

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 8, 1962.

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

QUESTIONS.

ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Today, a newspaper report on the Commonwealth Budget states:

South Australia will be granted £1,300,000 for the purchase of 12 diesel-electric locomotives and 100 waggons to transport ore on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie railway.

Can the Premier say whether this Government intends to construct any of these diesel-electric locomotives and waggons at the Islington workshops?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The answer to the honourable member's question could well be "yes and no". Dealing with diesel-electric locomotives, the Government carefully inquired to see whether the locomotives could be constructed in South Australia. In fact the calling of tenders was delayed for a considerable period while we investigated what was involved in the construction of the locomotives and whether South Australia could usefully secure such an industry. We found that many components required for the locomotives had to be imported irrespective of where the locomotives were constructed. Further, the Railways Commissioner strongly recommended against adopting such a course in South Australia. As far as locomotives are concerned, the answer is "No", and in relation to waggons "Yes".

Mr. BYWATERS: I was disappointed to hear the Premier's answer. He said that the Railways Commissioner had been consulted in this matter. A number of men in the Railways Department have told me that in the past these large locomotives could be built here satisfactorily, that in fact the Bluebird railcar was built here, and that it was their opinion that these locomotives could be built in South Australia by our workmen. Will the Premier ask the Railways Commissioner for a full report on the possibility of these locomotives being built satisfactorily in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The position regarding these locomotives is the same as that which applied with the Bluebird railcars the honourable member has referred to. The framework for those railcars was made here, although the power units were not made in

Australia at all but imported from overseas. They are a complex machine, and for the number that would be made here the tooling up would certainly be completely uneconomic. It is a question not of whether we could build the locomotives but of what the cost would be, whether it would be economic, and, indeed, whether we could have continuity of the industry if we produced them here. This matter was the subject of the closest scrutiny by the Government: an investigation involving, I think, two months took place before the contract was let. Ultimately the firm that got the contract, although it did not undertake to make locomotives in South Australia, undertook to establish a worthwhile permanent industry here. It is a large organization with other irons in the fire, so to speak, and it is establishing an industry here that will benefit us. I shall be happy to get the information the honourable member seeks.

DRUG SALES.

Mr. JENKINS: A report in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

The National Health and Medical Research Council will recommend that the pain killing drug phenacetin be obtainable only on a doctor's prescription.

The report also states that 53 deaths have probably been caused through use of this drug. Will the Premier consider whether this drug should be supplied in South Australia only on a doctor's prescription?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A Bill has been introduced in another place dealing with the control of drugs. I will submit the honourable member's specific question to the Minister of Health and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Last night I listened to the Budget speech and was disappointed with the treatment South Australia received. Western Australia is to receive £4,300,000 for rail gauge standardization, whereas South Australia is to receive only £1,300,000 for the locomotives and waggons mentioned earlier by the Leader of the Opposition. In view of these figures, and the announcement concerning them, can the Premier say whether it is correct to assume that gauge standardization in South Australia has been postponed indefinitely?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I received a letter from the Prime Minister to that effect early this week.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Premier make available the contents of the letter, as it directly concerns my electorate?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I see no reason why it should not be made available. It is a public letter, not a classified letter. I will let the honourable member have a copy of it.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Premier say whether the work on the powerline to the South-East is proceeding according to schedule, and also whether there has been any increase in the use of and demand for electricity at Mount Gambier, Nangwarry and throughout the district?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member was good enough to inform my Secretary that he wanted this information and I have a report that states that the 132,000-volt powerline to the South-East is proceeding according to schedule, and that the amount of power delivered by the Mount Gambier and Nangwarry power stations in July, 1962, was 5,834,000 units, which was a record: the previous highest monthly figure was 5,368,000 units in May, 1962.

CHOWILLA DAM.

Mr. CURREN: At a recent meeting of the Industries Development Special Committee at Renmark, submissions were made regarding timber stands, primarily of red gum, that would be inundated because of the building of the Chowilla dam. Will the Minister of Agriculture see whether this timber can be made available to milling interests for milling as railway sleepers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will examine this question. I point out, however, that the project is by no means sufficiently definite for people to arrange for disposing of timber, and that in other cases where reservoirs have been constructed arrangements have been made to dispose of the usable timber before the reservoirs have filled. I do not think this would be overlooked in connection with this project, but I will take the matter up with the appropriate authorities to ascertain the position.

POULTRY CONFERENCE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The conference of the World's Poultry Science Association will soon be held in Sydney. Has the Minister of Agriculture authorized any of his officers to attend and, if so, how many?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, some officers are going, but I am not sure of the number. I will get details for the honourable member as soon as possible.

OLD BELAIR ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A few months ago I made submissions to the Minister of Roads about the Old Belair Road with a view to its improvement because of the great amount of traffic it carries, even though it is not at present classified as a main road. The Minister replied at that time that he was having investigations made. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague whether those investigations have been made and, if they have, will he ascertain with what result?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Up to this point I have not received any communication from my colleague, but the honourable member's remarks will now come before him and I will receive a report in due course.

MELBOURNE EXPRESS TIME TABLE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On July 25 I asked the Minister of Works whether he would obtain a report from the Railways Commissioner to determine whether or not the time table of the Melbourne Express could be altered to permit the train to stop at Coonalpyn if and when requested to do so. Has the Minister obtained that report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the great majority of patrons on the Overland travel between Adelaide and Melbourne. In July, 1960, the provisional stops at Cooke Plains, Coomandook, Coonalpyn and Tintinara were discontinued to improve the schedule of this train and to ensure punctual arrival at its destination. This action was essential to retain patronage and preserve the character of the Overland as an express. It may not be realized that each stop involves eight to ten minutes, and if a request is granted for a provisional stop at one place, stops will no doubt be requested at a number of other places. The stations between Taillem Bend and Serviceton are provided with a daily railcar in each direction and a night passenger train three times weekly in each direction. This service is a good deal better than that enjoyed by most other country districts. The Commissioner regrets that he is unable to agree to the request that a provisional stop be made at Coonalpyn.

ABORIGINES.

Mr. RICHES: Last week I asked the Minister of Works, as Minister in charge of the Aborigines Department, to inquire whether any organization had been set up in South Australia to assist natives in obtaining employment, or, if there had not, whether it was anybody's specific responsibility to see that employment was available for our aboriginal children as they left school. I consider that to be one of the most important factors in the general policy of assimilation. Has the Minister a reply to that question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Acting Secretary of the Aborigines Protection Board, which bears out the information that I gave the honourable member last week but which contains additional information that I think he would be glad to have. The head of the department reports that activity within the department has been expanded recently to emphasize the employment aspect more. The department has been somewhat short-staffed for some years but not long ago it was fortunate in securing the services of an officer who had recently come to the department from overseas and whose particular duties in the service in which he had been engaged overseas concerned personnel and industrial relations. He has now been given the task, amongst other things, of concentrating on employment and it is proposed now to set up within the department, and centred around this officer, a small employment section. I continue by quoting from this report:

In continuance of the arrangements recently made by the honourable the Minister with other Cabinet Ministers, the officer in charge of this section will now visit all large employers of labour, both Government and private industry. These visits will be undertaken with a view to ascertaining the employment potential of the various concerns, and every effort will be made to encourage those employers who have not hitherto employed aborigines to do so. When the survey has been completed the officer in charge of the section will travel to all areas within the State in order to meet and discuss the employment of aborigines with employers in the remoter areas and to familiarize himself with conditions to which he is at the moment unaccustomed.

I think the honourable member will see from what I have said that the department is emphasizing this aspect of its work.

Regarding the employment of juniors, we have a considerable number of children who are in the homes of foster parents maintained by the department financially, and in other

institutions also. It has always been a problem to obtain employment for them when they complete their education, be it primary or secondary, and leave school. I would interpolate that quite a few, I am glad to say, are going on to secondary education and doing well. But the time comes when they leave school and we have laid special emphasis always on this point in obtaining employment for them. I think we have been reasonably successful in that regard. It is a critical time in their development, and we are loath to see a return to the camp or outback conditions from which they came originally. The department is always anxious to see that they can be employed—in other words, that the training they have had as youths or girls up to the adolescent stage is not lost by their return to more primitive conditions. We have made every effort, and with some degree of success, in that direction.

PORT PIRIE DAMS.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about the liquid waste dams at the rear of the Port Pirie uranium treatment plant?

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

The tailings dams at the Port Pirie Chemical Treatment Plant were never patrolled even in the days of full production. There is much less liquor in the dams now than over the past seven years, but the liquor is highly acid and certainly dangerous if in contact with persons or clothing. Children have never frequented this area and they are not often seen near the dams at the present time. The only certain way to keep children clear if they were intent on entering would be to totally enclose all dams with a proper security fence at an overall cost of approximately £5,000. The dams are clearly marked on all sides with prominent signs, which read, "Danger, Poisonous Liquids, Keep Clear of Dams, S.A. Department of Mines." Parental control appears the most likely method of keeping children clear of the area. Publicity recently given this matter in local and the Adelaide press should assist in drawing parents' attention to the problem. A Mines Department officer will visit homes near at hand to the tailings dams and ensure that parents are aware of the danger.

HEART DISEASES.

Mr. HUGHES: In view of the fact that the Department of Public Health issues a valuable booklet relating to the general health of the people, will the Premier take up with the Minister of Health the matter of his considering the production, for the benefit of the people, of a booklet setting out in non-technical

terms the present information of the medical profession as to the causes of the various types of heart disease?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The department issues, I think monthly, a booklet on public health. I will submit the honourable member's suggestion to the Minister of Health to see if the matter raised can be included in the publication.

FISHING.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Early in June I received correspondence from fishermen at Port Lincoln. I communicated with the Minister of Marine, who represents the area, and in a letter I got from him on July 17 certain matters were mentioned, which information had been obtained from the Minister of Agriculture. There is one portion of the letter on which I desire clarification, if that is possible. I quote:

Regarding the three matters specifically mentioned in your letter, I understand the legal minimum length of whiting is at present under review. This applies also to the question of licensing. The possibility of dividing commercial and amateur licences is being considered from all aspects.

Can the Minister of Agriculture say when a decision is likely to be reached on the three points?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If there is a decision to make about an alteration to any of these matters, I cannot say when it will be taken. The particular matters mentioned by the Leader are subject to the most intense disagreement, particularly the question of the legal sizes of fish. Everything is a matter of opinion and practically nothing can be proved one way or another on whether an alteration should be made. That makes it tremendously difficult to alter the *status quo* without some fairly strong evidence. We are trying to determine that now, but I cannot say how long it will be before we can do so. I should like to be able to give a firmer answer, but I think I would be doing a disservice to the industry if I did.

SLUM CLEARANCE.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I have received the following letter from the Town Clerk of the Hindmarsh Corporation regarding slum clearance:

You are well aware of the housing conditions within the area of the Municipality of Hindmarsh, particularly in Bowden and Brompton wards. The council is most anxious that some steps should be taken to put in hand as soon as possible with the object of clearing some of the area of the very unsatisfactory

conditions. The council therefore passed the following resolutions on July 30 last, and I have been directed to request that you consider taking action along the lines set out. The resolutions are:

That the Corporation of the Town of Hindmarsh views with alarm the practice of charging exorbitant rents for what can only be described as slum dwellings and urges the Government to commence such active steps as it deems necessary to put in hand a vigorous slum clearance project within the metropolitan area.

The Government is also urged to study legislation and to consider whether it would be prepared to hand necessary authority to local government to handle slum clearance, as it has no power at present to enter this field of activity as compared with overseas, where local government makes a significant contribution to slum clearance.

