

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 18, 1962.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Supply (No. 3),
Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy.

DEATH OF HON. A. J. MELROSE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Alexander John Melrose, former member for Midland District in the Legislative Council, and place on record its appreciation of his public services: and that, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased member, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Several members of this Chamber were here when the late Mr. Melrose was a member of this House. They will remember his services, and particularly the keen interest he took in agricultural and pastoral matters. When he was in this Chamber he was an acknowledged expert on agricultural and pastoral matters, and he was noted for his attention to that very important phase of the State's economic development. I believe that he was regarded by everybody who knew him as a fair-minded and honourable man who was dedicated to his work and to the service of his country. Therefore, it is with great regret that we record his passing.

I sometimes think that the public generally does not realize how much attention and time a member of Parliament gives in the service of his country, and that his job is sometimes looked upon as being an easy one that occupies little time. However, I assure honourable members—although I know they need no such assurance—that a member who is taking a keen interest in his work cannot find sufficient hours in the day in which to undertake the work involved in representing his district in this House. This was particularly so in the case of Mr. Melrose because he took a particular interest in such an important phase of the work of Parliament. I know that his advice upon all pastoral matters was valued by honourable members on both sides of the House, and his passing will leave a tremendous gap in the legislative establishment of this State.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I second the motion. We always regret

the passing of an honourable member, especially when the member concerned is still in the saddle, as it were, as was the late Mr. Melrose. The late honourable member was the member for Burra Burra in this House in the five-year Parliament between 1933 and 1938, I believe with the late Sir George Jenkins and Archie McDonald as his colleagues. He was the member for Stanley from 1938 to 1941, and in 1941 he was elected to represent the Midland District in the Legislative Council. His honorary positions included those of President of the Zoological Society, President of the Royal Institution for the Blind, and Chairman of the South Australian Fauna and Flora Board. The name of Melrose goes back for many years. Although the late honourable member associated himself with much public work, he was not one to seek the limelight: he carried out that work from sincere and genuine motives, without any thought for publicity, for that was his make-up. I join the Premier in paying a tribute to the late honourable member.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[*Billing suspended from 2.10 to 2.30 p.m.*]

QUESTIONS.**EDWARDSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates about the Edwardstown Primary School?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Working drawings and contract documents for the erection of additions to the Edwardstown Primary School have been completed. The Director of Education has recommended to the Minister of Education that this be one of four additions to the present Loan programme. It is hoped that it will be possible to proceed with this work later in this financial year.

DAW PARK TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates regarding a new technical high school in the Daw Park area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The need for a technical high school in this area has been recognized for some time and action is being taken to purchase a suitable site to the south of the proposed new Mitcham (Daw Park) High School.

The Mitcham High School will be built on about 20 acres of land in Daw Road that has

been reserved for a secondary school, as I said in my reply during the Loan Estimates debate. The Minister of Education has approved of this new high school's being known as the Springbank High School.

TRADE BALANCE.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Premier say whether, as reported in the press on Monday of this week, preliminary figures released by the Bureau of Census and Statistics indicate a favourable balance of £3,478,000 for July last in this State compared with £3,807,000 for the corresponding month last year? If these figures are correct, is there any significant reason for the decline in the value of exports by £3,343,000 and for the rise in the value of imports by £1,986,000? Does the reported fall in the value of exported barley from £1,728,000 in July, 1961, to £195,000 in July, 1962, indicate that we are losing overseas markets in that commodity?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I may reply to the latter part of the question first, I do not believe that the reduction means that we are losing overseas markets but I think the figures show the dependence of this State on primary production. I understand that the decline has arisen almost entirely because stocks of grain in this State have been depleted and we are not at present forwarding stocks of grain overseas to the same extent as we did during the previous year. Bulk handling of grain has meant a much more rapid disposal of our crops, and there has been no carry-over. If the honourable member looks at railway figures he will see that railway earnings from grain have also fallen off heavily. Last year's crops of grain have substantially been exported.

