses are another widely appreciated service. We will travel through to Sheoak Log and there see paddocks well cared for, seeded to wheat and barley, many of them growing Roseworthy College wheat varieties of a quality that is finding more and more acceptance in overseas markets. The College is yet another organization fostered by the Government.

We pass through Sheoak Log, where we note a little industry producing bulk handling elevators, etc. We go down to the corner of Gawler Belt and Main North Road and observe the excellent traffic island that has led to the very safe conditions existing on what was formerly an extremely dangerous intersection. At this stage we have left the Barossa electorate and are in the Gawler electorate which is so ably represented by a gentleman now listening to me. Here we see a dual line by-pass being built and note the bridges being provided. Looking across to the right we see a huge wheat silo towering up into the landscape at Roseworthy. That wheat silo exists, to a degree, because of Government co-operation on finance.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The Government did not provide the silo.

Mr. LAUCKE: No, but the Government has been co-operative in guaranteeing an organization in the erection of the silos. We have evidence all the way down in whichever direction we may look of good Government service. We pass the lovely town of Gawler.

Mr. Clark: You did not linger long there. You did not tell us all about the industries the Government brought to Gawler!

Mr. LAUCKE: I noted the wide recently rebuilt bridge to the north. We proceed further and notice the clothing factory that is doing an excellent job in selling its goods all

over Australia. The next bridge we approach has been recently painted and attended to, and then we come to the double highway, which is lined for safety, having posts on either side marked with iridescent paint for further safety. The Highways Department is doing an excellent job in providing every possible safety measure on the roads. We now arrive at the city of Elizabeth. We should note the wide open spaces left in that city. Some of the space is in the nature of plantations, adding to the beauty of the area, and some is being kept for recreational purposes. The median strip contains well-kept trees and shrubs and it is a pleasure to pass through Elizabeth and note what is being done towards its beautification. I pay a tribute to the Salisbury District Council for so carefully and faithfully caring for the trees and shrubs on the median strip and I also thank the *Advertiser* which has given many of the trees and shrubs.

An extension throughout the State of shrub and tree planting similar to the present scheme between Pooraka and Gawler would undoubtedly enhance the beauty of our highways amazingly. It is a pity that has not been done before. The example in that area could be emulated in other areas because the beauty of the trees, shrubs and green spaces adds to the general living conditions of the residents. It also adds to the safety of travellers on the road because it obviates much of the glare that usually comes from lane to lane. Much glare is arrested by the median strip. All in all the median strip provides safety and beauty besides which it is aesthetically pleasing and practicable.

Proceeding further on this trip from 42 miles north, we come to the Metropolitan Abattoirs, a killing works equal in standard to any in Australia, which is effectively attending to the killing requirements so far demanded of it. This, again, is a department that has been well cared for. Therefore, we note the many improvements that have been made. I will hearken back a moment and refer to the two main electricity transmission lines that cross the Main North Road. Towards Sheoak Log we have the new high tension lines and also towards Gawler we have the older lower powered tension lines. In these rural districts we will see the little single wire earth return services linking up from farm to farm with the power.

All these things are constructive and good to see and I refer to them because it is seemingly not within the desire of certain people to see just what is being done and what has

been done in the interests of the State's citizens generally. In that short run we see certain things that are pleasing to note and they are things that one could note to a very wide extent throughout the State.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are to continue in the role of an overseas income earner it is essential that producers' costs must be kept down as far as is humanly possible. In this regard I commend the Government for its expressed intention to guarantee repayments up to a further £200,000 to the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. as part of an additional loan of £400,000 to be made by the Commonwealth Trading Bank. The proposed guarantee will enable the company to construct additional facilities for the bulk barley shipments. Co-operative bulk handling affords a most convincing example of a practical reduction in costs incidental to cereal production and industry in the history of South Australia. Every commonsense primary producer, in common with every manufacturer, knows without being told continuously that costs must be reduced. We all know that we must reduce costs, but the ability or the facility to achieve lower production costs is the big question. Where is the opening to reduce them? Major savings have resulted from the adoption of bulk handling of wheat as against the cumbersome system of handling grain in bags. I appreciate what you, Mr. Speaker, have done over the years for bulk handling.