Will the Premier accede to this request?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The letter refers to two matters, the first of which is rents charged for slum dwellings. Legislation has been on the Statute Book for some time that enables the authority—the Housing Trust in this instance—to declare a building substandard and to fix a rent in accordance with its value, taking into account that it is substandard. It was used widely towards the end of the war and it led to substantial improvements in the standard of many houses, because the owner of a house which was declared substandard and which as a consequence had a low rent fixed for it immediately took steps to see that renovations were made and satisfactory conditions were established. However, I am not sure that the legislation goes as far as the problem requires, but the Housing Trust has been given specific powers under it. It has power to acquire and pull down slum areas, and to re-establish them. If I may digress, the problem is that the land is not owned by the Government or the Housing Trust; it is privately owned, and, the moment any action is taken to acquire it, the cost suddenly becomes exorbitant. The Victorian Government took up this work actively, and in some instances land which had previously had slums on it assumed a value of £40,000 an acre. This high price meant that the only type of housing that was feasible was high density housing—flats of eight or 10 storeys. That is expensive. Heavy losses are associated with it and it provides a type of accommodation that this House generally has never supported. We believe that the best type of housing for people, particularly those with families (and those are the ones we have to cater for more especially at the

moment) is where there is some ground space with the possibility of having a little bit of living area around the cottages concerned. As to the second part of the question, it is true that local governments overseas have made a contribution to housing, but I doubt whether it is within the financial ability of any council here to shoulder that work at the moment. Personally, I have no objections to it if councils were able to stand up to the financial obligation required, but I doubt whether they are in that position. Many of them are in difficulty in carrying out their present services, though I do not mean that to apply particularly to the Hindmarsh Corporation. I do not know its financial position; but speaking generally, South Australian councils are having the greatest difficulty in keeping pace with development and maintaining satisfactory roadways and other facilities within their scope.

ENCOUNTER BAY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. JENKINS: Last week the Minister of Works in reply to my question in relation to the Encounter Bay water district said he expected that the new water scheme would be in operation by November next. I am pleased about that and so are many of my constituents. Discussing the matter with them at the week-end I was informed that they had been told by a departmental officer that the water scheme could go into operation all right, except that electricity was not yet connected and that it would not be possible to operate the new pumps, owing to the lack of power at Goolwa, where the pumps are situated. Can the Minister say whether there is any basis of fact in that statement and if so will he endeavour to take steps to remedy the position? I had a look at the scheme during the week-end and everything is ready to link up the wiring to the electricity transformer.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The answer that I previously gave to the honourable member obviously took into account difficulties of every kind. Whether they related to electricity or to the physical matter of constructing or completing the pumping station or the mains, I did not know. In any case, whatever the problem at the moment the department is hastening to overcome it. I will make inquiries whether it be the Electricity Trust or the Engineering and Water Supply Department which is required to finish its particular part of the job. Both departments are well known for attempting to do their best at all times.

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 7. Page 423.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): Before I conclude my remarks, I should like to apologize to the House for a misunderstanding that occurred yesterday afternoon. While I was speaking my Party Whip came to me and said something, mentioning 5.15 p.m. I assumed from that that an arrangement had been made with the House to adjourn at that time. I found out afterwards that what he had said was that if I were still speaking after 5.15 p.m. the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) would then be able to secure the adjournment, thus saving him from starting his speech late in the afternoon. I regret any inconvenience it might have caused the House, but I cannot conceive that the inconvenience was great.

The first of the remaining few things I wish to speak about concerns a district matter—the sewage farm in my electorate. I understand that for 40 years promises have been made that the farm will be removed, and it appears that we are getting somewhere now and that it will be moved into a more appropriate area. Recently, I asked the Minister of Works a question about this and he gave a satisfactory answer, but I wish to insist, as far as I may insist that when the sewage plant is removed from Islington the land on which it stands should under no circumstances be made available to speculators. I believe that the farm is in an area where the land would be valuable for industrial purposes because it is in a largely industrial area. However, as it is also in an area surrounded by a thick population, I believe that some of that land should be made available for recreational purposes. I make that plea hoping that the Minister will give it due consideration, because I believe this is an important matter in that area, which is surrounded by Ferryden Park, Dudley Park, Kilburn, Mansfield Park, Dry Creek and Wingfield, and they are all densely populated. If some part of the sewage farm could be kept as open spaces that would be a great boon to residents in that district.

The other district matter that I mention concerns the Gepps Cross hostel. This is one of the few places left in my electorate that is a real eyesore and, in fact, it has all the earmarks of an eyesore. The Gepps Cross Hostel is a dismal place: it is a heart-breaking and depressing place. I asked the Premier a

question about the hostel during the last session and he then agreed that it was the type of housing accommodation that we should be getting rid of.

Mr. Lawn: Like the Government!

Mr. JENNINGS: I think we have almost got rid of the Government, but that will take care of itself in a limited time and I hope the same will apply to the hostel. In answer to a question today the Premier, when speaking about multi-storey flats, said that most of us favoured the type of housing where people had a little privacy. I assure the House that that does not apply at the hostel. Once you walk out of the front door—there is no back door—you are right in the open. The children have nowhere to play. They walk out into dust in the summer and into mud in the winter, and nine times out of ten rush out on to the roads. Fortunately the roads there are so bad that cars cannot travel fast and accidents are thereby avoided.

In the past people who have stayed in the hostel for several years have been unable to transfer into proper accommodation and have gradually given up hope, resigning themselves to spending the rest of their lives in this sort of accommodation, thereby becoming not quite the assets to the community that they normally would be. I know attempts have been made to improve conditions at the hostel, but the place has deteriorated to such an extent that the only way to improve it would be to pull it down. I realize that the hostel was first taken over from the Commonwealth Government by the Housing Trust, as the agent of the State, as a political stunt.

The Premier, realizing that the people there, dissatisfied as they were with the hostel when it was run by Commonwealth Hostels, were most likely to vote against the then Liberal members for Sturt and Prospect, thought they might be mollified somewhat if they received a slightly better deal in the way of stoves in their flats and a little more privacy than they had when they dined together in dining halls. That political stunt rebounded and the Liberal members for Sturt and Prospect lost their seats. Therefore, whilst it was a political stunt in the beginning it has now reached the stage where the Government should say to the Commonwealth, "This is really a Commonwealth matter anyway. We unloaded the difficulty off you, in the first place. Can you give us some kind of financial assistance to rehouse these people, because over 300 families live there?" I agree with the Premier's

answer last session that the place should be pulled down but if that were done without provision for extra housing then there would be an even bigger drain on houses built by the Housing Trust. I wonder whether that matter could be taken up.

I wish to refer to some of the remarks made in this debate by the member for Burra. I believe we had all expected in the circumstances a rather vituperative speech from the honourable member in reply to what he himself called the "chidings" he had received from this side of the House in regard to his recent activities. But this was not forthcoming. Like Harold Holt's Budget his speech turned out to be a bit of a damp squib. The honourable member was very objectionable, I thought, when he accused members on this side of the House of repudiating their Oath of Allegiance to the Queen. The fact that the Opposition did not attend the presentation of the Speaker to His Excellency was no reflection whatsoever on the Queen's representative, nor could it reasonably be construed as such; nor was it, indeed, a personal reflection on you, Mr. Speaker. It was a gesture we made as a protest at the whole sordid business of dismissing for political reasons a perfectly good Speaker and replacing him with one who might prove to be just as good but who was put in that position for the basest of reasons. As a consequence, we believed that we were not obliged to assist in the introduction to the Governor of a Speaker we did not support and did not want.

Mr. Harding: What has that to do with the medal business?

Mr. JENNINGS: We on this side of the House do not repudiate our oaths nor do we break our pledges to our Party. Perhaps loyalty, like charity, should begin at home and then burgeon into wider spheres. I believe the member for Burra, who is a man with many admirable attributes, has certainly not shown much loyalty to things that he has been associated with in the past. The member started off by saying:

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.

What he was referring to was another most regrettable incident relating to the subject matter of the last interjection. I shall not pursue it, because I think it could develop into an ugly situation. He concluded by saying:

I have been accused by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) of having applied to join the Liberal Party.

I imagined that this reply was prompted by one of the member for Adelaide's exploratory interjections, but apparently it was not, because Mr. Quirke said:

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.

I think it is obvious from that statement that the member for Adelaide must have had some information because the admission is clearly that the member for Burra is seeking admission to the Liberal Party if it will have him.

Mr. Frank Walsh: He has already applied.

Mr. JENNINGS: It seems as though he must have.

Mr. Frank Walsh: The Party made its decision today.

Mr. JENNINGS: It must be hard up, then. I cannot say that it will remove the majority of one from us because we have not got it now. We have never had a majority while he has been in the House. It will do nothing but make his position clear. I read somewhere that someone once said, "I don't know whether that bird is a duck, but if it waddles like a duck, if it quacks like a duck and if it swims like a duck, then as far as I am concerned it is a duck." As far as I am concerned, seeing that the member for Burra talks like a Liberal, and behaves like a Liberal, he is a Liberal and might as well be on the other side of the House with the Liberals.

I intend to refer to a matter that will not surprise members because they all have a copy of the document from which I shall quote. The letter is over the signature of Dr. Gillis and I am particularly interested in it because it seems as though an injustice may have been done him. Dr. Gillis is a constituent of mine, and Morris Hospital, of which he is the Medical Superintendent, is in my electorate, so I believe

I am justified in quoting some of this correspondence. Incidentally, I have spoken with Dr. Gillis over the telephone about this matter. He states in his letter:

I am writing to you, as everybody knows it is the responsibility of each individual member of Parliament, irrespective of Party (and I am not aware to which Party some I am writing to belong), not only to watch the interests of his own constituents, but also to guard the rights of every individual citizen. It is the very fact of the existence of Parliament in a democratic country, with its individual members, that protects the citizen against arbitrary injustice and victimization, whatever his position in the community happens to be.

Apart from the obvious rights of the public in the matter, as patients and as taxpayers, I have been denied my clear rights under the Public Service Act to the appointment of Assistant Medical Superintendent, Northfield Wards, Royal Adelaide Hospital. I know there can be no true evidence against me, because none exists, and, when I inquired from every person with responsibility for this appointment, what evidence, if any, with proof that it was true, had been produced to them against me, I was positively refused any information. In addition, the Minister of Health has been so misdirected that he has now threatened me with disciplinary action if I, a senior professional officer, try to prevent misrepresentations being successfully passed on to him and other high officials before he and they get the truth from me.

Only last night, the senior magistrate, Mr. L. F. J. Johnston, is reported as having stated that the important thing was that no man was to be convicted unless his guilt was established beyond reasonable doubt. "It is this 'beyond reasonable doubt' that distinguishes us from some countries overseas, where the word of the official is always right", Mr. Johnston said. Implicit in this statement of Mr. Johnston is of course the other fundamental difference—that the official has to produce his evidence with reasonable proof of its truth, and the evidence is never withheld from a citizen so that he cannot refute it.

You will see from the enclosures that I am entitled to this appointment from every point of view—overwhelming superiority of qualification, a record of absolute loyalty to the authorities and the patients in the carrying out of my duties, all the rights under the Public Service Act, and ordinary fair dealing. In addition, the public are entitled to the best qualified person that can be obtained for them, thereby the money available to the authorities being spent to the best advantage for the public and the patients, and not wasted. You will see that no evidence of any kind has been produced against me, not even at the hearing of the appeals board. You could check on this for yourself on the tape recording that was taken of the hearing.

I finally appealed to His Excellency, the Governor and the Executive Council. This appeal was acknowledged by His Excellency through his secretary, and by Mr. King, signing as Clerk to the Executive Council. But I have

received no answer to this appeal either from His Excellency the Governor or from the Executive Council through the Clerk to the Executive Council, Mr. King. On June 9 I wrote to Sir Lyell McEwin, in answer to a letter he had written me through Mr. King, signing as Under Secretary, and I emphasized that I was in no way implying a criticism or reflection on the conduct of the actual hearing of my appeal by the appeals board, and stressed that I was only saying that a mistake and only a mistake had been made.

