

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 7, 1962.

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

QUESTIONS.**LABELLING OF GOODS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Further to my question to the Premier on July 31 relating to the removal of labels from imported towels, I referred to the Goods (Trade Descriptions) Act, 1935, and suggested that he should obtain advice from the Crown Solicitor. I do not think I am doing him an injustice when I believe he gave his understanding of the position by reference to the Textiles Products Description Act, 1953. I now desire to inform the Premier that I have been told by the Customs Department that regulation 8 (a) under the Commerce (Trade Descriptions) Act, 1905-1950, provides:

8. The trade description to be applied in accordance with these regulations shall comply with the following provisions:—

(a) It shall be in the form of a principal label or brand affixed in a prominent position and in as permanent a manner as practicable to the goods.

Mr. Newbold, of that department, informed me that if the labels are being removed by any person, that is, either the importer or any eventual seller, then they are not fixed in as permanent a manner as practicable, as laid down in the regulation.

In view of my having explained already that I have a sample towel in my possession from which the label has definitely been cut off, is the Premier prepared to take up this matter with the Customs Department so that those responsible for selling imported goods without their being properly labelled will be compelled to discontinue the practice?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When the honourable member first raised this matter he was good enough to tell me that he proposed asking the question, and I made some inquiries, naturally from State Government departments. The answer I then gave related to the powers of those departments. I shall certainly be pleased to do what the honourable member now suggests.

WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: On several occasions recently I have directed questions to the Minister of Works regarding the water supply position on Eyre Peninsula. Last Thursday, on television, the Premier outlined a new

scheme for Eyre Peninsula. Will the Minister of Works enlarge on the Premier's statement?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The position on Eyre Peninsula is not good as regards water supplies for the coming summer. The Tod River reservoir, which is the mainstay of the water system there, has had no intake this year and, unless there was a slight intake yesterday and today, the position would be that the reservoir would be holding less than 500,000,000 gallons. The combined efforts of the Lincoln basin scheme, which is now almost in full operation, and the Uley basin scheme contribute, of course, a useful quantity of water—about 700,000,000 gallons annually between them, or a little more, but we rely on the Tod River reservoir for the main source of supply.

At the moment it appears as though we are some 400,000,000 gallons short of requirements at this stage in the year. Because a very large portion of Eyre Peninsula depends for stock water on the Tod River trunk main we have been urgently investigating the possibilities of the Polda basin. That basin lies about 20 miles west of Lock and it has interested the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Mines Department for a number of years and was, some time ago, subjected to a number of tests. The water, at that stage, was not used because it had a somewhat higher salinity than the Uley basin water; therefore, we went ahead with the Uley basin development and later the Lincoln basin development in preference to bringing the Polda supplies into the Tod River system. However, in view of the existing position the department has been urgently considering the possibility of harnessing the Polda basin, and discussions about it were held last week with the Premier. As a result of those discussions the Premier made his statement.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is now preparing estimates for this project and I hope they will be available so that a reference can go before His Excellency the Governor on Thursday to authorize the Public Works Committee to examine and report on the project. In the meantime all the essential data for the commencement of the scheme is being assembled so that when the committee has examined the matter, and, if reported on, the work can go ahead. I believe it will be possible, subject to supplies of steel plate being available, for some relief to be obtained from this source before the position becomes unduly critical during the summer. Every effort is being made to achieve that objective.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Works say whether there has been any appreciable intake of water this winter into our major reservoirs, and can he indicate the present quantities held in the Warren, Barossa and South Para reservoirs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a full report on this matter, including figures to 8 o'clock this morning. The Warren, Barossa and South Para reservoirs reached their lowest levels on May 21 when the storages were as follows: Warren, 119,000,000 gallons; combined total of South Para and Barossa, 2,132,000,000 gallons. The intakes during this winter have been slight, but appreciable. At present the Warren reservoir is holding 800,000,000 gallons and the South Para and Barossa reservoirs combined 2,921,000,000 gallons. Present indications are that with some augmentation from the Mannum-Adelaide main the supply to the Warren water district will be assured for this season. The storages in the South Para and Barossa reservoirs are adequate to maintain a full supply to the whole of the Barossa water district. A substantial quantity will also be available for Smithfield and Elizabeth which, however, may need some augmentation from the Mannum-Adelaide main towards the end of next summer.

As regards the metropolitan reservoirs, the figures as at 8 o'clock this morning reveal that Mount Bold is holding 2,578,000,000 gallons; Happy Valley, 2,001,000,000; Millbrook, 2,679,000,000; Hope Valley, 678,000,000; Thorndon Park, 118,000,000; and Myponga, 1,008,000,000—a total of 9,062,000,000 gallons. The total capacity of the metropolitan reservoirs—including the increased capacity of Mount Bold, which was completed last year, and the capacity of Myponga, which is virtually completed—is calculated at about 25,000,000,000 gallons, so the honourable member will see that the metropolitan reservoirs are now about one-third full.

Mr. LAUCKE: Recently I asked a question of the Minister of Works regarding the Government's intention in respect of the possible construction of a reservoir on the Little Para River at Golden Grove. I understand that the Minister now has a reply to that question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I saw the docket and made a few notes from it. A proposed reservoir on the Little Para was examined as far back as 1949 and it was not considered to be necessary at that stage. A subsequent examination shows that it could be very useful, especially with the development of Elizabeth and Golden Grove, both of which

places it would command. A reservoir could be developed to hold 2,500,000,000 gallons, which is considered to be the optimum capacity of the Little Para River. Further storages must be considered in the near future, but whether they will be on the Little Para or at Clarendon or elsewhere has yet to be determined. The honourable member will see that the department regards this project as being a useful one, in the light of metropolitan demands, and it will be considered when the Kangaroo Creek reservoir, construction of which is about to commence, has been completed.

CALLINGTON COPPER MINES.

Mr. BYWATERS: In his policy speech prior to the recent election the Premier mentioned the old copper mines in the Callington area and said they were to be re-explored to see whether it would be possible to gain copper from them. Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Mines, any further information on this matter? I have noticed that survey pegs have been placed in a number of spots through the area. Are there any prospects of work being started soon in that area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As a result of newer scientific equipment, many of the older mining projects of this State are being re-examined and some significant new finds have already been made. I believe the Kanmantoo area has possibilities, and that view is shared by the Mines Department. However, we have a complication in South Australia. In the early days the mineral rights were sold with some of the land and so those mineral rights do not belong to the State but to the landholder or to another person altogether. The land may have been sold a second time, but the mineral rights may not have been sold with it, so in some instances the land is owned by one person and the mineral rights by another. This complication has delayed consideration of one or two of our older mining areas. I think Cabinet will approve of an amendment being placed before the House to enable the present legal obstruction to be removed. If that is done I believe it will be possible to get a company to explore the possibility of re-opening the mines at Kanmantoo and conducting mining activities there.

PENSIONERS' RATING.

Mr. TAPPING: A few weeks ago I asked the Premier whether the Government would consider amending the Local Government Act

to afford councils the right to grant rate concessions to pensioners and other people suffering from financial hardship. I understand that he has a reply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received a report from the Minister of Local Government which states:

Section 267a of the Local Government Act, 1934-1961, enacted by section 5 of the Amendment Act No. 50 of 1959, empowers any council, if satisfied that payment of rates would cause hardship to the landholder, by resolution, to postpone payment of such rates. The amount due remains a charge upon the ratable property and is liquidated at the time such property changes hands, or at the death of the owner.

Mr. Tapping: That was not the question. It is an evasive answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

WHITE ANTS.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I have had a complaint, verbally and in writing, that a Whyalla resident, a purchaser of a timber frame Housing Trust house, has had excessive sales pressure exerted on him, accompanied by misrepresentation, to induce him to have his house treated for white ants by a firm of white ant exterminators for \$42. He was shown two pieces of wood with white ants that were alleged to have come from under his house, and was told that his house was being attacked by white ants. He signed the contract, but two subsequent thorough inspections showed that there were no active white ants present. The firm's manager refused to cancel the contract and suggested court action. This firm is representing to trust house purchasers in Whyalla that the safeguards and treatment of timber provided by the trust against white ants are effective for only nine to 12 months. The resident in question is prepared to give evidence on oath on these matters. In view of the importance of this matter in respect of the future sale of trust houses and of the timber industry in South Australia, will the Premier have the matter examined to see whether this firm can be proceeded against by the trust for misrepresentation, and will he request the trust to make an official statement on the matter to safeguard the purchasers from being unnecessarily involved in such transactions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member will let me have the necessary details I will obtain a report for him.

BRIDGE AT HAMLEY BRIDGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads when the new bridge at Hamley Bridge will be completed and opened to traffic?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

HILLCREST PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the unsatisfactory conditions at the Hillcrest Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. In March of this year the headmaster requested that additional rooms be provided at the school. However, a survey of requirements at all schools revealed that additional accommodation at Hillcrest could not be justified in view of more urgent needs elsewhere and the total number of rooms which could be provided. The site for the proposed shelter shed has been investigated and plans are now being prepared for the building. Paving of the playground was completed last month. A detailed survey of additional playing area has been completed, and design work for the scheme is in process of completion. Filling for the playground is incorporated in this scheme. I have been advised that no request has been received by the Education Department regarding staff facilities.

COUNTRY POWERLINES.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about contract work undertaken by the Electricity Trust for the reticulation of power throughout country areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Huddleston (Assistant Manager of the Electricity Trust) reports:

The Electricity Trust lets contracts for the construction of transmission lines and rural electricity projects, including single wire earth return lines. The letting of contracts has greatly increased the rate of construction of rural electricity schemes. Contracts are let because for certain types of work this is the quickest and most economical way of getting the work done. The trust is not short of construction staff for building power extensions. There is, however, a shortage of the technical staff required to design and lay out the schemes, and the trust has instituted a training programme to endeavour to improve this situation.

GEPPS CROSS SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister of Education aware that more than 12 months ago the Public Works Committee reported favourably on a proposal to build a technical high school at

Gepps Cross? Can he tell me when it is intended to proceed with this work, especially as one of the intentions of the recommendation was to relieve pressure on present overcrowding at the Nailsworth Girls Technical High School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I confirm the accuracy of everything the honourable member has said but do not desire to anticipate the Treasurer's Loan Estimates. If the honourable member will be a little patient, I think that in a short time we shall know the best or the worst.