A total of 18,949 wheatgrowers are members of the bulk handling co-operative. That is approximately 95 per cent of all wheat farmers in the State. In the season 1961-62, the total deliveries to the Wheat Board were 30,700,000 bushels, 24,300,000 or 79 per cent being delivered in bulk. In addition, 3,600,000 bushels of barley was converted to bulk from bags, *ex* Ardrossan. Also there were three shipments of bulk oats through the Port Lincoln terminal. I understand that at Port Lincoln the *m.v. Korea* was loaded with a full cargo of oats in one day. That is extremely efficient and must undoubtedly be reflected in better returns to the producers. Loading costs are very high, but can be reduced; to load a cargo in one day, as I have stated, is good going. There were 107 shipments of bulk wheat, barley and oats and I understand that no complaints have been received from overseas buyers.

Storage for 7,300,000 bushels of barley is scheduled to be completed for the next harvest. This would represent a 40 per cent

increase in one year. It is rather amazing that since 1955-56 the C.B.H. has established 70 centres in South Australia with silo accommodation. In 1961-2 (Pool 25), the wheat acreage in South Australia was about 2,240,000—an increase of 270,000 acres over the previous year. The total deliveries in that pool were 30,730,000 bushels, of which 24,800,000 bushels was delivered in bulk. The total bulk receipts exceeded the capacity of the system by 5,000,000 bushels—a most meritorious achievement. It is very pleasing to read in the Governor's Speech that there will be further assistance to this very worthwhile body to enable it more rapidly to provide silo facilities in the remaining wheat-growing centres.

I wish to refer to the activities of the Australian Wheat Board, and especially to its policy of getting out and finding markets for our production. A dynamic drive for sales in every possible market for all our commodities is essential. I note with great satisfaction the remarkable achievements of the Wheat Board, especially of its General Manager (Mr. C. J. Perrett), who is a master salesman. It is good to know just where our wheat has gone during the last 12 months. Mr. Perrett has proved himself to be a first-class salesman, as has his assistant (Mr. Dorman), who, like Mr. Perrett, has also proved himself to be a first-class ambassador for the wheat industry. Several members of the Wheat Board have also been overseas recently seeking and obtaining new markets for our wheat. In the season 1961-2, (Pool 25), we had a carry-over in Australia on November 30, 1961, of 24,575,000 bushels. The estimated receipts by the Wheat Board for that crop were 223,000,000 bushels. We had a total availability of 247,575,000 bushels of wheat. We need for home consumption about 52,600,000 bushels; for export flour and wheat products 26,000,000 bushels; and for safety purposes a carry-over of about 20,000,000 bushels. We had available for export in the last pool with the carry-over from the previous year 148,975,000 bushels, or 3,990,400 long tons. Of that total 139,975,000 bushels has been sold to markets as varied as the following: Algeria 11,900 long tons; China 1,024,700; Egypt 50,400; Eire 24,200; France 12,100; West Germany 233,300; Hong Kong 109,400; India 326,300; Iran 15,000; Iraq 19,600; Italy, 129,800; Japan 416,500; Kenya 23,600; Malta 14,700; Middle East 113,500; New Zealand 108,500; Norway 68,900; Pakistan 85,700; Rhodesia 70,000; South Africa 55,000; Spain 308,900; United

Kingdom 460,500; and sundry 66,800. So, we see that practically all countries that buy wheat are named as purchasers from Australia in the last 12 months. That has not come fortuitously, but is the direct result of the sales activities of the Wheat Board, and I pay a tribute to its members.