I received no answer to this letter. After six weeks, I wrote asking all the people who will be responsible for the final appointment what evidence against me had been produced to them. The replies included some that indicated that the authors had not taken part in any proper consideration of the matter at all; one that said that the person concerned was not required to justify his decisions; and others that refused the information on the grounds of secrecy. Nobody would deny that certain deliberations of boards or committees must, of course, be confidential. On the other hand, nobody can have any legitimate grounds for saying that the matter in question is one that needs to be secret or confidential in any way.

The SPEAKER: Order! I assumed that the honourable member intended to quote from that letter. He cannot read the whole letter. I realize that this is a case of alleged injustice, and I do not want to interfere unduly with the honourable member, but this is a lengthy document. The honourable member may intersperse it with argument, but he may not read it all. He may quote from it.

Mr. JENNINGS: I understand that, and I am going to intersperse it with some of my comments soon. I have almost completed quoting this part, and I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, will bear with me a little longer. The letter continues:

I was not asking to have any confidential deliberations revealed to me, only what evidence against me had been produced to the members of these boards and the Executive Council so that I could have the common justice of being able to refute it and show it up as false. I am sorry that the Minister of Health should have been so misled as to feel as insulting the paragraph I had included to show that I knew there could not possibly be any true evidence against me. It was not so, of course, and not intended as such, and not stated as such by the other people, including the Premier, who answered my letter.

You will see, Sir, that the Premier must have a more efficient secretary than has the Minister of Health. The letter continues:

Apart from other very serious matters involved, in one matter it has been proved and recorded on a *Hansard* transcript that incorrect facts and misrepresentations have been put and left on official files by two officials, who have also passed on misrepresentations concerning myself

to the Director-General of Medical Services and others, even to the extent of causing, as long ago as 1960, an official threat of a charge under the Public Service Act against me on false evidence, which one or both of them supplied, and both knew to be false.

Then follows a paragraph which I shall leave out because it is repetition. The final paragraph reads:

It is well known that I am a senior professional public servant, just carrying out my work conscientiously, with a great interest in my work, and having done nothing wrong whatsoever. I am therefore appealing to each member of Parliament, as an individual administrator, separately and together responsible with the Government for fair dealing and good faith with all officers, who do an honest and conscientious job for the State. I appeal to you not to be fobbed off by any excuses or explanations that have or will be given to the Government, for which the proof has not been supplied, nor an opportunity given me to refute them, but separately to take positive action to see that this whole matter and this appointment is rectified.

My only point in reading as far as I have done was to get the matter recorded in *Hansard*, and I shall not read any of the enclosures because every member has had a copy of this correspondence distributed to him. So far as we have been able to see, from what Dr. Gillis has sent us, there is a possibility that an injustice has been perpetrated, and therefore I ask the Government to look again at this matter at Cabinet level in order to see whether the allegations Dr. Gillis makes can be justified.

I wish to say no more in this debate except to refer once again to that very excellent editorial that was read out in full by the member for Wallaroo—the editorial of the *News* of July 17. I agree with every word of the editorial, as all members on this side of the House do and as, I think, many members opposite would if they expressed their real feelings. The only thing I disagree with in the editorial is the heading, which says, "Come off it, Sir Thomas?"; I believe it should have been headed, "Get out of it, Sir Thomas?."

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): Mr. Speaker, I rise, for the first time, to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as proposed to be amended by our Leader. In doing so, I join with other speakers in expressing sympathy to the relatives of the former members who passed away recently. Although I did not have the pleasure of knowing them personally, I met some of them on occasions and found them to

be fair and honest men. I offer my sincere condolences to the widows and children of those departed members.

At this juncture, seeing that our loyalty has been questioned, I reaffirm my loyalty to the Crown. On the question of wearing war medals during the opening of Parliament, I wish to say that I inadvertently left mine at home, and if some of the younger members opposite had taken the trouble to find out the real reasons why some newer members did not wear war medals they would have found out the truth before casting aspersions in this House. I join with other members in expressing pleasure at the forthcoming visit of Her Majesty the Queen and her Consort to this State. Although the visit will be very short, I trust that at some time during the visit Her Majesty will find time to visit some country districts. On the last Royal Visit the people of Renmark and the Upper Murray district had the chance to see the Queen in person. Although I doubt whether that district will be so favoured during the forthcoming visit, I trust that some other parts of the State will have that honour.

During his remarks the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) referred to myself and my family and our efforts to win this seat of Chaffey, as I was successful in winning it on March 3—although there was a period of suspense after that. I think it is well known that my late father contested the seat in 1938 and again in 1941, and that my elder brother contested the seat in 1956 and 1959. This bears out the old story that the third time can be lucky. It was certainly not as the previous occupant of the seat thought: that there must come an end to Currens one of these days. Incidentally, that thought was not appreciated by many people.

One pleasant feature of the closeness of the result was the publicity that was given our district: it really got the spotlight. That, of course, was of great benefit to our district. My final majority was 15, but that in itself does not tell the full story, because three years before that the sitting Liberal and Country League member was elected with a majority of 1,140 in a total vote of a little over 7,000. There was a big percentage swing, with 570 electors changing their minds in three years. I greatly appreciate the honour bestowed on me in being elected to represent the people of Chaffey, and I shall endeavour, to the best of my ability, to represent their interests in this House.

During the short time I have been in the House, I think the questions I have asked

indicate the problems facing the people of my electorate. The major problems at present are concerned with wine grape prices and their payment. Payments at present are delayed. We have finally extracted various reports from the Premier, after many questions as to when they would be available. I should like to make a case for the growers I represent, and in doing so I shall quote firstly from the 1960 report of the Prices Commissioner, tabled on February 12, 1960, which states:

Main grounds of complaint by growers are:

- (a) Since 1952 wine grape prices have declined whilst wine prices have increased.
- (b) Survey carried out by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in 1954 indicates that current prices are unprofitable to many growers.
- (c) Growers are continuing to incur increased costs.
- (d) Representations to winemakers for both increased prices and improved or speedier methods of payment have been unsuccessful.

I quote further from page 5 of this report, paragraph 11, where, in the final subparagraph (c), it says:

It is considered that growers should be paid in full by June 30 each year. It is not suggested that all wineries should immediately adopt this policy as to do so, in some cases, could involve hardship. Proprietary wineries, however, should gradually condition their business activities to achieve this objective. The department is satisfied that a case exists for an increase in wine grape prices and that relief in a number of cases is urgently required.

Now we come to the increased prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner. In the case of the irrigated area the increase of £2 13s. 1d. (say £2 10s.) a ton appears a most equitable solution. Apparently, the Prices Commissioner has based his assumption for that £2 10s. on 6d. a gallon increase to the grower, and that in simple arithmetic means that 100 gallons a ton is recoverable. I have checked this with the greatest wine firm in the State, one of whose officials informed me that the minimum recovery from a ton of grapes would be 125 gallons, and the overall average would be about 130. So once again the Prices Commissioner's recommendation is a little off target in that respect.

The major problem at the present time is the deferred payments system adopted by most large winemakers for the 1962 vintage which was put into operation after completion of the intake of grapes. This practice was adopted by winemakers and in most instances is contrary to the undertakings given to growers by

the buying agents of winemakers. Hardship and serious financial embarrassment have been caused to many growers. As the economy of the Upper Murray area is dependent on fruit production, any deferment of payment naturally has repercussions on all business activity, and alarm has been expressed by one chamber of commerce as to the possible effects on business.

In his latest report the Prices Commissioner claims that reasonable methods of payment are practised at present to a certain extent. I agree with the Commissioner that it is only for this present season, where there has been an extra big crop and all grapes have been taken, with little exception. A few tons was not. As regards the reasonableness of these payments, one winemaker has proposed and initiated payment by monthly instalments, which is causing grave concern to many growers. The fear held by representatives of growers' organizations is that this system may be adopted by other winemakers, and I have been requested by a growers' organization to discuss a suggestion with the winemaker concerned to find a solution to this problem, which solution may ease the present unsatisfactory state of affairs.

The whole set-up of the wine grape purchases is something that will have to be put on a much firmer basis. You, Mr. Speaker, have put forward proposals for a single purchasing authority to operate between growers and winemakers. I consider that is good but I fear it may take some time to arrange. In the meantime a system of individual contracts signed by both grower and winemaker or his accredited agent, clearly stating all the necessary details such as tonnages, quality, prices and terms of payment, could operate for the next and subsequent vintages and would thus overcome most of the causes of the unrest that arises from the present system of purchasing.

To overcome some of the difficulties being experienced by wine and brandy makers in disposing of the large stocks they now hold, I suggest that an approach to the Commonwealth Government for a further reduction in the excise levied on brandy would help greatly. Several years ago the excise on brandy was reduced, and this resulted in increased sales and no reduction in total revenue.

I now turn to the reports available, and the question of their secrecy. On every occasion this matter has been raised—and I understand that the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) had to ask on six occasions to have the first report made available—the Premier's answer

has, apparently, been that secret information was contained in those reports. But I have a section among my papers that deals with that aspect. Section 15 of the 1960 report, under the heading "General Comments", states:

Section 7 of the Prices Act limits the contents of this report to those of a general nature and in arriving at its final assessment the department is precluded from explaining in detail certain factors which have contributed to the recommendation in view of the information given in confidence.

That deepened the mystery of why the reports were not made available. There was nothing confidential in them. The Prices Commissioner says that, and it is a matter of months of questions being asked in this House before the reports are made available. In my opinion, and in the opinion of many growers to whom I have talked about the matter, the secrecy with which these reports have been surrounded is unnecessary and has caused them to be regarded with much suspicion by the growers in my area. There are other reports. The report of the Fruit Canning Industry Inquiry Committee has just been tabled. That was asked for last October by the member for Murray and on that occasion, too, the Premier declined to make that report available because it contained secret information. The secrecy has at last been removed and the report in an abridged form has been tabled, with references to individual canneries being omitted. I welcome its tabling because I have had many requests from leading members of the Canning Fruitgrowers Association for the report to be made available. They are responsible members and want to give a lead to other members. Fruitgrowing is not an annual crop affair. If the crop is not good the grower does not plough it in and hope for the best next year. It is a long term matter.

In addition to this matter of wine grape prices, the growers have had hanging over their heads the matter of the European Common Market. At a meeting last night I was asked whether I could indicate what is likely to happen when Great Britain enters the Common Market. With other people I wished I had been able to give information on the matter. Statements have been made by the Prime Minister, following on his return from Great Britain, that production in my district would be affected. I understand that dried and canning fruits were mentioned on two occasions as being products most likely to be affected by Great Britain joining the Common Market. Although various theories are held about what the entrance will mean to

Australia as a whole, Mr. Bury, the Commonwealth Minister who was sacked, may be right in his opinion. At present it is all a matter of conjecture. I do not say that he is right, because there is no telling what will happen.

Various proposals have been put forward for the general development of the Chaffey district. Some were submitted at meetings held recently in the Upper Murray area by the Industries Development Special Committee. One suggestion was that cotton be grown in the area on a commercial scale. I believe that the matter was referred to the Minister of Agriculture and it was recently announced that cotton would be grown experimentally at Loxton by the Department of Agriculture.

Another proposal was the provision of a stock and domestic water supply in the Overland Corner area. I have been interested in this matter and have contacted various landholders in the area. Most of them are interested and if the cost of water is economic to them they will support the proposal. I am told that such a supply would enable 50,000 to 60,000 acres of scrub land to be brought into production in the area north of the Morgan-Barmera road.