SLEEPER ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. CORCORAN: Last night I travelled from Kalangadoo to Adelaide by rail. In the course of this journey it was brought to my notice that two people had been denied sleeper accommodation whilst a further two people were being accommodated in the smoking compartment of the sleeper car. The requirement for sleeper accommodation was made known at Mount Gambier before the train departed and, even though an additional sleeper car was at Mount Gambier, it was not attached to the train because instructions had been issued, presumably from Adelaide, to the effect that an additional sleeper car should not be attached unless six berths had been booked. I am led to believe that similar cases have occurred in the past, which has resulted in people who normally use the railway as a means of transport seeking other means by which to travel. This being so, would the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Railways to have this matter investigated and to consider attaching an additional sleeper car, if available and if required?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the Goodwood Road drainage and its relationship with the south-western suburbs floodwaters drainage scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: A similar question was asked, I believe, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Frank Walsh), and I think both questions cover almost identical ground. So, if the honourable member would associate himself with the Leader of the Opposition in asking this question, I could reply to both questions now. My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that, following Government approval of the general scheme for the south-western suburbs floodwaters drainage, a considerable amount of detailed investigation

has been necessary to decide the location and capacity of the flood control dam on the River Sturt. These investigations have been completed and detailed design of the dam is being prepared by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is anticipated that a contract will be let for construction of the dam during this financial year. At the same time, investigations into the design of a new channel for the Sturt are in hand. These investigations involve model studies which will take some time to complete, but it is hoped that the studies will have reached a stage during this financial year when some work can be commenced on drains east of the Sturt.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Works a further reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked last week about a modification of the original design for the drainage of the south-western suburbs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the contract about to be let, quoted in the *Advertiser* article, refers to the provision of a drain in Sturt Road between Diagonal Road and Bennett Street. This drain is part of the Drain 11 system.

Before a recommendation was made regarding the alteration in the route of Drain 14 investigations into the drainage system for the whole of that area were carried out for the Construction Authority Committee, South-Western Suburbs Floodwaters Drainage. It is considered that the alteration will provide a more effective system of drainage of the area.

The sum of £19,000 is the estimated saving in the whole system of drains in that area, including lateral drains to be provided in the future by the local government bodies concerned.

SCHOOL CANTEENS.

Mr. CLARK: The Minister of Education knows that when a new school is built, and before it is filled with children, often a room in the building is used as a canteen, and that later, as a rule, a special canteen has to be built. I understand the department subsidizes the building on a pound-for-pound basis, so long as it is not too elaborate. Some concern has been expressed in cases where parents are anxious to build a canteen that it is awkward to do so without spoiling the appearance of the school building, or that a suitable place cannot be found for it. When a new school is to be built, will the Minister consider arranging the plans so as to enable a canteen to be built later, if required, and fit in with the rest of the school building?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: With great respect, I regard that as a constructive and sensible question, because it is inevitable that nearly all large schools in the near future will require canteens. It is not departmental policy at present to build canteens when there is such a shortage of classroom accommodation, but we subsidize their cost on a pound-for-pound basis, and also the profits from them. If an application is made for consent to establish a canteen my officers first investigate the matter. Then it comes to me and I agree in principle, but before I make a final decision the plans of the building are referred to the Public Buildings Department for investigation and report. After weighing all the circumstances, I finally approve of the canteen building, but I think it would be a much better idea if we did what the honourable member suggested, realizing that inevitably an additional building would be constructed at the proposed school. That could be taken into account in planning schools. I shall be pleased to take up the honourable member's suggestion.

CANINE DISTEMPER.

Mr. CASEY: Over the week-end I was approached by several people from the north-east of the State where, unfortunately, there has been an outbreak of distemper among dogs. The nearest veterinary surgeon is 40 or 50, and in some cases 100, miles away from the outbreak, and the dogs, mainly sheep dogs, are indispensable for working sheep. In view of the long distances people have to travel to get the necessary vaccine to treat the dogs, will the Minister of Agriculture see whether it cannot be made available to chemists in bigger towns in the north of this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have discussed this matter with the Director of Agriculture. Both the Stock Medicines Board and the Veterinary Surgeons Board will have views on this matter, and I will see what I can do for the honourable member.

STURT HIGHWAY.

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads when the work of removing the dangerous corners on the Sturt Highway between Berri and Renmark will be completed and whether the work is being held up pending acquisition of a small piece of land owned by the South Australian Railways Department?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will make inquiries.

RESERVE BANK BUILDING.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the building of the Reserve Bank? My question is motivated by the proposal that this building will incorporate extra accommodation for members of the State Public Service.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When the honourable member asked the question before, I suggested that information might be forthcoming as a result of the recent conference in Sydney between architects of the Public Buildings Department and of the Commonwealth Government. However, the Director of Public Buildings reported that the matter of timing was not discussed, but I learn from an advertisement inserted in the press by the South Australian Manager of the Reserve Bank that tenders are being called for demolishing the existing buildings and that those tenders will close on August 29.

DRIVERS' REST PERIODS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: At the recent transport conference at Darwin of the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport and State Ministers which was attended by the South Australian Minister of Roads and Railways, it is understood that the question of adequate rest periods for transport drivers was discussed. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from his colleague on what system is to be introduced to provide for adequate rest periods in this State, and how the system is to be policed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

UNIFORM COMPANY LAW.

Mr. BYWATERS: Can the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, say whether it is the Government's intention to bring down a uniform Companies Bill this year and, if not, whether it is intended to introduce a Bill to protect innocent people from robbery by unscrupulous company promoters?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Legislation is being prepared and will be finally considered by Cabinet soon.

HIGHGATE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week regarding additional land for the Highgate Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Property Officer of the Education Department has discussed the possibility of acquiring additional land adjoining the Highgate

Primary School with one of the joint registered proprietors. His elderly widowed mother lives in the house on the property and is reluctant to leave it. I think the honourable member would agree that it would not be desirable to compulsorily acquire—

Mr. Millhouse: I agree.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: —but arrangements are in hand to follow up the possibility of purchase if and when the property becomes available.

SCHOOL FIRST-AID EQUIPMENT.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week regarding first-aid equipment for schools?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: First-aid kits are supplied to schools on subsidy. It is the policy of the Education Department to ensure that efficient first-aid kits are maintained. Heads of schools are instructed to take care that the kits are not allowed to deteriorate or become exhausted, and all teachers are required to see that the equipment is kept in a high state of efficiency. In their visits to schools, district inspectors are asked to examine the kits to see that they are kept in a usable condition.

SCHOOL DESKS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I understand that a contract for the manufacture and supply of single and double school desks has been let to Tubular Steel Industries Ltd. by the Education Department, possibly because of the low tender. A previous contract for desks was let to Adelaide Air Conditioners, who paid their welders first-class rates. Since T.S.I. obtained the work they have engaged some welders at second-class rates, and on July 30 the firm advised the other welders, who are on first-class rates, that as from August 7 their pay would be £16 8s. a week, which is the second-class welder's rate. The wage of the first-class welders has been reduced to that of the second-class welder. At the same time these men were told that they need not be too particular about their work on the new contract. As a result of the proposed reduction in pay the men stopped work last week, and the dispute was referred to Mr. Conciliation Commissioner Portus. Can the Minister of Education say what was the influencing factor in giving the contract to T.S.I. and, in view of what I have said, will he see that a thorough inspection is made of the desks as they are supplied to the department

to see that they comply fully with the specifications set out in the contract?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Contracts would not have been entered into by the Education Department as such, but probably on its behalf. I will take up the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Works, or the Public Buildings Department, and ask for the supply of detailed information, and will report back to the honourable member.

COCKBURN TEACHER.

Mr. CASEY: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply to my question of last week regarding the transfer this year of the head teacher at the Cockburn school.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I had the matter investigated and I very much appreciate the fact that members of the Cockburn School Committee highly regard the services of the head teacher there, and that opinion is shared by the Superintendent of Rural Schools. I assure the honourable member and the parents that there is no intention to transfer the head teacher at present or before the end of the year, because the quality of his work is appreciated by the department, and it is readily understood that the parents of children attending the Cockburn school would not wish to lose his services. However, the staffing of the Cockburn school has presented difficulties for many years and, at the request of the school committee, it is now possible to provide a residence for the head teacher. It is proposed, therefore, to appoint a married man to take up residence in the new schoolhouse at Cockburn and for him to commence teaching there as from the beginning of the 1963 school year. Therefore, instruction and examinations will not be interfered with during this calendar year.

RICE.

Mr. JENKINS: I understand that the Minister of Agriculture now has a reply to my question of July 17 regarding rice-growing in the Murray Valley.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The following report has been prepared by the Chief Agricultural Adviser:

The main requirements for rice are:

- (1) Large quantities of water: From 4-10 acre feet is the amount generally required to produce a rice crop, depending on the type of soil and efficiency of irrigation.
- (2) Heavy impermeable soils: These require less water and after draining, crust quickly at the surface making

possible the use of heavy equipment. Apart from irrigated pasture, these soils are generally unsuitable for many other crops. The reclaimed swamps in the lower reaches of the Murray (approx. 14,000 acres) are probably suitable for rice, but because Adelaide's whole milk supply is so dependent on this area during the out-of-season months, it seems unrealistic at this stage to consider the area for rice production.

The heavy box flats near Renmark is another area of possibly several thousand acres which may be considered for rice growing. Periodic flooding and high salt content of these heavy clay soils are two serious limitations associated with this area. Detailed soil surveys are necessary to determine the extent and suitability of the soils in this region, but in any event considerable expenditure would be needed for—

- (a) the construction of levees to protect the flat from periodic flooding; and
- (b) extensive land grading to permit efficient flood irrigation.

In brief, there seems to be little scope for rice production in South Australia. The area of suitable soils with adequate water supplies is limited and even where soils and water supply are satisfactory, economic and other considerations are not favourable.

OSBORNE SOOT NUISANCE.

Mr. TAPPING: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on July 25 last regarding soot emission from the Osborne powerhouse?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. Sir Fred Drew has supplied me with the following report:

Soot and dust emission at Osborne power station is under constant surveillance and tests indicate that under normal conditions emission is being kept to a minimum. With the increase in capacity of the Thomas Playford power station the load on Osborne has been further reduced and the amount of fuel burnt and the total grits emitted are much less than they were. Also at present the "A" station at Osborne is completely shut down so that there is no emission from this old station which was the worst from the point of view of grit emission.

During the last month or two weather conditions have unfortunately been such as to aggravate the dust and soot nuisance. Light north-east winds and temperature inversions have occurred at times when boilers were being brought up on load, particularly in the early mornings. This would result in what dust and soot there is being directed towards the housing area. Grit tests are regularly carried out on boilers burning coal and the total emission has been shown to be far less than it was even two years ago.

Soot blowing must be carried out on coal-burning boilers on load once each shift and this is done whenever possible at times when the wind would carry the emission away from housing areas. Oil-burning boilers need soot-blowing only once a day and this is usually done in the afternoon. Smoke and dust

emission is far more difficult to control when boilers are being brought up to load, a fact that is recognized in Smoke Abatement Acts. At these times a man is stationed on the roof to report by telephone to the boiler room engineer regarding stack emissions so that immediate steps may be made to rectify any bad condition.