I feel that I must refer to the desirability of institutes established in country areas, being the venue of a branch of the Public Library, without having to cede ownership rights necessarily to the local government authority. I have in mind the situation in my home town where we have an institute that is the hub of social activity for the local community. It plays a very important part in local activities. We have a first-class subscription library at the institute. There is at Nuriootpa, four miles away, an excellent public library, and I feel that we should be enabled at Greenock to have a public library established in a room in our local institute, separate from our subscription library. We do not want a costly staff. We could work in easily with our librarian who is now on duty at the institute to care for the requirements of people who ask for certain books, which could be obtained from a major library in a neighbouring town. In appropriate circumstances the local government authority should be declared an approved body jointly with the institute committee, so that the former may be the recommending and financially responsible body, and yet arrange to secure the economies of existing premises, of establishment and of staff. I think it is a commonsense approach to the matter, and we could in this way add greatly to the number of public libraries in country towns, instead of having the existing situation of the committee's conceding ownership rights to the local government authority in order that the institute hall may be the venue of a library. This impedes the growth of public libraries in country areas. I ask the Minister of Education to look closely at the matter to see if effect cannot be given to my suggestions.

I now refer to the ancient culture of our aborigines. Australia has one of the greatest of the world's treasures in the ancient living culture of the aborigines, but it is fast disappearing. I am speaking about the ancient folk lore, the music, and the finer things of the original aborigines. In this regard I mean the aborigines in their natural form before the white people came to Australia. It is a shame that we are not seeking to retain for posterity the folk lore, music, records of habits and so

on of the ancient aborigines. We have in Adelaide one of the most competent gentlemen on aborigine culture in Australia. I refer to Mr. T. G. H. Strehlow, Reader in Australian Linguistics at the Adelaide University. He was born at the Finke River Mission and lived for the first 15 years of his life on the mission station. His schoolmates were aborigines. He has the confidence of the oldest aborigines in that area. It is such as he that could, if given the necessary finance, retain for ever the fast disappearing records of the culture of the aborigines. I realize that this is not a State matter, but I am referring to it, as I did three years ago, because of the need for urgent attention. As each year passes we are missing out on retaining for ever the records of the culture of these inhabitants of Australia back through the ages.

I am pleased to note that the Government intends to further harness (and possibly it is the last chance to do so), the River Torrens as a storage of water for the metropolitan area. I refer to the Kangaroo Creek reservoir, which will cost £2,650,000, £1,000,000 of which will go towards the provision of a deviation of the Gorge Road. We shall have there a 6,000,000,000 gallon reservoir with a gravity fall to the city, and there will be provided, I anticipate, one of the finest scenic drives anywhere in Australia. I commend the Government for utilizing to the utmost existing streams for the conservation of water, and I have in mind the great work of our Premier in respect to the Chowilla dam. It is good to see that we now have the prospect of a good water supply in South Australia, arising from the huge catchment that we anticipate will be provided at Chowilla. It will give to the State a water supply for many years ahead. In connection with the work of the Engineering and Water

Supply Department in catching water wherever possible, I think the work that has been done on the Para River is amazing. We have the Warren reservoir as the first catchment. When it is filled the water passes on to the South Para reservoir, from which it is reticulated into the Barossa reservoir, which receives water in its own right from the Para River. We have three major reservoirs on a single and rather humble stream. It is good to see the use being made of our limited resources in respect of water catchments.

In the Tea Tree Gully district there is a definite requirement for a hospital. The population of the area serviced by the Tea Tree Gully District Council is rising rapidly. In 1947 there were 585 dwellings and a population of 2,203. In 1954 the dwellings totalled 715 and the population 2,561. By 1961 the number of dwellings had increased to 1,605 and the population to 5,887. This year there are 2,500 dwellings and a population of 9,000. If we consider this rapid rise we can anticipate by 1965 about 24,000 residents in the area. A hospital will have to be provided and at present negotiations are proceeding for the provision of one. I commend to the Government's sympathetic consideration the need for a hospital in the area, remembering that the population increase is definite and large. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as originally submitted.

Mr. HUGHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 19, at 2 p.m.