Another suggestion was that a good road should be constructed between Pinnaroo and Bordertown. The matter was first discussed several years ago and if the work were done it would enable growers in the Upper Murray to take their produce by a shorter route to the South-East and to western Victoria.

A few days ago in this place I referred to the need to line earthen channels in the Ral Ral Division of the Chaffey irrigation area. The settlers are concerned about the matter because plantings adjacent to the earthen channels are being damaged. Unless the channels are lined they will prove ineffective in relation to the drainage scheme now being proceeded with.

I wish to thank all the voters in the Chaffey district who elected me to Parliament. I thank also the active supporters who worked so well on my behalf. I express my appreciation to members on this side in particular for their kind and thoughtful help since I took my seat in this House. I also thank members opposite and you, Mr. Speaker, for help to me. Also, my thanks go to members of the staff of Parliament House because they have assisted me wonderfully. I would be remiss if I did not thank my wife for her great assistance, not only during the election campaign but during the last two or three years when I endeavoured

to get to know the people of the Chaffey district better. This disrupted our family life to a certain extent. I thank my wife and the other members of my family for their active co-operation. I was born and bred in the Chaffey district and I assure the people there that anything I do here will be not only in their interests but in those of myself and my family. I trust that I shall at all times carry out their wishes to the best of my ability. I support the amendment to the motion.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support the motion as proposed to be amended, because the time is well overdue for a more realistic approach to land valuations. The sooner it is done the better for everybody. I offer my deepest sympathy to the families and relatives of deceased former members of Parliament. I join with previous speakers in welcoming the four new members to this place. I am sure that they will be an asset to Parliament. My congratulations go to the Minister of Education (Sir Baden Pattinson) on the very high honour bestowed on him by Her Majesty the Queen.

I am pleased that Her Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip will visit this State in the near future. It has become common for the Royal Family to visit Commonwealth countries, and I am sure that the people of Australia are looking forward to welcoming the Queen (as the head of the Commonwealth of Nations) and her husband as they should be welcomed. I am also pleased that the King and Queen of Thailand will be coming to this country, and particularly that they will be coming to this State. I think Australia is destined to become the leader in the South-East Asian sphere. As soon as the Australian people realize that, and knuckle down to a realization that as we are in this vicinity we shall have to live with these people in the future, understand their way of life and deal with them in every way we possibly can, Australia will be a better place in which to live.

About five months have passed since the State elections, when the people of this State voted overwhelmingly in favour of a Labor Government. I have noticed during this session that a change has come over the majority of members opposite; they have lost that sureness which was so prevalent last session. However, this change is understandable in view of the trend of the voting in March. Their winning of the seat of Frome was, in the opinion of members opposite, a foregone conclusion. While they were in the electorate during the election

campaign they called in their big guns. The Premier went all around the Far North and the member for Onkaparinga and the member for Albert were also there, but I shall mention that later. The result was a great blow to the prestige of members opposite, as it showed that the people in the electorate had the same confidence in the ability of the Labor Party to govern as the majority of people in other parts of the State had. A statement made in the campaign needs clarification, and I am sorry that the Premier is not in the Chamber to clarify it. The *Advertiser* reported that at Leigh Creek on February 23 he said that Parliamentary representatives had neglected the Frome district. I consider that to be a serious accusation. Who were the Parliamentary representatives the Premier mentioned? Was he referring to members of the Northern District in another place or to the two members who have represented Frome in this House? As the members of the Northern District in another place are all Government supporters, one being the Chief Secretary, I think it is most unlikely that the Premier was referring to them; so he could have been referring only to members in this House. If that is so, I can think of nothing so despicable as an attack on a man who was not able to defend himself—the late Mr. O'Halloran having been dead for at least 18 months then. If the Premier was accusing me, I can say only that the people of Frome showed conclusively that they were more than satisfied with, and preferred, a Labor representative.

I now turn to matters affecting my electorate. When I entered this House I was under the impression that Ministers read through the speeches made in this debate and answered the questions raised. I thank the Minister of Works for replying to certain matters I mentioned in my maiden speech. More sealed roads and an improvement to existing roads are essential; this work should be given a high priority. My electorate, which is the biggest in area in South Australia, has the huge total of about 10 miles of sealed road—and that has been constructed only in the last 12 months! Much publicity has been given locally and in other States to the beauty of the Flinders Ranges. This subject has been dealt with here before, and I mentioned it last year in this debate and in questions. Because of this publicity, the Flinders Ranges have become a major natural beauty attraction. It is right that this is so because, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others, those ranges are beautiful. However, we must have sealed roads

to the area. I have spoken to hundreds of tourists who have visited the area, and they have all complained about the long distances they have had to travel on dusty roads. The local district council is doing a magnificent job but is fighting a losing battle.

Mr. Pollnitz and the staff of the Tourist Bureau are to be commended for the work they are doing to assist the tourist industry, and Mr. Kevin Rasheed is to be commended for his enthusiasm in catering for people who travel to the Flinders Ranges. The road through the Pichi Rishi Pass is a typical example proving that the Government is doing nothing to help Quorn. Before the Commonwealth railway line was taken on another route which by-passed the town, Quorn was a thriving community. I believe that, if the road from Port Augusta had been sealed before the railway line was shifted, Quorn would have remained a thriving community. That view is held not only by me and by the member for Stuart but by hundreds of people living in the area. The people in the town and district fought back with everything at their disposal to hold the town together. They have shown the true spirit and dogged determination possessed by the northern people and inherited from their forefathers who first opened up that country, and who were responsible in a large measure for the development of the State. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Roads to make available more equipment and men so that the road can be completed this year. The distance involved is only 25 miles, approximately 10 miles or even a little more of which has already been completed, but the District Council of Kanyaka, which is undertaking this work, can complete only about two or three miles a year at the most, and at that rate it will take another four or five years to finish the job. Let us get on with it and finish it now.

Quorn is growing in popularity every year with tourists. The corporation is to be commended for the excellent amenities it has provided. Some time ago I attended a special meeting at Quorn called by the corporation and the district council. Invitations were sent to all South Australian and Commonwealth members of Parliament concerned. The aim was to get suggestions for the establishment of an industry that would benefit the town, where the people were prepared to accept anything that could be offered. On that occasion the Commonwealth Government member said that he could offer no suggestion whatsoever, and that he was sorry that he could not find any solution

to their problem. What a defeatist attitude to be adopted by a member of the Commonwealth Government. That Government should be asked to encourage the establishment of industries in our country towns by granting a period of from five to 10 years free of taxation in order that industries could be established. That would be a real incentive and a challenge to our secondary industries and would help to stop the drift of young people to the city. I see no reason why such a scheme could not be accepted, because such schemes have been employed in other countries. The Commonwealth Government granted tax concessions to the cattle industry in the Northern Territory, so why cannot it grant concessions to secondary industries?

Roads are of high priority in the north. During the election campaign at Burra the Premier said that the sealing of the road from Adelaide to Broken Hill was a top priority. As I mentioned before, there are only about 10 miles of bituminized road in Frome. Last year the Peterborough Businessmen's Progress Association wrote to me and asked if I would ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether it was the Highways Department's intention to continue the bituminized road under construction between Jamestown and Mannanarie direct to Peterborough, if there was no further deviation. The Minister assured me that that would be done and he also told that to people at Peterborough when he visited that town some months before. The letter went on to ask whether it was the department's intention to continue the road through Peterborough to the Burra and Oodlawirra junction, as originally planned when Mr. Jude interviewed the association's representatives at Peterborough. The letter was dated April 11, 1961. I understand that the Minister visited Peterborough and interviewed the Businessmen's Progress Association and informed it that the road would go through Peterborough on to the Oodlawirra-Terowie junction. The position is that the Highways Department is not continuing the bituminizing through to this junction, but is stopping at Peterborough, and that the gang is to be removed south to Bute or thereabouts. It is one thing for the Minister to tell the people one thing and another to turn around and do what he likes. The people up north are getting a little fed-up. Such action is not cricket.

In 1950 I can remember a survey being made for a sewerage scheme for Peterborough, and looking through *Hansard* I notice that the former member for Frome (Mr.

O'Halloran) asked many questions in the House as to when the scheme would be a reality. I understand that the designs were endorsed by the Public Works Committee. Subsequently, the scheme was gazetted, but not proceeded with, because funds would not permit. I ask the Minister of Works to look into this matter to see whether Peterborough has a priority for this work.

Now I come to the question of Radium Hill, which no longer exists. Strangely enough, while I was in Sydney a few months ago and attending a newsreel, suddenly there was flashed on the screen the dying moments of Radium Hill. Some time ago I asked the Premier a question regarding the water main from Umberumberka to Radium Hill, because of the Premier's statement at Burra that because of the top priority of bituminizing the road to Broken Hill they must have water; apparently, water is not available underground. So, the main from Umberumberka to Radium Hill would have been necessary. After I had mentioned the fact to the Premier I noticed that tenders had been called for the sale of this main. It was in a very bad state of repair, and therefore was sold. The report of the Public Works Committee on the Radium Hill water supply, dated 1953—nine years ago—said that the main would be constructed with six-inch galvanized pipes, unlined, and that they would be buried in shallow trenches. The work, it said, could be carried out in about three months. The Broken Hill Water Board was prepared to enter into an agreement to sell approximately 50,000,000 gallons annually, and the agreement was to be for a term of 10 years, with the option of extension. It was also said that the country through which the proposed main would pass did not present any engineering difficulty, and was good from the point of view of external erosion. If necessary, clean sand would be placed around any sections of doubtful soil, and the pipes were expected to have a life of at least 20 years.

That occurred nine years ago and the pipes have rusted out. When I inquired into this matter I found that new pipes were not used. Secondhand pipes were used, although the estimated cost of the pipeline was based on the use of new pipes. The use of secondhand pipes supplies the reason why the pipeline between Umberumberka and Cockburn has caused so much trouble. The north-eastern part of this State up to Cockburn has, over the years, been hard hit through lack of water and much water is carted to the various sidings. This shortage

has affected Mannahill, Olary and even Cockburn, and the Highways Department has to draw water from railway supplies. The department must receive permission to obtain the water from the Railways Department, which will not supply it unless supplies are adequate. The Highways Department could not obtain sufficient water for the bituminizing of the road. I regard the Radium Hill pipeline episode as a blunder on the part of the Government because it did not use new pipes.

The Premier was approached some time ago by the President of the Stockowners' Association of South Australia for the provision of drought relief for certain areas around Oodnadatta. The centre of Australia, particularly the areas around Oodnadatta, has been hard hit by drought and no rain of any consequence has fallen in that area over the past five years. I have visited that region twice in the last 18 months and its condition was the same on both occasions. The area is mainly devoted to cattle raising but, strangely enough, many sheep are also raised. Many of the station owners who run sheep have not raised a lamb in two or three years. I made no secret of my displeasure at the direct approach by the Stockowners' Association to the Government and I told representatives of the association of my displeasure. I told them that they should have approached the member for the district, and I referred to the member for Whyalla because people in his district and others in the far north-west of the State are affected.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Surely they are entitled to act under their own steam.

Mr. CASEY: I told them it would have been better if they had approached their district members instead of making a personal approach to the Premier. The Premier refused the association's request and consequently a letter was written to the Commonwealth Government by the member for Grey. In due course he received a reply from the Hon. Gordon Freeth, Minister for the Interior, which stated:

The proposal that freight concessions be applied for the benefit of graziers was recently the subject of an exchange of correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Premier after the S.A. Stock Salesmen's Association had raised the matter with the Premier. The Prime Minister said that he understood that in times of drought the Governments of Queensland and Western Australia have provided rebates in respect of the cost of transporting starving stock and fodder. Similar rebates have been introduced by the Northern Territory Administration for the benefit of pastoralists within the Territory. The Prime

Minister went on to point out that the Commonwealth does not, however, directly participate in these arrangements which are left to the State or Territory administrations concerned. Accordingly, he informed the Premier that consideration of the proposal for concessional freight rates was really a matter for the South Australian Government.