It should be noted that the Osborne power station is not the only source of smoke and grits in this industrial area. The trust is doing all it can to keep the soot and dust problem to a minimum, but there is no practical way in which this can be entirely eliminated at Osborne.

SWIMMING CAMPAIGN.

Mr. TAPPING: Can the Minister of Education say to what extent private schools participate in the annual learn-to-swim campaign conducted by the Education Department?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: All children from departmental and private schools are given opportunities for enrolment in the Education Department's learn-to-swim classes conducted during the Christmas vacation. At the end of September each year the public generally is informed of arrangements made through advertisements in the *Advertiser*, *News*, *Sunday Mail*, *Chronicle*, *Country Woman*, and *Southern Cross*. Lists of centres to be used and specimen forms of application are given. Copies of the *Application for Enrolment* forms are sent to departmental and private schools on request. From time to time I issue statements to the press and radio and make reference in speeches to the campaign. Special mention is always made of the fact that children from non-departmental schools are welcome to attend these classes free of charge.

During the Christmas vacation learn-to-swim campaign last year 27,242 boys and girls received instruction. Of this number 3,434, or one in every eight, were from schools other than those of the Education Department. In addition, 27,268 children received swimming instruction in school-time during the last summer season. As a general rule children from private schools do not attend classes conducted by the Education Department in school-time. However, when requests to do so are received arrangements are made for swimming instruction to be given to these children and instructors engaged in this work are paid by the Education Department in the same way as for vacation classes. Only a few requests of this kind are received each year. In most cases private schools make their own arrangements for term-time swimming. I think, probably, some of them are shy of making application and others, perhaps, do not realize

that we are only too pleased to receive them. I take this opportunity of repeating that the children from non-departmental schools are just as welcome as are those from our own schools.

Incidentally, during the period of seven years since I inaugurated this campaign, total enrolments in these swimming classes have exceeded 250,000 scholars. The great success of this campaign has considerably increased enrolments in classes conducted by the South Australian Amateur Swimming Association and the Royal Lifesaving Society of South Australia. I express my indebtedness, and I am sure the indebtedness of the Government, Parliament and the people of South Australia, to both these worthy organizations for the magnificent services they render in a voluntary and honorary capacity, particularly to the youth of this State.

WIG-WAG SIGNAL AT ROSEWORTHY.

Mr. LAUCKE: The Mudla Wirra District Council, in conjunction with the Freeling District Council, recently asked that a wig-wag signalling device be installed at the level crossing on the Main North Road north of Roseworthy. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from his colleague whether a decision has been reached in this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

FREE TRAVEL FOR UNEMPLOYED.

Mr. HUGHES (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to have free travel passes issued on the South Australian Railways and Municipal Tramways Trust buses to persons receiving unemployment benefits, whilst engaged in seeking employment?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Funds available to the Government do not permit this extension to be made.

RENTAL HOUSES.

Mr. Frank Walsh, for Mr. LAWN (on notice): How many applicants for rental houses are on the South Australian Housing Trust's waiting list?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Housing Trust has about 8,000 rental applications on its waiting list but, without detailed inquiry from the applicants, it is not known how many are effective. A relevant matter is that, so far, 595 applications to purchase houses under the rental-purchase scheme on a minimum deposit of £50 have been received

from persons who have current rental applications and 290 from trust tenants—a total of 885 applications.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice):

1. What is the present structural condition of Jervois bridge?

2. What is the condition of piles, cross pieces, etc., of the approaches to this bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Commissioner of Highways reports:

1. The condition of the Jervois bridge continues to deteriorate slowly and the risk of the flooding of the mechanism operating the moving span is increasing. As stated previously, it is not possible to estimate with any degree of accuracy how long the moving span can be kept in operation.

2. The timber approaches to the steel spans have required continuous maintenance. Some sections of the crossheads have been completely replaced and steel plates and timber girders have been inserted from below to support the worst sections of the deck. The position is being watched with a view to decreasing the load limit or closing the bridge to traffic when this becomes necessary. For the further information of the honourable member, it is expected to commence construction on the low level causeway opposite Bower Street this financial year and the Public Works Standing Committee is understood to be about to issue a further recommendation of the actual replacement of the bridge.

LOCK ROADS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (on notice):

1. What is the programme of work on Main Road No. 42 from Karkoo bridge to Lock?

2. When will this work be continued?

3. Has work commenced yet on the sealing of the streets in the town of Lock?

4. If not, when will this work be proceeded with?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The replies are:

1. Apart from reconstruction work at Lock, funds have not been provided for work between Karkoo and Lock during 1962-1963.

2. Subject to funds being available earthworks will be commenced between Karkoo and Lock during 1963-1964.

3 and 4. It is expected that work will commence on the sealing of the streets of Lock on Monday, August 6. This work will be extended for approximately 1½ miles in each direction on the four roads leading out of the township.

PORT AUGUSTA OFFICES.

Mr. RICHES (on notice):

1. Have tenders been called for the erection of new offices for the Engineering and Water Supply and other Government departments at Port Augusta?

2. If not, when is it proposed to call tenders?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The replies are:

1. No.

2. Completed drawings will be forwarded within two weeks to a private consultant to prepare the tender specifications. The firm have advised that it is anticipated that tenders can be called in approximately two months' time.

CHILDREN'S WELFARE BOARD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Who are the present members of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board?

2. When was each such member first appointed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The present members of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, other than the Chairman, who is a full-time public servant, and the date each member was first appointed, are as follows: E. A. Bantick, Esq.—March 22, 1945; K. J. D. Benger, Esq., M.B.E., J.P.—January 10, 1957; Brigadier F. A. Burrows, D.S.O., M.M.—January 7, 1960; Mrs. P. E. Duguid, B.A.—March 22, 1945; Mrs. N. G. Duncan, J.P.—June 19, 1947; Mrs. E. Lipman, M.B.E., J.P.—June 27, 1957; Mrs. M. Rice, January 14, 1954; Miss D. Vaughan, M.B.E., J.P.—November 9, 1916.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following interim reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Public Library Additional Building,

Strathalbyn Water Supply,

Port Lincoln Gaol,

Trunk Water Main from Mannum-

Adelaide Pipeline (near Highbury) to

Wattle Park Service Reservoir,

Junior Boys Training School,

Senior Boys Training School,

Strathmont Primary School,

Salisbury West Primary School,

Duplication of Morgan to Whyalla Pipeline,

Port Adelaide Bulk Handling System,

Port Adelaide Bulk Grain Bin.

Ordered that reports be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption, which Mr. Frank Walsh had moved to amend.

(For wording of amendment see page 182.)

(Continued from August 2. Page 398.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the motion and will have something to say about the amendment later. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. I was extremely pleased, as an individual member of the House, to note the way the mover (Mr. Freebairn) addressed himself to the motion. As time passes and he acquires the experience that is undoubtedly necessary in this House, he will be an asset to the deliberations of this honourable Chamber and of great assistance to his district and the State generally. It was pleasing to hear the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) who had so well conducted the business of this House as Speaker for some years. His absence from the floor of the House obviously did not deprive him of his capacity for lucid argument and debate. I congratulate him on his idea of service. Far from there being any need for carping criticism when he stepped down from the Chair, I think everyone honoured him for cheerfully accepting the challenge and stepping down to serve his Party. That action helped his Party and his district, and I believe he will continue to serve the State.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your appointment. In your short term of office you have proved that you will be an able Speaker who will conduct the business of this Chamber in a manner befitting the dignity of this House. On the first occasion I have ever heard it in this House, without your attention being called by objection to unparliamentary language you unhesitatingly called upon the honourable member who was so guilty to withdraw. With his wisdom and knowledge of Parliamentary procedure, he cheerfully acquiesced. The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) did use extravagant language, which I thought was entirely unwarranted. If the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) had cast reflections on the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader in a detailed and dignified reply disposed of that subject, so it was unnecessary for the member for Port Adelaide to jump to his aid. Even had it been necessary, it was unnecessary for him to use the language that you, Mr. Speaker, asked him to withdraw. I trust that the future deliberations of this House will be properly conducted and that

the speech used will continue to maintain the dignity that is absolutely inseparable from a Parliament.

We are pleased that Her Majesty the Queen has further honoured His Excellency the Governor. Anyone who has occasion to approach His Excellency knows how well fitted he is to hold that high office, and how well he is received by the people of this State. He is following a line of illustrious predecessors, and when his term is over he will leave this State as fully honoured as those who have preceded him.

We congratulate Sir Baden Pattinson (Minister of Education) on the high honour accorded him by Her Majesty the Queen. In recent times no-one has merited that honour more than he has done. He has devoted himself to the task of promoting and improving the education facilities of this State during a time when it has been a grave task. Following the war, the Education Department badly needed teachers and schools. The migration policy and the natural increase resulted in thousands more children requiring education. The way the department has responded to the challenge and the new conditions is almost entirely due to the wisdom of and the direction given by the Minister, ably assisted by his excellent officers. Those who peruse the reports of the Public Works Committee will realize the enormous increase in the number of schools in this State. The great increase in capital expenditure on those schools has been a tremendous drain upon the Government's resources. When I think of the money spent on education in the last three or four years I conclude that the Minister must have great persuasive powers with the Treasurer, because it appears that he has been very successful when he has dipped into the pool. Considering all those things, it is befitting that every member of this House should congratulate the Minister on the masterful job that he has done. He has carried out his duties with knowledge and complete understanding of the conditions, and he has adopted a wonderful attitude towards the children of this State who need education and his guidance.

Sometimes when sitting in this Chamber—and I am sure all honourable members have had the same thoughts—I think of those who preceded us. In 1857 the bi-cameral system came into operation in this State. I do not know whether an estimate has ever been made—I think it would have been—of the number of members of Parliament who have passed

through the two Houses since that system was introduced; it must be many hundreds. All those members contributed worthily to the advancement of the State. All the capital expenditure, all the public amenities, every house ever built, every road, every bridge, in fact, everything that we have today, is a product of something that passed through this Parliament after being approved by people of yesteryear. When we look back and see what has been achieved in this State we realize that those past members performed their duties with the greatest credit to themselves and in a way that provided the greatest benefit to South Australia.

Quite recently several members have passed into the Great Beyond, and to the bereaved widows and families of those members whose names are now on the roll of honour of those who have served, I offer my sympathy. They have the satisfaction of knowing that those members served well, and that the greatest thing a man in this life can do is to give service to his fellow men. It is because of that that we in this House honour them and offer our condolences to those they have left behind them, knowing full well that they are proud of their achievements as members of this Parliament.