PEP PILLS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In the unfortunate absence of the member for Mount Gambier, I have been requested by the Mount Gambier Trades and Labor Council to ask the Government to consider the advisability of bringing pep pills under control so that they can be procured only with a doctor's prescription. The council claims (and says it has good reason for its deduction) that many accidents that occur with semi-trailers travelling long distances are caused by exhaustion of drivers who are regular consumers of pep pills, which keep them awake until they become exhausted. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Minister of Health to see whether the Department of Public Health will consider acceding to this request?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will do as the honourable member requests, but I believe the question rather emphasizes the need for a much more definite control over long-distance driving in this continent. Cases have come to the notice of the Government recently in which people have been driving heavy vehicles for extremely long periods, and I believe that this is an action which ultimately all States will have to take steps to control, because not only does it lead to exhaustion of the driver (and, in some instances, I think that would constitute an undesirable industrial activity) but, what is much more serious, it undoubtedly conduces to road accidents because persons cannot drive for these long periods and still have the alertness that would be expected of them. As the honourable member knows, we have a singularly difficult position because of section 92 of the Constitution, but I will have the matter examined from the point of view raised by him and see whether this matter can be listed for interstate consideration.

LIGHTING OF TRANSPORTS.

Mr. LAUCKE: My question relates to the lighting on heavy transports when parked on roads. I am concerned about the high incidence of accidents, many of them fatal, occurring through motor vehicles colliding with parked semi-trailers. The hazard is increased through ineffective lighting on parked heavy transports or through the inefficiency of reflectors placed on the roads as required by the Road Traffic Act. The proposal of the Chamber of Automotive Industries of South Australia that, when a heavy transport vehicle is left parked within 8ft. of the kerb, it should be marked by two flashing red lights on the back corners of the vehicle has, in my opinion, much to commend it. In the interests of public safety, will consideration be given to prescribing this type of lighting as that necessary under the Road Traffic Act for indicating parked transports on our roads?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will have that matter examined. We have now established fairly consistently throughout Australia a National Road Traffic Code and our own regulations have just been brought up to date in accordance with the recommendations of that body. If we have in our Act a provision that is not Australia-wide in its application, drivers of visiting transports obviously will not be acquainted with it and probably will not comply with it. In those circumstances, although they commit an offence, they create a greater hazard than if the provision had not been made.

SALISBURY SCHOOL ENROLMENTS.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 21 about future plans to cope with the accommodation and the overflow of enrolments at the Salisbury Consolidated Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have a fairly lengthy report from the Superintendent of Primary Schools, in which he says:

It is not expected that the building of a new primary school at Salisbury West will have any influence on the enrolment of the Salisbury Consolidated School. The school that will be affected is the Sansbury North school. The building of a new school at Brahma will, however, have a decided effect on the Salisbury Consolidated School, as all the children from the Brahma area at present have no other school nearby at which they can attend.

The Sansbury school has a total of 22 classrooms which can, on the normal basis of 40 children per room, accommodate 880. On August 17, 1962, the enrolment was 870. Since my memo of August 22, 1962, was submitted, the Acting Assistant Superintendent of Primary Schools, Mr. Gunton, has asked for approval to rent the hall of St. John's Anglican Church in readiness for the appointment of an additional teacher when required. It is not expected that this additional accommodation will be sufficient to house the children that will enrol at the school before the new school at Brahma is ready for occupation. It is hoped, however, that the school will be ready for occupation by February, 1964, if not earlier. In the meantime, of course, the enrolment at the Salisbury Consolidated School must be expected to increase considerably since it increased by 151 in the 12 months ending July, 1962. If the increase in enrolments continues at this rate, it is thought advisable not to incur the expense of erecting four or more timber classrooms that would probably be in use for 18 months at the most. It would be much cheaper to transport classes of children to the schools in Elizabeth as required. The Elizabeth South school has four spare rooms, and spare accommodation could be found at other Elizabeth schools, especially when the Elizabeth West and Elizabeth Downs schools are completed and occupied in February next, as is expected.

The delay in the erection of the Brahma school building is unfortunate, but it was brought about by the fact that the owner of the site was overseas, and the acquisition of the land could not be completed until his return. In short, the position is that the Salisbury Consolidated School at present has sufficient accommodation, although the infant assembly room and the primary library are in use as classrooms; the hiring of St. John's Church hall can provide accommodation for an additional class as soon as required; the transport of children to the Elizabeth South and, if necessary, other Elizabeth schools would be much cheaper than erecting timber classrooms at Salisbury for use over a short period.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Mr. Speaker, have you any further information or replies regarding the letter you sent to our Senators some time ago in connection with the resolution passed in this House on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie gauge standardization?