These people are asking only that they should receive the ordinary concessions granted for the movement of livestock and that the concessions should apply when they bring stock fodder into the area. That is a reasonable request, because similar concessions are granted in the Northern Territory and the same line is used. This is a form of drought relief and in some cases the station owners in South Australia live just inside our border, but their friends live over the border. Their friends receive the concessions but they do not receive them. We may even have a case of a man with property on each side of the border, and if he wishes to move cattle in his Northern Territory area, because they are drought-stricken, he can receive the Commonwealth concession, but if he wishes to shift cattle from the South Australian section he cannot receive the concession. The position is silly.

Mr. Hutchens: It is very disappointing.

Mr. CASEY: It is disappointing for the northern people and I told them that I was prepared to press their claims once again. If the Premier is prepared to discuss these things with me I shall be happy to explain the position in more detail in an attempt to come to an understanding and arrange for him to meet these people.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: How are we to implement this concession you speak of?

Mr. CASEY: The Minister of Agriculture is asking me. I have fixed ideas on the matter, but the Minister is a member of Cabinet and should be able to formulate his own ideas. Recently I had the opportunity to visit the Department of Agriculture in Queensland after noticing an advertisement in a newspaper relating to farmers building tanks on their properties. The Queensland Department of Agriculture, apparently, has received hundreds of inquiries relating to the building of these tanks and I was able to obtain full information on the subject. I spoke to the Director of Agriculture in South Australia and told him that I had procured this information and was prepared to let him have it. If the Minister of Agriculture wishes to peruse this material before I hand it to the Director I shall let him examine it. The provision of tanks may benefit

dairy farmers operating on small acreages and it may help many other small property owners.

During the election campaign the question of electricity was uppermost in the minds of people in the Frome electorate, especially as the Labor Party contended that country tariffs should be comparable with those applying in the metropolitan area. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) visited Hawker and told the people there that no reason existed why they could not get Electricity Trust power from Quorn. When I got to Hawker members of the local council said to me, "What can you do about our electricity supply? We have been promised—"

Mr. Nankivell: There was no promise at all.

Mr. CASEY: This is what I was told.

Mr. Nankivell: You get your facts right!

Mr. CASEY: They told me that the honourable member had said that electricity could be brought from Quorn to Hawker. I told them to ring the Premier and ask him to substantiate that claim, but unfortunately the Premier was absent in the South-East. This type of thing was going on in the Frome electorate during the last election campaign. I must confess that I was surprised that the member for Albert, and a member from the Legislative Council, should go to Hawker and say those things. I am sure they will not want to return to Hawker, but if they do they will have to take their own powerlines with them.

Cockburn, in my electorate, is the starting point in South Australia for the great gauge standardization scheme that we have heard so much about. During the Frome by-election one could almost see the dogs being driven into the sleepers, but now we discover that this scheme was the greatest hoax ever put forward by the Premier. He referred to it at length at a meeting in the Peterborough Town Hall, but it was an untruth and had no foundation: Cockburn's population is about 270, including those on the New South Wales side of the border. It must be one of the few places in South Australia that has not a 24-hour electricity service. It will not be long before diesel locomotives pass through Cockburn from Broken Hill, and in this twentieth century these people should have a 24-hour service.

If I can obtain the Premier's blessing, I am prepared to approach the New South Wales electricity authority to inquire whether a powerline cannot be constructed between Broken Hill and Cockburn. If a main can be put through there is no reason why a powerline

cannot be put through. Some years ago a request was made for a powerline from Radium Hill, but that was a greater distance. My present proposal could be instituted if there were understanding between the State Governments concerned. After all, New South Wales people live in Cockburn, although on their side of the border they call it Burns. The present power is supplied from a D.C. motor operated by the South Australian Railways Department which does not deem it necessary to provide two motors because the load on the present motor during the day is not sufficient and is detrimental to the motor. Power is switched on only in the evenings at certain times.

Mr. Hutchens: Does that mean that refrigerators are out of commission during the day?

Mr. CASEY: Cockburn has no electric refrigerators or fans. Cockburn gets extremely hot in the summer, with temperatures of up to 110 degrees. It is one of the hottest towns in South Australia.

Mr. Nankivell: What has the D.C. current got to do with it?

Mr. CASEY: It is on for only a certain period. People will not purchase expensive items, such as irons, when they cannot be used during the day. They have kerosene and gas refrigerators, and some have installed their own 32-volt lighting. If the member for Albert can help the people of Hawker I expect him to back me up in this case and help me to get some power for Cockburn, even if it comes from New South Wales.

Mr. Jennings: You must want it badly if you want his help!

Mr. CASEY: A touchy question, so far as the Minister of Agriculture is concerned, relates to the abattoirs. A special committee was established some time ago to examine the question of abattoirs, but the Minister has not tabled its report yet. Undoubtedly he soon will, because if he does not we will be asking him why.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I have already told you why.

Mr. CASEY: We do not take "no" for an answer on this side.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Neither do I. I told you why.

Mr. Nankivell: Do you want to see it closed down?

Mr. CASEY: The member for Albert is way ahead of me. I have not even started yet.

Mr. Nankivell: I am waiting for you to start.

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member is surmising—

Mr. Shannon: "Surmising" is the word!

Mr. CASEY: We have galahs by the thousand in Frome, but I did not know they were so prevalent down here.

Mr. Nankivell: Frome has one representing it.

Mr. CASEY: I believe that the weight and grade method could be instituted in our abattoirs. This system has operated in other parts of the world—in Argentina and America—and could work here, although I would suggest that whereas elsewhere the beasts are weighed live weight they could be weighed on the hook here. At present when the primary producer—and the member for Albert is a primary producer as am I—sends beasts to the abattoirs he has no control over the prices he receives for them.

Mr. Shannon: Except public competition.

Mr. CASEY: Here we go again!

Mr. Shannon: All right. You will deny that, of course.

Mr. CASEY: I do.

Mr. Shannon: I thought you would.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: I know that people who send their produce from the country to the abattoirs are disgusted with the prices they receive for it. I will give the member for Onkaparinga an example and, strangely, I was at the bad end of the stick. This is a matter I mentioned to the late Mr. O'Halloran. I sent two calves down from Peterborough, one of which I thought would bring about £18 and the other about £15. That was not only my opinion, but the opinion of the auctioneers who were selling the beasts for me, yet I received a cheque for only £3. I estimated that the price of veal that I received was about 3d. a lb. I also understand that some people today are bringing down their livestock, particularly pigs, and are not selling them at the abattoirs but keeping them in their trucks and asking the wholesalers for their price. That is what the position is coming to at the Metropolitan Abattoirs today.

In the country the set-up is somewhat different. When we take our livestock to a market we do not have to sell it unless we get a price that we think is fair. However, if we send our stock to the Metropolitan Abattoirs we have to take what is offering, and nine times out of ten we are dissatisfied. Only recently a farmer

sent down a calf one week and received £20, and the next week he sent down its twin sister and received £10. Can anyone say that is fair? Under the weight and grade method there is no reason why that producer could not ask to have his stock slaughtered at the abattoirs, graded according to quality and weighed, and then be paid accordingly. I think that is a very fair way of doing it. The abattoirs would have to install a properly refrigerated meat hall, and under this system there would probably have to be two establishments, one to cater for the southern end of the metropolitan area as far as, say, Hallett Cove, and the other, which could be somewhere near the abattoirs, or even at the abattoirs itself, could cater for the northern area as far as Gawler. I know that certain members of the Abattoirs Board definitely favour this proposal. Of course, the wholesalers do not favour it, but there is "pie" buying going on today, in the way the Wool Board discovered it to be going on in the wool industry.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would you cut down the deliveries by the Abattoirs Board?

Mr. CASEY: Not necessarily; that would have to be gone into also. The Minister is getting away from the point. I maintain that the question of this weight and grade method would have to be gone into by a special committee. I do not see that there is anything wrong with it at all. Three years ago, on Wednesday, July 29, 1959, the Premier, in reply to a question, said:

Some considerable time ago the Government desired the grading of meat to be undertaken and offered to the Abattoirs to permit the grading and strip branding of meat . . . it met with much opposition from the industry concerned and it did not appear to meet with any support on the consumer's side.

I suggest that if we asked the producer and the consumer about it we would find that they would welcome this system with open arms.

Mr. Nankivell: Have you looked into this yourself?

Mr. CASEY: Yes, I have.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not question time. The honourable member for Frome.

Mr. CASEY: The majority of people in South Australia rely mostly on reports which they read in our daily newspapers and they are entitled to an unbiased report on all matters which come before this Parliament. In my opinion, newspapers have a moral duty to the community to overcome any false impressions that could arise in the minds of the readers, by printing the truth always.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I wish first of all to join with other members in my expressions of sorrow at the death of some of our colleagues since we last met, and to express my appreciation of the very fine work that they did in their various spheres of office over many years. It is remarkable how quickly the faces have changed in this Parliament during the last few years. I extend my congratulations to the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply (Mr. Freebairn), whose speech showed that he has great promise in this House as a speaker. What he had to say was forthright and clear, and I am sure that he will become a great asset to this House. I add my congratulations also to the other members who made their maiden speeches on this occasion. All of them have shown considerable ability and confidence in making speeches in this House for the first time. We on this side of the House are very happy to have such able new members to assist us in our work.

Mr. Shannon: You badly needed them.

Mr. LOVEDAY: A short while ago I received a notice which once again illustrates that in this session we have seen many things happen which, may I say, are almost unprecedented. I ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, to exhibit on the notice board the notice that I have here.

The SPEAKER: No, that is completely out of order.

Mr. LOVEDAY: We learn now of a great shock to the people of South Australia: a so-called Independent member of this House has joined the Liberal Party.

Mr. Shannon: That upsets you!

Mr. LOVEDAY: No, it does not upset me at all; in fact, it is no surprise, because the member concerned indicated as much when he spoke here only yesterday. As far as the Opposition is concerned, I think the only change that we shall notice is that probably he will be occupying another seat in the House.

Mr. Shannon: In other words, you will not get his vote; you never have had it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla.

Mr. LOVEDAY: A number of things that have happened in this House probably have no precedent. For example, we have seen a Government brought into office by a minority of electors, and we have seen you, Mr. Speaker, elected under rather unusual circumstances.

Mr. Shannon: By a vote of Parliament; that is not unusual.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I said "elected".

Mr. Shannon: That is not unusual.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The circumstances are unusual, and I shall proceed to show why. We were accused by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) of doing something very reprehensible. The member for Mitcham, referring to the occasion when we did not follow you, Mr. Speaker, to Government House, said that that was a very reprehensible thing. As I listened to him I could not help imagining what his attitude on this question would have been had the position been reversed, had we then done what the Government did and had he been sitting on this side and commenting upon the position. I could imagine his going along and consulting on what had been done in the past under, shall I say, somewhat similar circumstances in the House of Commons.