I have realized—and I think all other honourable members have realized—that I am continually under fire. I do not mind that; it is part and parcel of the life of Parliament that criticism is offered, and if it is justified it can be accepted. I accept all the criticism of my actions and do not apologize for any one of them. The action that I have taken regarding this Parliament and this Government is something that I will always be proud of. If honourable members think that they can justly criticize me for that action, I accept that in the spirit in which it is meant. But there is, sometimes, just a little criticism that can hurt, and I do not think any honourable member should hurt deliberately in that way. I am not referring to myself in this instance; I do not think anybody can hurt me very much. On Thursday there was some criticism here that was designed to hurt. I would say that if the honourable member concerned had been aware of what he was saying and how it could hurt, he would never have made the remarks that he did, but as the remarks read in *Hansard*, it looks as though they were deliberately designed to hurt. I refer to the remarks made by the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) about the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). I know perfectly well that the

member for Port Pirie was a good soldier; anybody that knows the honourable member knows that he could not be other than a good soldier, and I am certain that had he realized what he was saying he would never have said it. As it reads in *Hansard* it appears that he is prepared to take up the gauntlet thrown down by the member for Mitcham against Communism. The member for Mitcham merely referred to the campaign by the Returned Servicemen's League against Communism and gave reasons why Communism should be combated, but the member for Port Pirie adopted the attitude that if the member for Mitcham wanted to criticize Communism or if he wanted to fight against it, why did he not join the forces and go to Korea to fight against the Communists and then perhaps he could wear the medals worn by some other honourable members who did fight. That was quite unfair, and if it was something that was designed to hurt it could not have been better designed. It should not have been said. I am sorry the member for Port Pirie is not here; he is, I know, engaged on district business.

Mr. Riches: He was not referring to that at all; he was referring to the attack on the member for Millicent who was charged with disloyalty for not wearing medals.

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Port Pirie said:

I am sure he will agree with me that he is afraid of Communism. If he is, he could, as an officer of the Commonwealth Military Forces, have gone to Korea or Malaya, where he would have had an opportunity to do some real fighting against Communism instead of talking about it in this House.

There is the indictment, and nobody can apologize for that. To his credit, I do not think the member for Port Pirie meant it that way, but that is how it reads and that can hurt. A good soldier will never comment on whether or not any other man joined the forces.

Mr. Loveday: Or whether he is wearing his medals, either.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is so. I do not wish to say anything about the question of medals, because I was not wearing mine either; I forgot them.

Mr. Loveday: Why don't you deal with the lot?

Mr. QUIRKE: I forgot my medals, and so did some members of the Opposition, and it was not their fault; but anybody who had them on and took them off . . .

Mr. Shannon: I could name a few who did that.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not apportioning blame at all; if the member for Mitcham did it, that is his business. I am only commenting upon what was said, and it should never have been said.

I now refer to the incident about which I have heard a whisper on the grapevine that it will be answered. Here, on the opening day, honourable members of this House took the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen and, within an hour or two, some repudiated it. One cannot repudiate her Vice-Regal representative here without that having a direct impact on Her Majesty.

Mr. RICHES: On a point of order, I am a member of the Opposition referred to by the member for Burra. He has made a statement that I object to and ask be withdrawn. If any act or statement suggests that I in any way repudiated the oath I took on the opening day, that is offensive to me. I ask that that statement be withdrawn, and for apologies.

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member has objected and I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Burra has withdrawn.

Mr. QUIRKE: With regard to the Vice-Regal representative, what prompted that action I do not know, but I do not think there is an honourable member who took that action who is not sorry for it today.

Mr. Fred Walsh: I did it; I'm not sorry for it.

Mr. QUIRKE: The members of the Opposition today say that, if there were an election tomorrow, they would be the Government. They would not, and what would speak against them more than anything would be that action that they took on the opening day. That action would stop them, as would the clowning and the notices held up before the television camera. I do not know of anything that had a more devastating effect on the public mind than that. It was not only seen by Government members but was universal throughout the State wherever television was observed. They were two foolish actions that did not reflect credit on Parliament as a whole—that is what I object to. It was a reflection on Parliament that members should clown on a ceremonial occasion like that. It should not have been done.

We come now to the elections. I have taken it hip and thigh for quite a while now, and I think it is about time I replied to some of it. I reply in this way; Parliament was elected—or members were elected to this House; that is

the right way to put it—and the Labor Party had one more member than the Liberal Party; also, there were two Independents. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) said that we are not independent because we support the Government but, if we, the two Independent members, had sat pat, the Labor Party could not have formed a Government. The whole thing would have fallen flat. Assuming that the Labor Party had attempted to form a Government, the two Independent members could have destroyed them any day.

Mr. Ryan: And you would have destroyed the Government.

Mr. QUIRKE: You could not stop it.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You could not govern in those circumstances.

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member is a realist in these circumstances. He and his fellow members today think that, because they have 19 members and the Liberal and Country League has 18, they have a right to form a Government. They have no such right. The people who can take charge on the floor of this House are those who can command a majority; they have the right. A few years ago there were four Independents in this State. What would have been the position if those four had been here?

Mr. Shannon: If you go back a little further, there were 15.

Mr. Fred Walsh: They all joined up with the Liberals.

Mr. QUIRKE: Not all. At the last election, the electors in the 19 districts not contested by the Liberal and Labor Parties—that is, there could be a Liberal candidate and no Labor candidate or there could be a Labor candidate and no Liberal candidate—amounted to 245,877. So 46 per cent of the total electorate of South Australia did not have a competition between the Liberal and Labor Parties.

The Opposition says it received a mandate from the people, but it did not receive anything of the sort. It got 54 per cent (I think that is the figure it quoted) of the votes of those people who voted. Let us look at this. Here are 158,846 electors: Adelaide—no Liberal and Country League, Democratic Labor Party or Communist; Barossa—Liberal and Country League and Communist; Burra—Liberal and Country League and Independent; Edwardstown—Australian Labor Party and Democratic Labor Party; Enfield—Australian Labor Party and Democratic Labor Party; Gumeracha—Liberal and Country League and Democratic Labor Party; Port Adelaide—Australian Labor Party,

Democratic Labor Party and Communist; Port Pirie—Australian Labor Party and Independent (that is a funny one); Stirling—Liberal and Country League and Independent; Stuart (another humorous one)—Australian Labor Party and Independent. Then, carrying on with a little more humour, Whyalla—Australian Labor Party and Independent. In other words, in Stuart, Whyalla and Port Pirie there was no contest between Liberal and Country League and A.L.P., but they are counted in the 54 per cent.

Mr. Shannon: They would never get it otherwise.

Mr. QUIRKE: There were two metropolitan districts uncontested by the Liberal and Country League—Hindmarsh and Semaphore—with a total of 46,000 votes. Then the same sort of thing occurs in six country seats. The total of those votes is 87,000. All these things amount to the formidable figure of 245,877, where there was no contest between the two main contending Parties. Labor has 19 seats, nine of which were uncontested by the Liberal and Country League. I do not blame the Labor Party for that; I blame the Liberal and Country League for it. Members know that my opinion is definite on this, that, if there are two Parties, Liberal and Country League and Labor, in this State, then every seat should be contested; otherwise their supporters in these districts are disfranchised. Nine seats held by Labor were uncontested by the Liberal and Country League—two being unopposed and seven with token opposition or straightout, self-confessed dummies.

Of the 26 country seats, Labor contested 12 (less than half), seven went unopposed to Liberal, and three to all intents and purposes were not contested. The seats that went unopposed to the Liberal and Country League were: Albert, Alexandra, Angas, Eyre, Gouger, Rocky River, and Yorke Peninsula. Country seats in which the Liberal and Country League did not have a candidate were: Port Pirie, Stuart, and Whyalla. There were Labor dummies in all those. They were masquerading as Independents.

Mr. Lawn: That is what you are doing, too.

Mr. QUIRKE: But the Labor vote is included in the figure given. So, of 531,000 electors entitled to vote, 245,000 had no direct contest. Yet the Opposition says it has a mandate from the people. No district should be uncontested, and both Parties were at fault there. I am not discriminating between them. In the districts of Whyalla, Stuart and Port Pirie thousands of people would vote Liberal,

but are not given the chance to do so. In other country districts some men and women about 25 years of age have never voted in an Assembly election. They have been disfranchised at every election, which is wrong. Labor won two seats in a contest embracing 54 per cent of the total electors, either Labor or Liberal. Labor does not have a majority in the 39 Assembly seats. Parliament recognizes elected members and not Parties. Without the Independents neither Party can form a Government based on numbers. The Liberal Party won most of the elections for the 26 country seats.

I have prepared a summary in this matter and I think members will judge it to be fair. Although there are many thousands of thwarted Liberal voters in those districts, I give the total votes in Port Pirie, Stuart and Whyalla (24,318), entirely to Labor. I have also excluded the combined votes of Quirke and Stott in Burra and Ridley. I have not considered them at all. In Ridley I have credited both Parties with the votes each obtained, whether Labor or Liberal. I have excluded Democratic Labor Party, Independent and Communist votes, totalling 14,060, including Burra and Ridley. Six uncontested Liberal seats are included at 50 per cent of their strength of 40,759 votes. I assume that the Parties each got 50 per cent of the votes, giving an included figure of 20,379, which is less than the total votes I allow for the Labor seats of Port Pirie, Whyalla and Stuart 24,318. I have discarded in all 34,439 votes, none of which was cast for Labor. The final result is that Liberal candidates received 82,333 votes and Labor candidates 71,511. The majority for the Liberal candidates, after excluding the 34,439 votes that were not certain Labor votes, is 10,822.

I now want to give one of the reasons. Last year the total export production of this country exceeded £1,000,000,000. About 70 per cent of it represented primary production, and it was produced by 5 per cent of the people of Australia. In the last 10 years they increased their production by about 40 per cent, but in the same period income fell by 40 per cent. At one time Opposition members supported the one vote one value system and I used to think it was fair until I obtained figures showing who produced the wealth of Australia, and how they were safeguarded. A system of one vote one value would rob that 5 per cent of representation. It would be completely dominated by the mass of city seats, as was the case in the last election. In the metropolitan area the Labor Party received a heavy proportion of the 54

per cent of votes. A system of one vote one value would take away any semblance of standing for the 5 per cent who produce 70 per cent of our exports. It must be remembered that they also feed the people of Australia. The 70 per cent represents only the export quantity.

Mr. Casey: You are comparing the whole of Australia with South Australia.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have the figures for South Australia, too, and they are proportionate throughout. I thought a system of one vote one value was good, but I have had to change my opinion. Other people have changed their minds, too. I remember that at one time a Party had proportional representation first on its platform. I used to support proportional representation but I don't now. It would not work in South Australia and I am glad that the Labor Party has changed its views on that matter.