The SPEAKER: I have received this additional letter:

The Speaker, The House of Assembly, Parliament House, Adelaide, S.A. Dear Mr. Speaker, Re: Gauge Standardization. I acknowledge the proof of the Debate in the House of Assembly on 23rd August enclosed with a notice from your Office indicating that it was sent with the compliments of the Speaker. This document, delivered to my Office in Adelaide, was immediately sent to me in Canberra by my secretary. When speaking in the Senate on the above subject raised in the House of Assembly, I was able to refer to the matters therein contained. I want to assure you, however, that my omission to write to your Office acknowledging the document was not in any way meant as being discourteous to you or the House of Assembly of which you are Speaker. Yours faithfully, K. A. Laught, Senator for South Australia.

As regards replies that have not been received from other Senators, I think they have overlooked the fact that the resolution came from this House by unanimous decision. Therefore, they are ignoring the whole of this Parliament which, incidentally, represents the whole of the people of this State. When Senators treat the people of this State and this Parliament with such a disdainful approach, I do not think there is much political future in it.

OSBORNE SOOT NUISANCE.

Mr. TAPPING: I have received a petition from 200 people living near the Osborne powerhouse, but as it does not comply with Standing Orders I ask the Premier to regard it as a request. It states:

We, the undersigned residents of Osborne, beg to lodge a protest against the soot and steam menace created by the Electricity Trust of South Australia powerhouse situated at Osborne. Most of the soot blowing is done in the early hours of the morning, when at that time there is nearly always an easterly wind. Under these conditions, the whole area is covered by a pall of smog. Also the noise of the steam which is blown to atmosphere at all hours of the day and night is appalling. We consider that these conditions which are a menace to health and property can be eliminated.

I have raised questions on this matter frequently. Will the Premier transmit this request to the General Manager of the Electricity Trust for consideration?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

HAPPY VALLEY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON: Prior to the show adjournment I asked the Minister of Works a question about a reticulated water supply for people living in the Happy Valley area. Although these people realize that difficulty might be experienced in pumping water from the Happy Valley reservoir they believe it might be possible to get a supply from the Chandlers Hill tank. Has the Minister of Works a report that I could submit to my constituents?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received what might be termed a preliminary report. The Engineer-in-Chief reports that, following the receipt of petitions from the honourable member and the District Council of Meadows, a plan has now been prepared showing the properties desirous of obtaining a water supply and the proposed location of mains. About 70 properties are involved, covering an area of some 5½ square miles and ranging in elevation from R.L. 600 to R.L. 1200. The proposal is to supply the area from the Chandlers Hill tank on the Clarendon-Blackwood scheme and it will also be necessary to construct a pressure-reducing tank. The next move is the preparation of estimates of the cost of the scheme and a revenue statement to enable the economics of the proposal to be examined. This work is now in progress.

PORT PIRIE UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. McKEE: Prior to the show adjournment, in reply to a question I asked regarding unemployment at Port Pirie, the Premier referred to work to be done in the Polda Basin in respect of the Tod River scheme. This area, of course, is near Port Lincoln, and the Premier should realize that this work would not help the situation at Port Pirie because most of the unemployed are married men and it would not be economic for them to leave their families and live at Port Lincoln. It would be impossible for them to maintain two homes on the basic wage. Port Pirie has a permanent population and should be considered. A number of trust houses there are unoccupied and this is uneconomic for the State. Will the Premier further consider this problem? Has he anything in mind for the uranium treatment plant? I understand that Roela Pipes Limited is interested in this location, but the number of people it will employ will not relieve the position much.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that a report has been prepared by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and that it is in the process of being

conveyed to my office. I believe that about 80 men have already been employed in the area since the honourable member asked his question. I will have the matter investigated and get a prepared reply.

GOOLWA BARRAGE ROAD.

Mr. JENKINS: About five months ago the Premier indicated that funds would be made available to the District Council of Port Elliot at Goolwa to construct a bypass road around the barrage works to provide access to a parking and launching site below the works. Subsequently it was ascertained that the land was vested in the River Murray Commission and the Premier wrote to the commission asking whether an easement could be made available for the road. This morning when I rang the Premier's office I was informed that a reply had not been received. However, I understand that a reply is now to hand. Can the Premier indicate whether the commission is prepared to allow an easement?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The commission has replied that it would not be prepared to allow traffic to go through the area where its works are situated but that it would not object to the proposed deviation so long as it did not interfere with the commission's work of examining methods of preventing sand drift. Provided the council can undertake the work without causing sand drift there is no reason why the work should not proceed immediately.

WALLAROO COPPER MINES.