In reference to this matter, I thought that what the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) had to say this afternoon was particularly apposite. I thoroughly endorse all he had to say on that question, with which he dealt so aptly. In view of what I thought the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) might do had the position been reversed, it is rather interesting to notice that, whenever an instance of this sort occurs, in so far as members of the Labor Party are concerned, always there is an effort to put some sort of smear on us in regard to our loyalty to the Crown or our behaviour with respect to Parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Shannon: You have earned that.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The honourable member may not have so much to say when I have pointed out the House of Commons procedure in these matters. I should like also to draw the attention of the House to what the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) had to say when he spoke. I was happy to hear him on the floor of the House because that was the first occasion since I have been in the House that I had the pleasure of hearing him out of the Speaker's Chair. The honourable member had this to say:

As honourable members know, our procedure and Standing Orders are based on the practice of the House of Commons. I refer in particular to Standing Order No. 1, which says that, if there is no provision in Standing Orders in respect of a particular matter, then regard must be had to the practice of the House of Commons.

I should now like to turn to the eminent authorities on this question and see what they have to say about House of Commons procedure relative to the Speaker. Let me say in dealing with this that I have no reflection whatever to

cast upon you, Mr. Speaker; I am dealing merely with House of Commons procedure as set out in all the authorities. May's *Parliamentary Practice*, which is so often quoted as an authority, at page 249 says this:

Confidence in the impartiality of the Speaker is an indispensable condition of the successful working of procedure and many conventions exist which have as their object not only to ensure the impartiality of the Speaker but also to ensure that his impartiality is generally recognized.

Josef Redlich, who wrote *The Procedure of the House of Commons*, has many similar things to say. In regard to the Speaker and his office and authority, he says:

This authority is securely based on the Speaker's absolute and unvarying impartiality, which is the main feature of his office, the law of its life. His impartiality within the House is guaranteed by a number of arrangements to which other Parliaments provide no parallel.

Mr. Riches: Nothing could be more important to a Parliament than impartiality.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Then on page 36 he says:

The complete aloofness from politics imposed upon the Speaker received its full extension during the 19th Century when it came to be considered that he must keep himself free from all political action outside as well as inside the House, even in his own constituency.

I turn next to Sir Ivor Jennings who, in his book entitled *Parliament*, in 1939, says this:

The Speaker is normally chosen from the Government majority.

The present Government had no majority and had to obtain the promised support of both Independents (so-called) in order to have a majority, one of whom was appointed Speaker, the Speaker's vote being essential to the obtaining of a majority. On the question of a Speaker's impartiality, we are now faced with the situation that we have a Speaker who has assured us that he will support the Government on anything that the Premier declares to be a vital issue. Is this impartiality, in those terms?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is reflecting upon the Chair. I ask him to withdraw that.

Mr. LOVEDAY: In deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw, but I have pointed out previously that I am not reflecting on you at all; I am merely stating what these authorities say on the question of the procedure of the House of Commons.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would you have mentioned a Speaker who came up to the qualifications you cite there if he had been a member of any Party?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I am not saying that. I am merely quoting authorities on that matter and pointing out the actual position in regard to this House in view of what has been said. Nothing concerning what I say has been said can be denied. What is more, if the Minister of Agriculture wants to look at the definition of "impartiality", I advise him to look at *Murray's Dictionary*, which is an authority on the English language. It defines it as "Not favouring one party or side more than another".

With regard to what Jennings has to say in his book entitled *Parliament*—which is a recognized authority that I have already quoted—I want now to quote what he says in regard to a particular instance that is relevant to the issue. On page 55 he says:

Mr. Gladstone insisted in 1871 the Speaker ought not to be taken from the Treasury bench—

I am not suggesting that this was done—because to resort to such a measure in critical times would not be without a tendency to lower the dignity of the Chair by giving rise to a suspicion that the disposal of it had been made use of to serve the purposes of the Government.

Those last few words are relevant. I hear no interjection at the moment from the member for Onkaparinga. The same principle was laid down by the Liberal Cabinet in 1895. Again turning to the question whether it is usual to re-elect the Speaker of the preceding Parliament, Jennings has this to say on page 57:

But since then—
that was 1835—

the convention has been established that a Speaker who wishes to continue shall be re-elected, even if the Party from which he came is no longer in office. In 1841 some members of the Conservative Party were in favour of opposing the re-election of Mr. Speaker Shaw Lefevre. Sir Robert Peel declared himself in favour of re-election, for five reasons.

I quote only three because the other two are not relevant. These are the reasons he gave:

First, I do not think it for the public advantage that the election for the Chair should necessarily be made the object of a Party. Secondly, I do not think it would be just towards a Speaker who has shown himself well qualified for his office and has in my opinion acted fairly and impartially, to reject him. Thirdly, I think that the late Speaker, if he be re-elected with the general goodwill of the House, will have greater authority and power to preserve order than a Speaker elected after a party contest.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say on this matter, except that the member for

Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) should be the very last person to talk about members on this side sacrificing principle for expediency.

During this debate we have heard two or three members on the other side say much about the problems of primary producers, who certainly have problems—no-one will deny that. Of course, over the years they have never realized who their real political friends are. As a matter of fact, if one cares to look through the history of the political party that has assisted the primary producers over the years with the marketing arrangements so vital to their welfare, one will find that the originator of these arrangements has always been the Labor Party. It is unfortunate that primary producers have been so misled over the years that they have never recognized their political friends.

When you, Mr. Speaker, first came here you had no doubts about the political friends of primary producers. You came here when they were right at the lowest ebb of their fortunes. I can remember the time because primary producers were fighting to get a fixed price for their wheat. Supporters of members of the Party opposite set up another organization to counter the one supported so strongly by you, Mr. Speaker. It was called the Freedom Association. It is strange that whenever people endeavour to combat a democratic movement seeking to better conditions for its members they use the words "freedom" and "liberty". This was no exception. I can recall that the farmers were experiencing the worst features of the depression and were pressing for what turned out to be a miserable amount of 4s. a bushel for their wheat. It was opposed by farmers spurred on politically by this Freedom Association, which was supported by the Party opposite. It is just as well that at times these things are recalled because the memory of most primary producers in this place is short indeed. Primary producers in those days were in financial difficulties. The finance authorities had no compunction or compassion about the matter. They treated farmers as units. Accounts in the ledgers had to be balanced irrespective of the humanitarian aspect, and if the situation arose again the same attitude would be adopted. Supporters of the Party opposite who say that the Labor Party does not understand the position of the primary producers would see on which side their bread is buttered if a similar situation should arise again.

Mr. Jenkins: Whom are you kidding?

Mr. LOVEDAY: With the Speaker, I went through that period, and we know what happened. I can remember the organization set up by Parliament to control the affairs of the primary producers in financial difficulties trying even to garnishee the baby bonus paid to the wives. Can anyone contradict this? I was interested to hear one or two members on the other side strongly oppose Australia having a Commonwealth shipping line, even though primary producers are faced with lower prices. They demonstrated how the share of primary producers in the national income had been deteriorating for a long time, and they were aided by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke). They said they had no time for a Commonwealth shipping line. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) said:

I believe that shipping is best left in the hands of competitive owners rather than that it should be under State or national ownership. Despite the difficulties referred to, these members were naturally concerned about what might arise from the entry of Great Britain to the European Common Market. They can see serious disabilities arising from the resulting arrangements. Because of that, we must obviously have more control over our exports and the promotion of sales. These people want us to be at the mercy of overseas shipping lines in relation to matters that are vital to Australia's future. History appears to have taught them nothing. The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) proved to the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) that there was a national shipping line and that it was paying its way. Then the member for Rocky River objected to it. He said, by way of interjection:

Any shipping line can make a profit of £1,000,000, and primary producers object to this.

The interesting thing is that if it were a private enterprise shipping line he would expect it to make a profit of £1,000,000, and if he were a shareholder he would grizzle if he did not get a dividend of at least 10 or 15 per cent. Interestingly enough these people object to a national line making a profit of £1,000,000.

Mr. Heaslip: I didn't say that. I said "pay for", not "object to".

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has already made his speech, and he is out of order.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I copied from *Hansard* the words used by the honourable member and I assure him that what I quoted was precisely

what he said. Whenever we have a Government institution members opposite complain that it cannot make a profit, because it cannot be run efficiently as a Government concern. That sort of thing has been said for years. The Commonwealth Bruce-Page Government sabotaged the first national shipping line, yet it did much for the forebears of the members opposite during the First World War and prior to it. Let members go back into history and see what happened. The farmers said the line should not cease to operate because it saved them much in freight costs, but supporters of members opposite who say they are the friends of the farmers sold all the ships. They virtually gave them away. They rigged the board that ran the line so that the profit was turned into a loss. They were hostile towards it and condemned it because it was a national line. Now the farmers are in a bad position but members opposite still condemn any thought of having such a line. Australia is practically the only country in the world of such magnitude that does not have its own ships to cope with its shipping requirements. We are relying in the future on the proper control of our exports and promotion.

Mr. Hall: This is hardly a matter to be decided by this Parliament.

Mr. LOVEDAY: If it is not a State matter, why did members opposite mention it? Mr. Laucke introduced it. If members opposite are so happy with a shipping line being in the hands of private enterprise, particularly overseas private enterprise, let us see what such enterprise is doing to help Australia with her export trade. It is necessary to quote only one or two instances. Australia is charged £170 a ton freight on steel to Singapore, yet the freight from Singapore to Great Britain (twice the distance) is only £120 a ton. We pay £173 a ton freight to Indonesia, yet for the greater distance from Great Britain to Indonesia the charge is only £163. This was complained about even in the journal of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, the great steel monopoly in Australia. That company complained about the discriminatory freight rates charged by overseas combines, but members opposite are happy to ignore all these facts. They are still living in the dim and distant past when everyone thought that anything the Government undertook was inefficient.

Mr. Nankivell: Did you mean pounds or shillings? That is a high freight.

Mr. LOVEDAY: It is pounds. Since 1955, freight rates for beef have increased by 62 per cent, for lamb by 44 per cent and for mutton by 34 per cent, but members opposite are happy not to have a shipping line! An interesting sidelight is the putting into operation of the *Princess of Tasmania*, a vessel that now runs to Tasmania. At a conference of the Australian Political Studies Association held in Sydney in August, 1961, this was said:

The *Princess* has proved probably the most lucrative vessel on the Australian coast;—

This vessel was put into operation by the Australian National Line—

this notwithstanding, private enterprise was not interested in a similar Sydney-Hobart service. So it is again the Australian National Line which has plans well advanced to operate another ferry on that route, to reopen a service private enterprise had not provided for over 20 years.

Why has not private enterprise provided it? Because it has found other avenues that are more lucrative. The service does not matter; all private enterprise is concerned with is the maximum interest it can get on its money. The Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport (Senator Paltridge) admitted this in speaking on the old s.s. *Taroona* before it left on its last voyage on the Bass Strait run, yet members opposite still say that we must not have a national line to ship our goods even in the present circumstances. It is amazing that some people who are supposed to be supporting primary producers have the nerve to come here and tell us that we on this side of the House take no interest in their problems and make these accusations about us when they are not sufficiently interested to see on which side their interests lie.

The member for Gouger said there appeared to be some form of hysteria in the country because of the activities of the Industries Development Committee in going around the country taking evidence on decentralization. He said, too, that anything in the way of decentralization should be done only on a proper economic basis. If he gives that a little thought he will realize that, if all things in the State that favour producers were done only on a proper economic basis, many of them would be discontinued. He should be wary of where he is treading, as this may be put into effect if his advice is followed. It seems to be thought that industries established in Adelaide do not receive subsidies, but they are getting indirect subsidies all the time through the services the Government has to supply to enable workers to get to work at a price they can

afford so that these industries can be supplied with necessary labour.

Mr. Hughes: This costs millions of pounds.