I now come to housing and housing costs. The member for Port Adelaide said that originally a term of 40 years was allowed to pay off the cost of a house, that it was then changed to 30 years, and now it has gone back to 40. I asked him whether he thought it was a good thing, and I think he said it was. Actually, it is a dreadful thing. If a person gets an advance of £3,000 to pay off the cost of a house under the Government Scheme, at £3 15s. a week he will have paid about £7,800 in 40 years. Nothing can be done about it under the existing system, but I would like to see a change. In assurance, if a man invests £2 10s. a week for 25 years, at the end of the term he will get a return of £3,250. If he pays £3 a week for 30 years he will get £4,680. If he pays £3 a week for 25 years he will get £3,900. That shows that the costs would be returned easily with no disadvantage to the house purchaser. I am well aware of the reasons for all this. In purchasing a home under the existing scheme it is necessary to find £3,000 at once, whereas under the assurance scheme the amount gradually accumulates, so that at the end of the period the policy holder gets more than he paid in. Under the housing scheme an enormous amount of money is concerned because the cost price of the house is not available to the purchaser in the first instance. Under the Government scheme the sum of £3,000 is made available at a cost of 2s. 6d. per week for each £100, which means £195 a year, and £7,800 in 40 years. Of that £7,800 about £4,800 goes in interest. If a person were to invest £1 16s. 6d. a week in assurance for 30 years for a total payment of £2,780 he could get £4,000 at the end of 30 years, not 40 years. These figures have been taken

from policies that are available from assurance companies. The poor devil who borrows £3,000 (not £4,000) at £3 15s. a week for 40 years will at the end of the period have paid £5,020 more than the man who invests £1 16s. 6d. a week and receives £4,000 in 30 years. The difference, of course, is that the former must find £3,000 to build the house whereas the latter benefits from a gradual accumulation over the period. The only infallible method of finance is to find some way to make the £3,000 available at the start and have it out on a system whereby it can be reduced until the £3,000 is paid off. I do not think there is any insuperable obstacle to that. I should like members to apply themselves to this problem to see whether some scheme cannot be worked out whereby that can be done. I know that cuts right across accepted principles of banking, which postulate an absolute debt structure, but I cannot see why in fairness people building houses should be called upon to pay such enormous sums in their lifetime for the little houses they occupy.

I shall now deal with primary industry and what I see of it in relation to what is known as the European Common Market, which is better called the European Economic Community. I have some figures that were given in an address entitled "Problems of Growth in the Australian Economy" delivered to the Australian Institute of Political Science on January 29 by Mr. G. Chislett. He did a tremendous amount of research to produce these figures. I tried to get only portion of them and found it extremely difficult to relate one to the other. All the figures I shall quote have been extracted from the official documents and compilations of various authoritative bodies. Mr. Chislett says:

Production from the primary industries is valued at just over half that coming from the factories or secondary industry. Within the rural sector, the pastoral industry

(embracing wool, meat, skins and hide production) traditionally leads the field, and, in the non-rural, mining is the leader. The discovery of oil in commercial quantities would radically alter the situation and it is to be hoped that this will be realized in the not too distant future.

He then gave the following figures of the net value of production:

	1958-59. £	1959-60. £
Agriculture ..	329,000,000	292,000,000
Pastoral ..	444,000,000	536,000,000
Farmyard and Dairy ..	170,000,000	186,000,000
Rural Total ..	943,000,000	1,014,000,000
Trapping ..	6,000,000	7,000,000
Forestry ..	53,000,000	55,000,000
Fishing and Whaling ..	11,000,000	12,000,000
Mining and Quarrying ..	119,000,000	127,000,000
Non-rural Total	189,000,000	201,000,000
Total Primary	1,132,000,000	1,215,000,000
Total Factories	1,843,000,000	2,075,000,000

Continuing, he said:

Within the rural industries there are 250,000-odd holdings of one acre or more on which about 490,000 persons are engaged (including owners, operators and employees) compared with 531,000 persons in 1938-39, which, as a percentage of the population, amounts to a reduction from 14 per cent to 5 per cent. Since 1938-39, mainly with the aid of massive mechanical aids, 248,000,000 acres have been added to holdings. The difference between the area of holdings (1,145,000,000 acres) and the area under crops (26,000,000 acres) is accounted for mainly by land used for grazing. Another picture of the order of increase in rural production is provided by the quantity index of production, again taking two periods approximating a decade each. This shows dairy and farmyard production as falling below the general increase, whereas agricultural output rose by 69 per cent (equal to 3.3 per cent a year) and pastoral production by 56 per cent (or 2.7 per cent a year).

QUANTITY INDEX OF PRODUCTION.

	Agriculture.	Pastoral.	Dairying.	Total.
Three years ended June, 1939 ..	100	100	100	100
1949-50 ..	117	112	111	115
1960-61 ..	169	156	117	151

He then gave figures relating to the average return on capital in the wool growing industry in the various States:

	Area (acres).	Capital. £	Return to capital. per cent.
Queensland (pastoral) ..	35,000	79,000	3.9
New South Wales (wheat-sheep) ..	2,000	45,000	3.5
Victoria (wheat-sheep) ..	1,800	27,000	0.9
South Australia (pastoral) ..	60,000	48,000	4.8
Western Australia (wheat-sheep) ..	3,700	36,000	6.5
Tasmania (high rainfall) ..	1,900	29,000	1.7

The big area of pastoral holdings in South Australia is brought about by the type of country we have in the north of this State.

Mr. Loveday: What about the return on capital of the people who lend them money?

Mr. QUIRKE: That is another point: the producer is carrying the incubus of interest on his capital expenditure. Mr. Chislett continues:

According to the type of woolgrowing followed, extensive, mixed farming or intensive, capital required ranges from just under £30,000 to £80,000 for an average sized property, the average for Australia being about £39,000. Based on actual financial results for the three years ending June, 1960, one must be prepared to accept a low rate of return on that capital, as shown. The rate of return to capital on woolgrowing properties averaged over Australia as a whole for 1959-60 was 4.4 per cent. An examination of the financial results of rural producers over recent years is the best indication of their current situation. Except for occasional good seasons net farm income has barely been above the 1949-50 figure of £448,000,000 in the intervening years. Despite a rise of 31 per cent in volume of production, net income to farmers rose only 4 per cent in the 11 years to June, 1961. This highlights the futility of raising output as a means of increasing income.

The more one produces in a period of low prices, the more one gets into debt. For 1949-50, with an index figure of 115, the net farm income was £448,000,000. In 1960-61, it was only £467,000,000, although there has been a tremendous increase in production. The farmers were told, "Produce, produce. We want more production." Everyone benefited except the farmers. The address continues:

Assuming that the net income of farmers is reinvested in farming enterprises after meeting personal living expenses, by dividing the actual money income shown by an index of the prices of materials and services used by farmers, an indication of the relative quantities of those resources represented by the changing money income is obtained. The farmer's income is only of use to him as a means of obtaining a quantity of goods and services and this technique in effect deflates his residual money income to the extent that the costs of his requirements have been inflated by price rises. This exercise shows that the total net money income of farmers in 1960-61 (£467,000,000) would buy only 55 per cent of the quantity of resources commanded by their income of 10 years earlier.

Those figures are devastating. On the face of it, producers are certainly in a hazardous position. I am not a Jeremiah saying that we are all going to be ruined if we have the European Economic Community as an actual fact, but there will be the time when we shall be beset

by considerable tribulation, The address continues:

This relentless squeezing of the producers between prices and rising costs has been recorded in index form, showing that whereas in 1949-50 the purchasing power of each £1 of income was at a premium of 15 per cent over the base period (5 years ended June, 1950 = 100) it was at a discount of 20 per cent by 1960-61 for all products. The loss of purchasing power for wool and wheat in particular by June, 1961, was 40 per cent. In 1938-39, 55 per cent of our exports went to the United Kingdom and 41 per cent of our imports came from that source. In 1949-50 the percentages were—exports 39 per cent, imports 52 per cent, and in 1960-61, exports 22 per cent, imports 31 per cent. Over the two decades the proportion of our exports bought by the U.K. fell by more than half. Now that Commonwealth preference is virtually finished, Britain has decided that it is in her best interests to join the E.E.C. and the most realistic assumption is that she will in fact become a member.

At present Commonwealth producers enjoy preferential entry into the U.K. market, in most cases duty free and with liberal quota on commodities subject to quantitative control, whereas our foreign competitors are subject to tariff disadvantages. If Britain were to sign the Rome Treaty tomorrow and enter the Common Market under existing conditions our position on the U.K. market would virtually be reversed. We would be "foreigners" on the same footing as all other non-members, whereas the members who at present are foreigners would enjoy preferential entry.

I thought that by placing this matter on record from an authoritative source it could be of advantage to honourable members in watching the trend of events, particularly when we know that probably Britain will sign up, and if she does, appreciating what we may expect will happen to us. I am not one who thinks that Australia will be broken down and smashed up if Britain does join the Common Market, but there will be a period at the beginning when things will be bad. For instance, the items that will be most hard hit will be dried fruits (and they are already being hit, as in the last two or three weeks the price of currants in London has dropped £11 a ton), canned fruits, wheat, sugar and dairy products. It is a peculiar fact that France, West Germany, Holland, Belgium, Denmark and Italy, member nations of the European Economic Community, are able to supply their own wheat requirements. So great has been the improvement in agricultural processes in those countries that today they are exporters of wheat. It is possible that in average years these countries could supply Britain with her wheat requirements with the exception of some of the higher protein wheats, but our wheat industry will

be hit to some extent. We are now exporting wheat to 40 countries, a greater number than ever before. I believe that there is no future for dried fruit, unless production is subsidized as the West Germany wheat industry is subsidized. Do not let us despair because of this proposal of a subsidy. In West Germany the people pay less taxation than was paid before the subsidizing of her rural economy, and the country is able to export wheat—and we all know how prosperous it is today. Practically every single item of rural production is subsidized in Britain. If Australia is to maintain its rural industries and standard of living over the intervening period and absorb production costs—no-one desires that producers should receive less—we must sell our products overseas at prices in excess of the cost of production. It is up to the Commonwealth Government to maintain these industries, because unless that is done when we have adverse circumstances, these industries will be destroyed. At present, Australia exports 1,250,000 gallons of wine to the U.K. each year, but if that quantity were dumped on the Australian market we should have a surplus that we could not dispose of in any way. I do not know quite how to tackle that problem, but it has not yet occurred, so sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Our wheat position might remain stable if the countries to which we export wheat continued to pay prices comparable with our standard of costs and living. We live in hopes. For too long in the past we have relied on one market with all our eggs in one basket and now, as some eggs may be jolted out of the basket, and even broken, the energy and enterprise that will have to be spent by the Australian producers to maintain their markets and find new markets might, in the long run, prove to be advantageous.

As I am speaking about costs I shall now deal with rentals. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that various substandard houses in the metropolitan area are not covered by the provisions of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act and that the tenants are probably paying exorbitant rents. That position should not be allowed to continue. Although I have not designed a scheme to remedy the situation, those dwellings should be dealt with separately. Houses that are almost reaching the stage of condemnation should still be subject to rent control. Once a house reaches this low standard it should be covered by special provisions to stop the charging of high rents merely because people are in desperate straits.

People cannot get better type houses in which to live and, therefore, they must live in hovels. We do not want that position in Australia and it should not be allowed to continue. The Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act should be amended specifically to deal with substandard houses and we should then make sure that people forced to live in those houses are not victimized by the imposition of high rents.

Dealing with land tax I shall not address myself directly to the amendment. The land tax provisions could simply be amended in this House without anything in the nature of a Royal Commission examining the question. The Royal Commissions proposed in this House over the last two years would, if appointed, not allow members sufficient room in which to turn around in this building. We would have to acquire the new Reserve Bank building to accommodate all the Royal Commission members. Royal Commissions are unnecessary. This House is the place for legislation. All enactments could be made here and any legislation necessary to alleviate the land tax provisions could be effected by an amendment passed in this House. The Land Tax Act contains some dreadful provisions. I have an example where the previous assessment for land tax purposes was £79, whereas the current assessment is £727. That represents a ninefold increase on the original assessment. Other cases are as follows:

Previous Assessment.	Current Assessment.
£	£
82	147
50	169
39	121

I have many others. That position stems from the Act.

Mr. Riches: They are not the only anomalies.

Mr. Frank Walsh: We asked for a committee of five members to be appointed from this House.

Mr. QUIRKE: I doubt whether we could find a more inept committee on this question than one comprising five members from this House. We would probably have the member for Gawler on that committee and he would not be in a nice position.

Mr. Riches: That committee would operate in the same way as the Public Works Committee.

Mr. QUIRKE: No, it would not. This position can be remedied in this House by a simple amendment. Dealing with the interjection of the honourable member for Stuart, I agree that this legislation affects more than land. It also affects death duties, gift duty, council rates,

and all sorts of things. The trouble with this legislation is that it is based on unimproved land values and the definition of "unimproved value", in part, is:

.....the capital amount for which the fee simple of that land might be expected to sell if free from encumbrances, assuming the actual improvements (if any) thereon have not been made.

That is the common definition of "unimproved land value". Section 12c (5) of the Act provides:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained a tax payer in respect of declared rural land shall be liable to pay and shall pay only an amount of tax computed in accordance with the provisions of this Act upon the taxable value based upon the unimproved value of that land assessed as land used for primary production.

That is, what it could be expected to bring if offered for sale.

Mr. Riches: That was created because of the anomalies.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and all these conditions must be changed. Last year's amendment did not change that wording—"the unimproved value of all land owned by the taxpayer". It still remains the "unimproved value", but the taxpayer has the first £2,500 deducted. Otherwise, the provisions are still based on the unimproved value or what the land could be expected to bring if offered for sale. If the subject land is contiguous to land being subdivided—with the astronomical values attaching to subdivided land—what could it be assessed at if offered for sale?

Mr. Hall: The nearest comparable land value.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but who assesses that? If it is declared rural land used for production purposes and ceases to produce, being held for speculative purposes, the land could be taken out immediately and subjected to tax, because I do not believe that people should hold land for the purpose of receiving an annual increment to the value of the land purely for speculative purposes, nor do I think anyone else believes in that principle.

Mr. Hall: Five years would cut most of them out.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, it would. We should handle these matters in this House and they can be handled here without the appointment of special committees. The Lord forbid that we should have a committee comprising members of Parliament on a question such as this.

The member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) referred to superphosphate in relation to the South-East. However, I am concerned with

the need for using bigger quantities of superphosphate on Kangaroo Island. The initial settlers at Parndana are having a bad time. I was a member of the Land Settlement Committee when that land was first proposed for development. I then formed the opinion—and time has proved it right—that it would take at least 10 years before that country would return sufficient to enable the settlers to meet their commitments. It was an inherently poor soil. We were told that the plateau upon which Parndana is located was completely eroded of its top-soil. What was then the top-soil of Parndana was actually the sub-soil. It was low in natural fertility, which was obvious from the scrub growing upon it.

The first settlers are the victims of that early development. It was not intentionally planned that they should suffer, but they are suffering now from the lack of appreciation of the necessity to build up the fertility of that soil. That area contains much iron-stone and too little superphosphate was applied to it in the first two dressings. Iron-stone has an affinity for phosphate; it grabs it and fixes it. The superphosphate does not become available until years later when a top humic cover has been built up on the ground and which, in the decomposition, produces the minor acids that permit the phosphate to become available. The initial settlers on Kangaroo Island were the victims of an incomplete method of bringing that ground into production. Those settled later benefited from the heavier initial application of superphosphate and from better means of clearing the ground. When I first went there I was horrified by the way the Majestic plough was being used. Its discs were almost buried and the horrible yellow clay was being turned up and the top-soil was being buried a foot deep. It was a complete waste of natural fertility. That practice was later stopped, but the first settlers still have their fertile soil a foot below the surface. I know that pure sand can be converted to fertile soil within a year, but the situation is different when 2,000 acres of land is involved. It takes time to solve the problem of the regenerating of the natural cover and frequently hearts are broken during the process. I plead for the first 50 settlers on Kangaroo Island.

At present the possible transfer of workmen from Nauru to another island consequent upon the exhaustion of the phosphate supplies there is being discussed. I believe that some of our land could do with less phosphate than is at present being applied to it. Some of the soils in the South-East could do with less phosphate

and a little more lime as they are highly acid and cannot possibly get full results from superphosphate. They can grow subterranean clover, but not grass. As supplies of superphosphate are being depleted, we should investigate the problems associated with the application of superphosphate to see whether the same returns could be obtained from using less superphosphate.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The main thing is to discover the constitution of the soil.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. When I visited Kangaroo Island I was informed that ironstone had an affinity for phosphate and that heavy applications of phosphate would be necessary before it would become available. I do not know whether any substitute can be found for superphosphate, but the position should be investigated now that supplies at Nauru are running out. I congratulate the Engineering and Water Supply Department on our State's water supplies. At present we are short of water. The Minister of Works indicated earlier today that our reservoirs were only about one-quarter full. When we remember that last year, and in preceding years, we did not have water restrictions—and from our reservoirs our parks and gardens were watered at full pressure, and water was used for irrigation and for the growing of tomatoes and carrots—the department, under the control of the Minister, merits the highest commendation for the way our water supplies have been controlled and maintained. Perhaps those of us who are members of the Public Works Committee have a better knowledge of the department and its work than other members. What has been achieved by these devoted people whose responsibility it is to maintain our water supplies is nothing short of amazing. The same can be said of the Electricity Trust. Of course, some people say that electricity extensions are not going ahead as fast as they should. That is said particularly by the man who is a mile from a person who has a supply and wonders why he cannot get one. The trust has worked splendidly in my district and the surrounding districts, and it, too, is worthy of commendation.

I should like to mention briefly our apprenticeship legislation, which needs overhauling. I have mentioned this subject before. There is too great a wastage of people who would be eligible in every way to become tradesmen but who today have no opportunity of doing so, particularly if they live in the country. Boys of 15 have to be sent down to the metropolitan area to live by themselves,

and it is not good enough. If it is necessary to increase the number of tradesmen, then it is necessary to see that the youngsters are trained, and they are not being trained in sufficient numbers under the existing system.

Another thing that concerns me is the lack of physical training. We have the National Fitness Council and similar organizations, but they only touch the fringe of the problem. I remember the old cadet system that we had in about 1912 to 1914, with the compulsory military training. Although I do not suggest that we have compulsory military training today, that system gave physical training as well as military training. Is it not possible in this country to introduce something like the Swedish system under which all children throughout the country have physical training as part of their education?

Mr. Clark: We have it here, you know.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know, but what the children get in the schools is not enough. I do not advocate merely having this training in the schools: I would take it out of the schools, and have a system based on an afternoon's full physical training.

Mr. Casey: Most children take part in sport.

Mr. QUIRKE: Some do, but most of them do not.

Mr. Casey: We are recognized as a country with more sporting activities than any other country in the world.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know that, but many thousands of children still do not undergo any physical training. It is useless for people to put their heads in the sand in this matter. We have heard of the results of tests in New South Wales, and people have been horrified at the lack of fitness of small children there. Tests in America showed the same state of affairs there. We do not want that. It is a pleasant thing in a child's life to undergo proper physical training. This physical training allows an avenue for the expenditure of children's energies, which today are spent, in many instances, in more undesirable ways. If that physical training could be introduced it would have a marvellous effect upon the youth of this country.

I do not wish to be bitter and recriminatory about the Transport Control Board, but one feature of the board's activities is not right. Today, if a person wants to transport sheep by road carrier he has to obtain a permit from the board. If permits are not granted, what happens? Every farmer puts his own sheep on his own truck and drives

that truck over the roads. Hundreds of vehicles on the road today would not be there but for the actions of the board in refusing permits. That seems to me to be a foolish way to operate. I have been refused a permit myself, and I have mentioned the matter in this House. My people had young sheep to go to Warooka on Yorke Peninsula, and they had to come from Hallett down to the Mile End marshalling yards on one of the shunting trains; they had to be taken all the way to Paskeville, and then put in trucks and taken down to Warooka. Can anyone imagine anything more stupid? There is no sense in it.

I am now really going to put my head on the block, Mr. Speaker. A reference before the Public Works Committee concerns a new library building in Kintore Avenue. As a library, the new building will fulfil its duties, but in front of it is that little squat building known as the Institute Building, which has lately been redecorated. It is forecast that ultimately the library building will go to six or seven storeys, a piece at a time, and behind that again we shall have the Teachers College towering in the air. Many people—and I applaud them for their views—have strong opinions regarding the preservation of these old building monuments.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Like the old Legislative Council building.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. The kindest thing to do to that Institute Building on North Terrace would be to rub it out. It occupies possibly the most valuable piece of land in Adelaide, and it cannot possibly carry out the duties of a library. In many respects it is derelict, and quite a lot of money is to be spent on it to keep it from falling down. It has a well underneath it, and it is sitting on water in another part. If it were a historical monument it probably would be worth preserving, but it is not a historical monument. A library is the treasury of the knowledge of the human race and should be adequately housed. If that old Institute Building were taken down, we could build on North Terrace something worthy of the material that it housed, something different from the granolithic type of building being erected today. Some of the tall buildings being put up today are built mainly of glass, and at first sight one would think they were filled with water and were massive aquariums. I may have a jaundiced view of the latest type of architecture, but those buildings do not appeal to me. The latest proposal is for the library to be built on the same style, and therefore it has no direct

appeal to me as a library building. What is wrong? Could not an approach be made to those people who have erected these great corner buildings in Adelaide, almost every one of which houses some financial institution? They are bank or insurance buildings. Would those people be prepared, in view of what they extract from the public—they give some service but make good profits out of the people—to give the people a return in this way: could they underwrite the cost of a building such as I propose, something of which everybody in South Australia could be proud? Make it a real building, embodying all the features of good architecture and the activities of a master builder—something like a small edition of the Bonython Hall, something that would look like a library and be worthy, on appearance, of housing the treasures it would contain.