Mr. LOVEDAY: This example can be multiplied in many ways, so do not imagine that an industry is subsidized only if it goes into the country; it is being subsidized in the city all the time. It is not possible to say exactly in terms of money to what extent it is subsidized. That would probably be too vast a problem even for a mathematician, but members have only to consider the matter to realize that this is so. I shall now deal with the activities of the Housing Trust and the Government's policy in relation to it. If the Government had been really seized with the importance of decentralization, what would have been its attitude towards the activities of the trust throughout the State? I (and I think most people) would say that to encourage people to go to the country we must make housing conditions there as good as, if not better than, in the city because, after all, the basic requirement of decentralization is that country conditions shall be, as nearly as possible, as good as those in the city to attract people to the country and keep them there. But what do we find? The Government, through the activities of the Housing Trust, built Elizabeth—the show place. Whenever visitors come to this State they are taken there because it is an example of what the Housing Trust does. Of course, everyone knows that Elizabeth is virtually an outlying suburb and that it is only a matter of time before it becomes absorbed as a suburb.

Do we really find the same attention to design, lay-out, facilities and appearance anywhere else in the State where the Housing Trust has been operating? With all due respect to the trust, I say deliberately that we do not: we find something a little lower in the scale of things. We do not find such a variation in design. I have cuttings taken from the *News* and the *Whyalla News* in which complaints are made about the monotony of the Housing Trust's designs at Whyalla, where there are 2,000 trust houses. Whyalla has the most trust houses of any town outside Adelaide. It is 250 miles from Adelaide, and as the city is the natural centre of attraction because of its many facilities, it is obvious that the distance militates against people going there. However, Whyalla has housing that is not as good as that at Elizabeth, not only in appearance but in other ways. There is less variety of design, as well as less attention to facilities and amenities. What has been done is just good

enough to hold people employed by the B.H.P. Company in the town. This is not the attitude of people concerned primarily with decentralization.

I turn now to another aspect of decentralization—the price of land at Whyalla. Here again the same sort of argument applies. Obviously, if you can provide an incentive to people to go to the country by providing cheap land, it indicates that you believe in decentralization. I think that it is the obvious answer. Whyalla is probably the only place in South Australia where the Government had the opportunity to divide up, for housing, Crown land that was virtually valueless. It is pastoral saltbush country carrying only one sheep to 20 acres. It could have been sold cheaply to people who wanted to build their own houses.

The Minister of Lands in one of his letters said that the first allotments were offered under those conditions in 1940 and that the prices were based on land at £20 for a quarter-acre block. That sounds very good. At that time I think prices ranged up to £100, because these blocks were being sold by auction. A deputation waited on the then Minister and said that this was not the best way to allot the land, and that the people should be putting their money into furniture instead of so much of it into the land and the house. He agreed that the land should be allotted at £30 a block or thereabouts, and this was done for a number of years. Under that scheme the ratio of house builders and purchasers rose very sharply. I think that at that time a higher proportion of people were buying their own houses than anywhere else in South Australia. By 1959 prices had reached £70 and £80, and even that was still reasonable, taking into account the change in prices during that time; but from 1959 to 1961 prices jumped from £70 and £80 up to £320 and £340 a block, and it was hard to sell them. Is this encouraging house ownership and decentralization? The Minister's answer was that it was considered that the prices were reasonable, but they had no relationship to the value of the land. Of course they did not, because the land was almost valueless.

As to the answer that the prices were reasonable, it depends on one's interpretation of "reasonable"—whether it is reasonable under the circumstances to charge £340 for residential blocks of a quarter-acre which two years before were being sold for £80. It was pointed out that these higher prices included the cost of roadmaking, which previously had not been included. Assuming that one has

a 22ft. sealed road and that each house owner is responsible for half the cost of the road fronting his property, including the kerbing, footpaths, and gateway approach, the total would be £100. So, if we add that to the £80 we get £180 as the prices these blocks should have been made available at, and this would still show a handsome profit to the Lands Department, because the land was valueless. Instead, the people were being charged £320 and £340. Is that the attitude of a Government that believes in the value of decentralization and one seized with the importance of making blocks available to people to build their own houses?

Many people arriving at Whyalla come from overseas. I have heard members opposite say that immigration is essential to the development of this country and I agree. However, many of these people arrive without a cracker in their pockets, and they go into a rental house, and usually stay there. The Government's policy has not been in the best interests of decentralization or with the aim to enable people to get their own houses as quickly and cheaply as possible.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) had something to say about housing. He said in reference to the Government's announced new deal to young married couples, that it would provide advances up to £3,000 to give them the opportunity to build at a repayment rate of only 2s. 6d. weekly for every £100 borrowed; and in the event of the breadwinner dying the loan would be cancelled. He also said:

This is one of the greatest examples of social legislation in our history—introduced by the Liberal Party, mark you, and not the Labor Party. It was announced by the Government before the election as a plank of its platform. I did not hear that type of thing suggested by the Labor Party.

If he had paid the same attention as the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) to the Labor Party's booklet containing its platform, he would have seen what our policy was in this direction. I am surprised that he does not pay a little more attention to these matters before making such a statement. In our platform on this subject it is provided that the Party believes in the encouragement of workers' homes co-operatives for the purpose of providing houses for the workers, and the building of a sufficient quantity of multiple-type houses; the establishment of a fair rents court; and provision by insurance that, in the event of the death of a breadwinner in a State purchase house, the house shall become

the freehold property of dependants without further financial obligation.

If the honourable member cared to look at our Commonwealth platform he would see that provision was made for the supply of cheap interest money for housing at preferential interest rates. So, he was very much off the beam when he said that the Labor Party had never put forward proposals of this character. I can remember his speaking about this matter several times. During the present debate he said:

The Liberal and Country League believes in encouraging home ownership. Our friends opposite seem to be opposed at times to an increase in the number of people owning their own houses, whereas the L.C.L. believes in encouraging home ownership.

Let us see whether his viewpoint squares up with that of his Commonwealth counterpart. This is what Mr. Bury, who until recently was the Minister assisting the Commonwealth Treasurer, had to say, as reported in the *Advertiser* of July 6, 1962:

It is the natural desire of the States not to become landlords. However, houses are often sold by the States on small deposits, low interest rates and long-term repayments. The result is that the States offer terms which private enterprise finds difficulty in matching. So, the Minister is concerned about the competition being afforded private enterprise by the State housing authorities. He does not like it. The press report also included the following:

This had resulted in an extra demand for Commonwealth finance. It would be unreal to assume that the Federal Government would make extra money available for housing. The States, by selling houses, also reduced the number of houses available for rent by people in the low-income brackets.

Silence rules supreme on the other side of the House. The press report continues:

The States should create higher and more rigid terms in the sale of houses to people who could afford to pay the higher rates.

Of course that is in direct conflict with the views expressed by the honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. Coumbe: Mr. Bury advocated house ownership.

Mr. LOVEDAY: "The States should create higher and more rigid terms in the sale of houses to people who could afford to pay the higher rates." And the honourable member was eulogizing the lower and less rigid terms that he says his Government will extend. Mr. Bury went on to say:

This will enable extra money to be diverted to slum clearance.

Therefore, it is about time State members of the Liberal Party brought their policy into line with that of Commonwealth members of the Party.

Mr. Nankivell: Why should we?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Obviously, over the years what the States have done on housing has been bound up with and has, in a large measure, been dependent on the treatment received from the Commonwealth Government in relation to the sums granted and the interest rates payable. In fact, according to press accounts of meetings between the Premiers and the Commonwealth Government, they have always battled on the question of interest rates. This is one reason why the cost of housing has increased so much over the years. Let us see what has happened to interest rates under the beneficent influence of the Liberal Party in control of the Treasury benches in Canberra. The interest rate for house-building has increased from 3½ per cent in 1945 to 5½ per cent in 1961, and this is what Mr. Brodie (Chief Clerk, Registry of Co-operative Housing Societies in Victoria) had to say when the rate went to 5½ per cent:

On a £3,000 loan the repayment of interest would advance by 25s. a month at the new rate of 5½ per cent.

For every ½ per cent increase in the interest rate we have a corresponding increase in rent of at least 6s. a week.

Mr. Nankivell: What will the honourable member do about it?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I am illustrating the conflicting viewpoint between members of the Commonwealth Liberal Party and members of the State Liberal Party and stating that the position of the States in relation to housing largely depends on the money they receive from the Commonwealth and the interest rate. In fact, on previous occasions I said that it was most unfortunate that the Premier had to pay so much more for the money he received from the Commonwealth Government. I pointed out that it was wrong that the Housing Trust should have to pay bond interest rate on the money it received, and that there should be a preferential interest rate.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: If the honourable member was the Commonwealth Treasurer what would he do about the interest rate?

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Party has stated that preferential interest rates should apply to house building.

Mr. Heaslip: What about the primary producers?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Surely the honourable member is not going to drag in the primary producers again after what I said about his attitude on shipping. I have stated what I would do; I am a member of the Labor Party and I endeavour to carry out its platform.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Where would you get the money from?

Mr. LOVEDAY: That could be overcome if reasonable control were retained over the banks.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You do not get cheap money if you cannot pay a reasonable price for it.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Minister must surely know that if the Commonwealth Bank acts properly as the people's bank it can decide the interest rate charged for its money. I refer at length to housing, because it has been a feature of many speeches in this debate and is an important question. Indeed, members on this side have regarded it as a fundamental social question. I was interested to note some pertinent remarks in the Auditor-General's report on the activities of the South Australian Housing Trust. If I say anything critical of the Housing Trust I do not mean to imply that my Party is not fully behind an organization such as the trust. We believe it is the only way in which the needs of the community can be met but, nevertheless, we believe that there are grounds for criticism and that, if our criticisms are followed up, they can lead to improvements in the trust's operations.

We have listened far too often to the story that this is the best housing authority in Australia, that it is without peer, and that nobody else can touch it in its operations; but much can be learned from the operations of other housing authorities in Australia. I noticed that, according to the Auditor-General's report, effective applications for rental houses still held by the trust totalled about 8,000. The Premier answered a question on this matter only yesterday.

In the metropolitan area the waiting time for a house is still about five years and I understand that a tremendous demand still exists for rental houses. We have just been told that the policy is not to build more double units and that, I may say, from many points of view is a good move but, nevertheless, surely something has to take their place. It has been said that the number of people vacating rental houses is sufficient to enable the trust to satisfy the needs of those desiring those houses. That assertion remains to be proved, and I question its accuracy in view of the figures given.

Let me turn to the sale of houses. According to the Auditor-General's report, (page 7), the number of applications received for the purchase of houses from 1952-53 to 1960-61 reached its highest peak in 1954-55—3,873—but since then it has steadily declined. The decline has not been continually progressive. The figure rose from 2,750 in 1957-58 to 3,418 the following year and then fell to 3,098 in 1960-61. One would think that, with a Government professing to be so concerned about the promotion of house ownership and having under its command the best housing authority in Australia, the number of people purchasing houses would have risen, but that is not the case. It has declined. On page 8 of the report the Auditor-General states:

Applicants, before they can be allotted a house, must have sufficient moneys in hand to pay the necessary deposit and meet stamp duties and other expenses.

Here again we have a conflict of policy between the State Liberal voice and the Commonwealth Liberal voice. Here they say that they want to promote house ownership, but undoubtedly the applicants have been affected by Commonwealth policy. The credit squeeze and other factors have rendered it impossible for many people to go ahead with their plans to purchase houses. Some interesting information regarding the selling of houses is contained in this report. The selling price of a brick dwelling of five rooms—1,120 square feet overall area and roofed with tiles—was £2,880 in 1953, but £4,100 in 1961. The Auditor-General comments in this regard:

During the above period land values, which increased by £395, accounted for one-third of the total increase of 42 per cent.