Mr. Hall: As long as it does not look like the Sydney Opera House.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am talking not of an opera house but of a library. We have a big adjacent country-like area, and all that it is now housing is the skeleton of a long-dead whale. The land that that skeleton is on is worth many thousands of pounds. Does the skeleton serve any useful purpose there? It could easily be put somewhere else or it could be ground up for bone manure, if there were a shortage of manure. This land is there with this little squat building on it. Now is the time that we should contemplate building this library. We should continue with the section that we propose but have a front that will be a worthy building, something that can be looked at with pride in future years as the Adelaide library.

At present we have hardly such a thing. But, now we are going to build it, let us build something decent and appeal to the big financial organizations of South Australia to provide the money. Even if they are not prepared to give it, at least we could ask them to make it available to the Government at nominal interest charges. It would not hurt them at all and they could do it without difficulty. Everybody would be grateful to them for their having done so. I know that I am under fire, and I go back to where I started from. The position is that, had I elected to help the Labor Party form a Government, I probably would not have been under fire. I have been accused by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) of having applied to join the Liberal Party.

Mr. Clark: I think you would have been under fire from a different direction.

Mr. QUIRKE: But not from your side. I have not applied—as yet—but my point is this: if I did join, I would remove from the Opposition its majority of one, and then it would be “all square”. I have been chided all the time and I think that, sooner than stand it any longer, I shall have to take some steps because I will not tolerate it any longer. There is a limit to what a man can withstand and do. I can stand most things but to be chided the whole time for having done something that I knew to be in the best interests of this State is something different.

Looking back over the last 20 years at the progress made in this State in every way (there are, of course, some deficiencies as there are in any economy) I asked myself: Is it conceivable that with the money available any Treasurer could have done better? My decision was that he could not. Therefore, I have no reason to throw down the organization that has done it.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The honourable member need not tell us now what he is going to do. What worries him is that he was not made the Leader of his Party and given a motor car!

Mr. QUIRKE: That is not fair.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. QUIRKE: It is with pleasure that I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply in its amended form—and that is, I am confident, the form in which it will eventually be carried. I, too, have a great burden of responsibility representing, as I do, far more people in this House than any other member does. I hope I adequately represent them as far as the law will allow me. I join with other members in expressing regret at the deaths of our former colleagues and sympathy to their relatives. It is impossible to spend some years here without getting on to fairly friendly terms with one's fellow members, irrespective of Party. Consequently, we always feel a heavy blow when we lose them. I am sorry that Sir Baden, our new knight in shining armour charging around on his worthy steed tilting at windmills, is not here. I don't go very much for this knighthood business. Nevertheless, if it gives him any satisfaction, I congratulate him. I should be the last person to deny him any enjoyment of it. I consider there have been far less worthy recipients of this honour.

I congratulate the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. He

made an interesting and well delivered speech, keeping away (possibly wisely) from controversial questions and energetically working the old parish pump. The honourable member said he was the youngest member in this House. That, undoubtedly, is an accomplishment but it is not a lasting accomplishment. Time always looks after that one. Representing the Party that he does, when his Parliamentary career terminates, he will not be able to claim to be the father of the House. When the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) some years ago pointed out that he was the youngest member of the House, we told him that it would not last long—and it didn't either. Anyway, I wish the new member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) well.

I congratulate, too, the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) as the seconder of the motion. Here, my congratulations are, I suppose, sweetened somewhat by sympathy because of the shabby treatment he so recently received from his own Party. It seems to me that because of the honourable member's comparative silence over six years, through occupying the Chair, we have forgotten how loquacious he can be. We were forcibly reminded of it the other day when he took us for a trip around the world, from alpha to omega as it were. Coming back we found to be much easier, because by that time we had got used to it. My hearty congratulations go to the honourable member, and they are serious and in retrospect, for I congratulate him on his dignified and impartial conduct of the business of the House during his distinguished period in the Chair, which was unfortunately terminated. There is no need for me to congratulate my Leader, who is the rightful Premier of South Australia, and other leading members on this side who have spoken. They have lived up to the high constructive standard of debate that members on this side have built up over many years. However, it is one of my most pleasing duties to say that I am proud of my three new colleagues.

Two of them have already spoken in this debate and have shown themselves unmistakably to be acquisitions to this House. The new member for Millicent, only the second member for that district and bearing the same name as the first member, has inherited the greatness and simplicity of his illustrious father. He has inherited more than that. He has obviously inherited the robust and mellifluous voice of his father and I envisage that it will not be long before once again we have a Corcoran in full

throttle directing questions at the Minister, making the rafters ring and the walls shake as he pleads that his voice may not fall on deaf ears. The second new member to get the ordeal of a maiden speech off his chest is my friend, and everybody's friend, the member for Unley. He has already highly distinguished himself in several departments of human endeavour, but I consider that his most meritorious accomplishment was to win the Unley seat for the Labor Party. Wider spheres of distinction may be open to him.

Mr. Clark: You did a bit of work there yourself.

Mr. JENNINGS: Why do you think the honourable member is here? The new member for Chaffey is soon to make his maiden speech and I wish him luck. He comes from a very well and favourably known family in the district. He has served the movement well and he will do so here. He had a hard row to hoe in winning the seat for Labor from the sitting member, particularly in a district that was difficult for us to win. I say "was" advisedly, because from now on it will not be difficult.

I come now, as I think members might expect, to the result of the recent election. To say that it was a marvellous moral victory for Labor would be the understatement of the century. The situation will soon be transformed from a moral to a real victory. We know already from our contact with the electors that they will no longer tolerate, once they get the chance, the banditry and bushranging that has kept the Government in office for so long. A tremendous number of people in this State have lived so long under the Playford rule, not realizing properly that it was a rigged rule, that they thought that if by chance the present Premier ceased to be Premier the sun would dance in the heavens as it did on the morning of the Resurrection and then rise no more. They now realize the position. They know that the erstwhile hero has feet of clay; whereas they previously could not understand what we understand as the implications of the gerrymander. However, they realized that it was unfair that the Labor Party could always get a majority of the votes cast in an election, yet get a minority of the seats. They vaguely realized that position, yet it was always said that the Liberal and Country League had so many more seats. On this occasion they have seen that the Labor Party not only got an overwhelming majority of the votes cast throughout the State but got more seats than the L.C.L. yet could not form a Government for reasons with which we are now familiar.

They did not realize before that this Government is a subtle and surreptitious dictatorship.

Mr. Clark: Is that why Government members have decided that the system of election should be changed?

Mr. JENNINGS: I shall come to that later. It is all right to say that despite the election result the Government can still command a majority on the floor of the House, but if we are democrats, and I think that concerns only this side of the House, the way in which members are elected should be what we should consider and not let it be said, "Well, we are here whether it was the right or wrong manner of election." This is the reason for the member for Burra making a cynical sophism on the opening day that the Government won because it still could command a majority on the floor of the House. We should remember that what might be constitutional might still be very undemocratic. That is the position we have here. What we should be considering is not the number of members here but the way in which the members are elected. Let us look at the figures. Twenty-six country districts have 198,147 electors, an average of 7,600 for each district. The 13 metropolitan districts have 332,082 electors, or an average of about 25,000 electors. A study of the election results shows that Labor secured 219,777 of the formal votes cast, or 54 per cent, and the L.C.L. 140,230, or 34 per cent. The Independent, Democratic Labor Party and Communist candidates, and the other odds and sods, received 46,814, or 11 per cent. This reveals that Labor, with 19 seats in this Chamber, represents 313,219, or 58.9 per cent of total electors, and the Liberal Party, with 18 seats, represents 205,134, or 38.6 per cent of electors.

Mr. Shannon: The member for Burra gave figures about this.

Mr. JENNINGS: I heard him, but his figures were wrong. The two Independents represent 12,875, or 2.4 per cent of all electors. Members in this House have for a long time given me credit for being a rather voracious reader, and I have catholic tastes in literature. In my study of political and economic works, I recently purchased a copy of a book, costing only 2s., called *Young Modern*. Headings in this book are "Did Johnny O'K. take her song?" "Now it's the Ya Ya", and "Ya Ya is Ga Ga". I knew I would come to something—I now come to "Ha Ha", an article written by Robin Millhouse, M.P. There is a fine touched-up photograph here.

Mr. Millhouse: Fair go! It is not touched up.

Mr. JENNINGS: This article deals with the recent election results.

Mr. Clark: You are surely not going to read it all, are you?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I do not want to nauseate members completely. The article is headed, "It is not confusing once you know the facts."

Mr. Clark: You mean the interpretation of the facts!

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Mitcham says:

The position is this: the Government—any Government in Parliamentary democracy—is formed by the party which has a majority of members in Parliament. In South Australia this means a majority of members of the House of Assembly. There are 39 members in the Assembly. A majority is any number over half—

You see, he is talking down to these young moderns. He continues:

and therefore, in the House of Assembly, 20 members. At the election last March 19 Labor members were elected—not, mark you, a majority—18 Liberal and Country League members, not a majority either—

Note the emphasis on this: and two other members who call themselves Independents.

In another paragraph he says:

What you are not told is that there were no elections at all in nine of the 39 electorates. The members for these seats were elected unopposed, and the votes of the electors were not even cast—

That is not unusual; if there is no election the votes are not usually cast. He continues:

much less recorded or taken into account in working out the total percentage vote throughout the State. And seven of those nine seats are held by Liberals!

I ask members to recall that the article is entitled, "It is not confusing when you know the facts." I think we know the facts well enough to know that there were eight, not nine, uncontested seats, six being Liberal and two Labor. The six Liberal seats were as follows: Angas, 6,679 electors; Rocky River, 5,942 electors; Eyre, 7,096 electors; Albert, 7,473 electors; Yorke Peninsula, 6,585 electors; and Gouger, 6,984 electors. The total enrolment of these districts was 40,759. The two uncontested Labor seats were Semaphore, with 22,935 electors, and Hindmarsh, with 23,337 electors—a total of 46,272 compared with the total in the six Liberal seats of 40,759.

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't that stated in the article?

Mr. Shannon: What does that prove?

Mr. JENNINGS: That the gentleman telling the young moderns not to be confused was apparently going out of his way to confuse them himself.

Mr. Shannon: All it proves is that you do not know how many Labor voters there are in those seats.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think somebody knows, otherwise they would be contested.

Mr. Shannon: You cannot tell us how many Labor voters there would be in those electorates.

Mr. JENNINGS: That information can be obtained from the Senate vote. In the final paragraph of this most illuminating article he says:

Don't get me wrong, though. I'm not saying that the present electoral set-up in South Australia is perfect or unalterable. It is neither, and for a number of reasons it will have to be changed.

Mr. Clark: Give us the chief reason.

Mr. JENNINGS: The chief reason is that he knows the Government cannot win the next elections with existing boundaries.

Mr. Shannon: So we won't have fresh boundaries in the next election?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think there is a fair chance we won't. The member for Mitcham, with all the veracity of Ananias, deliberately tried to confuse the readers of *Young Modern*, and his article was in keeping with his contribution to this debate. We expect the ordure we got from the member for Gouger on this occasion, although some of us had continued to hope against the mounting evidence that we could expect something better from the member for Mitcham than his insipid attempt to reflect on members of my Party because of certain actions on opening day. However, the only people who needed to be ashamed of themselves on that day were members of the Government Party for sitting on that side of the House after the election results. I am flattered by the assiduous attention the honourable member always pays to the welfare of the Labor Party. He always seems to be more concerned about our business than about his own. Perhaps that is because he has none of his own. We were glad that on this occasion he had available a copy of our rules and platform, a study of which will certainly reward him. He said he paid 5s. for it, but I do not believe that he would even pay 5s. to bail his dog Susie out of the Lost Dogs Home! Now, he cannot say now that our Party's rules and platform is a secret

document and is unprocurable by the general public. Of course, he has never been able to say that truthfully. As most members will recall, he told us once that he walked through the Labor Party's office over plush red carpets and sought to buy a copy of our rules and platform and was told that none was available to strangers. However, we have nothing whatsoever to hide in this document. When he made his assertion in the House, the late Mr. O'Halloran immediately said he would present him with an autographed copy. I do not know whether that offer was ever taken up, but I remember I was in the Parliamentary Library one day when the honourable member was trying to find a copy, because he was speaking in a debate somewhere. Once again believing that we have nothing to hide, I gave him my personal copy; and yet after a few short weeks he was still brazen enough to come into this House and say that our rules and platform booklet was unavailable and was a secret document. I am afraid that he was not on his best form in this debate, because after initial abuse of the Labor Party he then degenerated into a dissertation on safety belts. There may be some association of ideas here, for recent Liberal proposals for electoral re-arrangement plainly were designed to be safety belts for the present Government. Take the proposal that fizzled out for the three electoral zones.

Mr. Shannon: What happened on the opening day of Parliament? No notice was given of a certain matter.

Mr. JENNINGS: That was a proposal for electoral reform. I am talking about the Government's proposal to perpetuate the gerrymander—the proposal for three zones. The Premier thought that he put one over us there, but when it was worked out statistically we found that it was designed to do nothing else but make the present unfair electoral system worse than it is at present. In today's *Advertiser* we read of the Liberal and Country League executive's proposal to exclude from its principles—I did not know that it had any—the maintenance of the present ratio of representation in this House between country and city. In bringing its platform up-to-date, the L.C.L. proposes to introduce a new principle—opposition to Communism and other forms of tyranny. Is anti-Communism a new principle to the L.C.L.? The Labor Party has been fighting Communism for years, but it is now to be introduced as a new principle on the L.C.L. platform. If that is not a slight against the Playford Government, I do not know what is.

I see that they are going to support the retention of the Legislative Council with the same franchise. Once again, the Government is not interested in such a thing as electoral reform. It is only worried about how it can keep its majority in this House and, if it loses it, how it can frustrate by an undemocratically elected Upper House the wishes of a democratically elected Lower House. I still do not know whether the L.C.L. executive will be able to influence the Premier, because often he has said that he does not care two hoots what happens there.

Mr. Lawn: That is what the *News* says today.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. The real difference is, of course, that we on this side have an equal say in deciding our policy. That is something different from the position of honourable members opposite. They do as they are told.

Mr. Shannon: In your Party if you answer back you are out.

Mr. JENNINGS: I now come to what must be a very interesting question: why does the L.C.L., after all these years, want a change in electoral boundaries, or a change in the basis of country and city representation? I do not think for one moment that it is reasonable for us to believe that the L.C.L. is suffering a sudden and unique attack of conscience.

Mr. Lawn: The gerrymander is getting out of date, and they want to bring it up-to-date.

Mr. JENNINGS: That is so. The real point is that the Government knows that it is not in a position now to win an election, and it is useless for it to try to alter the electoral laws of this State unless it gives us something fair and honest. It knows that Labor will win the next election even with the present boundaries. We are in the fortunate position of knowing definitely and confidently that we will win this election under the present system even if we cannot in the meantime get more fairness and justice. What will happen to the peregrinating member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who took us for a world tour on a magic carpet? He would lose his seat to a Labor candidate. Another national calamity would be for the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) to lose his seat. There are also several others. It is interesting to note the different attitude the Government takes in respect to Commonwealth electoral boundaries compared with a re-arrangement of State boundaries. The Commonwealth electoral boundaries are established by a proper tribunal working under the Commonwealth Constitution. The districts must

be as near as possible numerically equal. The Liberals are now squealing like stuck pigs because after a fair redistribution by the Commonwealth tribunal it looks as if the Speaker of the House of Representatives (Hon. Sir John McLeay) will lose his seat. The Liberals are concerned only with the possible loss of one seat and that is why they have opposed the recommendation of the commission. I do not think their opposition will get them anywhere. It was rather interesting—and I hope this is a good omen for us—that one of the Ministers recently sacked by Mr. Macmillan was a Mr. J. Maclay. I do not wish to proceed much longer in this strain, but I shall run briefly through some of the remarks of speakers from the other side of the House, although I shall not say much about them.

I sincerely sympathize with my friend the member for Stirling because, on this occasion for some reason or other, he omitted reference to his favourite subject of bull seals. Strangely enough, only a couple of days later, we saw a reference to a bull seal not only damaging fishing nets but also mauling a man on a surf board. Discussing this matter with the honourable member he told me that, as he understands it, the authorities in New South Wales are making an all-out war on bull seals; so members can see what a progressive Government is doing in New South Wales when here the Government, which the honourable member supports, has so far resisted his blandishments in this matter.

The member for Rocky River made one of his usual lachrymose laments about the plight of farmers—all due, of course, to the 40 hour week! It is always due to the 40 hour week. I put it to the member for Rocky River this way. If the farmers, whom he claims to represent—

Mr. Heaslip: Not only claims, but does.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the honourable member is more interested in the Grosvenor than he is in the farmers. However, if the farmers are suffering, as he alleges they are, I put it to him that for many years in this State and in the Commonwealth sphere we have had anti-Labor Governments, Governments of the honourable member's own complexion (which is not very nice) so he might agree that he could not blame the Labor Party for the things from which the farmer is suffering.

The member for Torrens made one of his usual praise-Playford-at-any-price panegyrics.

It is hard to change the habits of a lifetime and, to an impatient young man like the member for Torrens, it must be an awful blow now, after trying for so long to get into the good books of the Premier for the purpose of getting into the Cabinet, to realize that the next Cabinet will not be formed by Sir Thomas. The member for Torrens talked about new buildings and new industries, both real and imaginary, here, there and somewhere else in South Australia. He was quoting mostly from his expert knowledge of the Public Works Committee. Hasn't the honourable member ever travelled to other States? We know he has. We know that if he goes to Victoria, New South Wales or any other State he will see progress at least equal to and, in most cases, much greater than the progress we have seen here. He could walk around Sydney, for example, and see the new Australian Mutual Provident Society's building. Similarly, the honourable member could see progress in Victoria, and I sincerely believe that one reason for the great animosity between the Premier of this State and Mr. Bolte of Victoria is that Mr. Bolte has out-Playforded Playford.

One thing I agree with is the honourable member's advocacy of flats in areas already served by water and electricity, because this would greatly relieve our housing problem. True, some people do not want to live in flats but, on the other hand, many people prefer to live in flats, at least early in their married career. If we concentrate a little more on building big blocks of flats we would do much to ease the bad housing situation in South Australia.

The Housing Trust has been praised in this debate by members on both sides, but we must remember that, considering the tremendous rise in population that this State has enjoyed (and I use the word advisedly), there has been no corresponding increase in the number of Housing Trust houses. According to the Housing Trust report, the numbers of houses built between 1937 and 1961 were as follows: 1937-38, 84 houses; 1938-39, 290; 1939-40, 244; 1940-41, 306; 1941-42, 204; 1942-43, 381; 1943-44, 353; 1944-45, 344; 1945-46, 308; 1946-47, 587; 1947-48, 1,016; 1948-49, 1,252; 1949-50, 1,782; 1950-51, 3,059; 1951-52, 3,118; 1952-53, 4,126; 1953-54, 3,555; 1954-55, 3,268; 1955-56, 3,238; 1956-57, 3,140; 1957-58, 3,032; 1958-59, 3,142; 1959-60, 3,174; 1960-61, 3,314. In the last year for which official figures are available the trust built about 800 houses fewer than in 1952-53. Considering the rapid

rise in our population members may well agree that the Housing Trust is not building the houses we need to cope with our rising population.

Some years ago the Premier, when addressing a meeting of Young Liberals in South Australia, pointed out that housing was a serious matter in South Australia whereas in some other States (and he mentioned Western Australia) the Government had already overcome the housing shortage. Now, the Premier would probably tell us that this year South Australia has built more houses than Western Australia. The obvious answer would be that we need them because, according to his own statement, Western Australia has eliminated its housing lag. According to the Premier's reply to the member for Adelaide this afternoon, the demand obviously still exists. The Premier said the Housing Trust had about 8,000 rental applications on its waiting list, but that without detailed inquiry from the applicants it was not known how many were effective.

Mr. Clark: All of them will have to buy their houses.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, on a £50 deposit, and then they will have to pay rates and taxes. I have a personal reason for knowing that the housing position in New South Wales is such that ours cannot possibly compare with it. My sister was recently married, and before that event she and her fiance looked around for a house. They went to the Rural Bank and were allocated a house so soon that my mother had to move to New South Wales a week before they were married to look after it while they were on their honeymoon. Can members imagine that happening in South Australia, where the waiting period is about five years? I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 8, at 2 p.m.