I have frequently referred to the fact that, although better techniques are employed in house building nowadays, the costs are not falling and it is more difficult for a wage earner to purchase a house. Although the selling price of these houses has increased by 42 per cent over the period I have mentioned, the basic rate has increased by only 21 per cent and a fitter's rate by only 32.7 per cent. It is becoming harder for a wage earner to purchase a house under Liberal administration throughout the Commonwealth. Higher land values accounted for one-third of the increase, and these have been caused by speculative land transactions to which the Opposition is opposed, but which are not criticized by members opposite.

Mr. Coumbe: No! The Premier has frequently spoken against them.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The people benefiting from speculation are invariably supporters of the Party opposite. The fact remains that it is difficult to acquire a house, and it is becoming more difficult as time passes. The fact that housing loans are now on a 40-year basis instead of a 20-year basis is further evidence of that position. When one examines what the Leader of the Opposition said on this question, one cannot help wondering how the wage earner getting less than a skilled person's rate can buy a house if he has a family. The Leader said, "Let us examine the financial commitments of a couple under this scheme." He was referring to the Government's new scheme whereby an applicant had to be under 25 years of age—although later the age was increased—and had to find the difference between an advance of £3,000 and the cost of his house. The Leader said that this difference could be as much as £1,500 and that in addition the applicant required a surplus of not less than £15 a week after he had met his mortgage repayments of about £4 a week. That puts such a commitment outside the scope of many persons who do not get a tradesman's rate. Indeed, even a tradesman would find it difficult to purchase a house under those circumstances.

Mr. Jenkins: You are quoting the higher-priced house; there are houses that cost only £2,300.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I am quoting what the Leader said. Let us examine the cost of houses provided by the Housing Trust. A five-room brick house costs over £4,000.

Mr. Jenkins: They are not all brick houses; there are other cheaper houses.

Mr. LOVEDAY: That is so, and I will have more to say about them later.

Mr. Hutchens: He is referring to little houses.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is entitled to be heard without interruption.

Mr. LOVEDAY: If a person were purchasing a house over a 40-year period he would have to find about £4 a week. That is not denied. However, the basic wage today is only £14 3s.

Mr. Coumbe: The tradesman's rate is about £19 9s.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Let us work on the basic wage and assume that a man has a family of two or three children. How can he afford to buy a house under those conditions?

Mr. Jennings: He can starve!

Mr. LOVEDAY: He is being encouraged on every hand to pay a few shillings down on this, that and the other thing for use in his house. In fact, if he were not doing so he would be told by the Premier, "Industry just cannot carry on working if hire-purchase is cut out."

Mr. Jennings: It would dry up!

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, so the worker has to participate to keep industry going, and he usually does. Having in mind this burden on him, how can he buy a house under these conditions? I will listen with interest to any mathematician opposite who can explain to me how the man on the basic wage (or the man enjoying a small margin over it) can buy a five-room brick house, or something less than that, under the present arrangements—even the wonderful arrangements that have been mentioned during this debate.

Mr. Jennings: You are an optimist expecting to find a mathematician opposite. They cannot add one and one and make two.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Whyalla.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Premier, in speaking on this question of single-unit houses in a broadcast, was reported to have said, "Here I believe we will have a housing programme unique in the world." He said that deposits would be as low as £50 in appropriate cases, that loans would be repaid over 40 years, and that weekly repayments would be between about £3 15s. and £4 a week. It is not a programme unique in the world. It is not even unique in Australia. Surprisingly, we have not examined what the other States are doing. One would have thought that with all the housing authorities in Australia there would at least be a constant interchange of information on the subject of what each is doing and an interchange of officers. Definite advantages would arise from such an interchange.

The Western Australian Housing Commission has a wonderful scheme and we could adopt some of its methods here. I was privileged last January to be taken around by a senior officer of the Western Australian Housing Commission and I was able to see what it was doing. It does not believe in double-unit housing. It is constructing single units, and when I was there it was using 12 designs, which are varied from time to time. I am referring to five-room houses, almost all with tiled roofs with great variations in the colour and texture of the tiles. No corrugated iron is used and only three or four per cent at the most are roofed with corrugated asbestos.

These are all brick veneer houses. The best quality jarrah is used throughout, including the floors. All have three bedrooms, a modern bathroom and a hot water unit; they are well-equipped and well-finished throughout. The finish of these houses is far superior to anything the Housing Trust is providing in Whyalla, although I do not know what is happening elsewhere because I cannot examine that.

How is this achieved? Simply by more rigid inspection. We had occasion in Whyalla some time ago to lodge serious complaints about the way certain Housing Trust purchase houses were finished. Of course, it was regarded as being almost heresy to say such a thing, but the complaints were substantiated and the houses, which were new ones, had to be repaired. It was disclosed that the person responsible for the inspections had the impossible task of having to inspect not only the houses being built at Whyalla at the rate of more than 300 a year but also the houses the trust was building as far away as Ceduna and Tarcoola. That was an impossible task to impose upon anybody.

Mr. Jenkins: How many would be built at Tarcoola?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Only an odd one here and there, but the travelling time involved in travelling that distance in the course of a year—and I think the honourable member knows the distance involved—would be terrific. After all, when a house is being built it needs frequent inspection. This was the task imposed upon the inspector. This state of affairs provides all the opportunities in the world for these get-rich-quick contract builders, employing labour at under-award rates through sub-contracting methods—and this matter has been dealt with during this debate—to put in work that is not satisfactory. I have been told that the inspectors in Western Australia have to inspect no more than about 75 houses in a year if they are in the country; if they are in the city area they are responsible for the inspection of 120 to 150 houses. That is why the finish is so good in Western Australia. An interesting feature is that the Western Australian houses cost between £3,300 and £3,400, with a maximum of £3,500, which is better than can be done here. Of course, the Auditor-General's report referred to the fact that the cost there was slightly less than here.

Mr. Jenkins: They have brick veneer houses as against our solid brick.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I appreciate that, but if the honourable member cared to inspect those

houses he would see that they were 100 per cent satisfactory for a house owner. They are a beautiful job and, what is more, the appearance of those houses, because of their finish and the variety in the tiles, design and so forth, is completely different from anything we have in any country area. I exclude Elizabeth, because that is a show place.

Another interesting feature about this Housing Commission's work was that the maximum waiting time, if a person desired a special location and a special design or type of house, was 12 months. If a person wanted a house straight away he could go into one straight away. That was the position in January of this year. These houses could be either rented or purchased at the option of the person concerned. That is a tremendous advantage, because when a person arrives in an area he is not always certain whether he wants to stay, so he rents a house. He then purchases his carpets, linos and other things. If he does that when he goes into a double unit such as we have here and he gets set, he is not so keen on moving into a purchase house. He has done all these things and his attitude is that because he has put in much work he will stay there. If a person goes into one of these houses in Western Australia he spends some time getting set while he is paying rent.

Mr. Nankivell: How much?

Mr. LOVEDAY: About £3 17s. If he decides to stay in that locality he probably decides to purchase the house. If he makes this decision within the first six months he gets the house at cost price; if he makes that decision after six months he gets the house either at cost or market price less 10 per cent, whichever is the greater. That takes care of any inflationary situation which may have occurred since the house was built, and that is fair both to the commission and the would-be purchaser. I have already instanced some of the tremendous advantages of this. It is a tremendous encouragement to house ownership. On this question, let us compare that with what is happening here. We have heard much about the promotion of house ownership. The Housing Trust in its last report states that it has built 25,997 dwellings for rental and 20,578 houses for sale; in other words, less than 50 per cent of the houses have been sold. The annual report of the Western Australian State Housing Commission for 1960-61, on the other hand, states:

In the country areas, houses erected by the commission were predominantly for rental, although on a State-wide basis over 80 per cent

of all homes erected during the year were disposed of on a purchase basis.

Over 80 per cent! I suggest that this policy should be adopted here. Members on this side of the House have said that the position regarding rental houses is still desperate, and it is still desperate. The policy we have heard outlined leads us to think that there will be no more double units and, apparently, no more rental houses built. I suggest that if we are going to have these houses built on the lines indicated by the Government, they should be available either for rental or for purchase. I say definitely that, in view of the experience of Western Australia, that will not be a barrier to purchasing houses; in fact, it will be a fillip and an incentive. What is more, it will provide an opportunity to a person to rent a house if he wishes to do so.

Mr. Nankivell: How do the cheaper rentals in Western Australia compare?

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Housing Commission has a variety of houses, built earlier in its experience going back a good many years, which are cheaper, in the same way as the Housing Trust in South Australia has houses that are cheaper than the ones now being built. But, as the honourable member probably knows, when a tenant leaves a house that was built many years ago, the rent is raised to a level about that charged for houses being built now. Some houses in Western Australia have lower rents than others, but I am talking about the policy that has been followed by the Western Australian Housing Commission for some years. The driving force behind this policy was the Minister for Housing in the Labor Government in Western Australia before the present Liberal Government came into office—the Hon. Herbert Graham. In fact, some flats are named after him in Perth and, in my opinion, they are the finest flats for pensioners I have seen anywhere. There again provision is made that, if a couple goes into one of these flats and one of the couple dies, the rent is reduced by half. They are paying 27s. 6d. a week for pensioner flats, splendidly equipped in every conceivable way and beautifully designed.

Mr. Nankivell: Are they multi-storey flats?

Mr. LOVEDAY: They are three-storey flats, the top storeys of which are let to business couples who pay slightly more than the economic rent to offset the uneconomic rents of the two lower-level flats. So, instead of talking so much about priority and the superior methods in every respect that we have in our

housing arrangements here, we should be looking round, exchanging information and trying to discover whether there is anything better in the other States that we could adopt. I am certain that what I have spoken about this afternoon points to some particularly good methods, better than those we are employing in South Australia.

My last point concerns the opal fields in my electorate. I refer first to Coober Pedy. I had the privilege of opening a new school there recently and want to thank the Minister of Education (Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson) for being so helpful in getting that school established. The native children who were attending school, first of all, in what is known as the community hall on the opal fields have now been transferred to a three-classroom school and, although they have been attending school for only a relatively short period, the change in them is tremendous. In fact, one would not know them for the same children as the result of their having that comparatively short period of education. It points to what should and must be done for aboriginal children throughout the State.

I should like to mention also the excellent work being done by the departmental welfare officer of the Aborigines Department (Mr. Busbridge), and his wife. Although they have not been there long, they have already achieved wonderful changes in the native people there. If we can appoint competent welfare officers of this type elsewhere in similar situations—and I believe that consideration should be given to appointing one at Andamooka—that will go a long way towards solving the difficult problems confronting both these fields.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The honourable member realizes that we have to get the right men?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes. I said previously in this House that I thought attention should be given to the training of the natives in this work without reducing standards. I realize

that this presents difficulties but I am certain this is the way to achieve confidence, particularly among the people being helped.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I do not know whether we could go that far at the moment, but the idea of having aborigines in responsible positions in charge of other aborigines appeals to me greatly.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I think when one examines what has been done in other countries in the field of native welfare, countless examples can be found of successful ventures in this direction. It has frequently been said, "What does the State get out of the operations of the opal fields?" I do not want to elaborate on this except to reiterate that the opal production and exports have again risen in the last year. Whereas in 1959-60 the exports of opal were valued at just on £1,000,000 (of course, these figures are always somewhat inconclusive and conservative because the statistics are not full; they are obtained from only a limited number of buyers) exports for 1960-61, according to the Commonwealth Census and Statistics Office, have risen to £1,122,000, which shows that these two opal fields provide the basis of a valuable export trade. They are the only two fields from which a substantial quantity of opal comes. The other opal fields in Australia have virtually petered out, or at least are not being worked. We have in this State two valuable assets in these opal fields.

I take this opportunity of thanking the Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson) for his assistance in seeing that these two fields were helped by water cartage during the dry period in the last year. Having said this, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, as amended.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 9, at 2 p.m.