Mr. HUGHES: I have received the following letter from the Town Clerk of the Corporation of the Town of Kadina:

Following the reading of a news item in the *Advertiser* on September 6, 1962, under the heading "New Mineral Search Plan" I have been directed by Mayor Wearn, on behalf of the above corporation, to seek your support to a request that the Department of Mines extend the proposed tests for minerals to include the old copper workings at Wallaroo Mines. The news report stated that it was proposed to use a new electronic device, recently purchased by the Department of Mines, in a search for copper deposits beneath the earth's surface which would warrant exploiting. Tests are proposed to be carried out in the Adelaide Hills and at Burra. I would be pleased if you would lend all the support possible to induce the department to extend its test programme as above mentioned.

Will the Premier take steps to have the Mines Department extend its testing programme with the electronic eye to include the old mining area in the Wallaroo district?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that the work in the honourable member's district is being undertaken at the suggestion of the Mines Department and with its co-operation by one of the larger private mining companies. I am not sure whether the Mines Department is doing the work or whether the mining company is, but I will see that the question is submitted to the Minister of Mines. I am certain that if there is any possibility of success the Mines Department will be happy to extend its investigations as requested. I will have the matter investigated.

ADELAIDE OVAL.

Mr. COUMBE: The proposed lease of the Adelaide Oval concerns the Adelaide City Council, the South Australian Cricket Association and the South Australian National Football League. This was the subject of a public statement by the Premier during a popular television programme last Thursday evening when he put forward the Government's view. Seeking information, I asked a question about a month ago. Can the Premier say what form the lease will take and what opportunity members will have of discussing the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under the Local Government Act it is not necessary for this lease to come before Parliament: it can be approved by the Minister of Local Government. The lease has now been submitted to the Government for examination, and the Government believes that it is very satisfactory except for what the Government believes to be one small omission in that no provision is being made for any special function that might arise. The Government has therefore referred the lease back to the Adelaide City Council with the suggestion that it examine the question of whether, for instance, if the oval were required for a Royal visit or something of that sort there should not be some special provision to cover what might be perhaps only a couple of days a year at the most. The lease is given to the South Australian Cricket Association, which has developed the oval to its present state. The Government expresses no criticism of the general terms of the lease: it merely thinks that some provision should be made in respect of such special functions as I have mentioned.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier had the Crown Solicitor's opinion that all that is necessary is the approval of the Minister? I was under the impression that the renewal of the lease had to come before Parliament. Members will have no opportunity to raise any matters unless

the lease comes before Parliament, and I should like to raise several matters.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not believe there is any doubt whatever that the answer I gave to the member for Torrens is correct. I think the Local Government Act is clear on the matter, but, if the honourable member desires it, I will ask the Crown Solicitor for an opinion.

ABATTOIRS OVERTIME BAN.

Mr. HARDING: During the weekend I had occasion to visit the holding paddocks at the Gepps Cross abattoirs and saw the thousands of lambs which have been there some time awaiting slaughter. In addition, during the weekend the northern agricultural areas did not receive any good rains, and this has accentuated the position. Tens of thousands of fat lambs are ready for slaughter, and there are just as many immature lambs that probably will have to be slaughtered. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government can have the slaughtering expedited to enable more lambs to be slaughtered at the Metropolitan Abattoirs?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Government is greatly concerned about the present position, which has arisen because of a dispute over the payment of sick leave. The union approached the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board and asked for an extra week's sick leave in addition to the one week a year to which union members are entitled at present. The board referred the union to the industry's wages board, and since then the union has decided to ban overtime work until its claim has been met. This has caused a considerable banking up of stock at the abattoirs. From the State's point of view it is a most inopportune time to ban overtime work. The State's lambs represent an annual crop that should be slaughtered when ready. It is an economic loss to everyone concerned if there is a delay in the slaughtering of lambs beyond the time when they are ready to be slaughtered. The producers suffer because they have difficulty in matching costs with returns. The consumers also suffer and the State as a whole undoubtedly suffers. At present the Metropolitan Abattoirs is in a favoured position under the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act as it has certain rights over the local market that are not available to other interests. I should think it is the responsibility of every section of the abattoirs to interest itself in seeing that these rights are fully exercised in the interests of the State.

It appears that there will be a continued delay in the killing of some of this livestock. I think the only thing to do is to look for some other person that could kill and would be prepared to kill. As a result of that thought I have approached the Parliamentary Draftsman and asked him to prepare an amendment to the present legislation to enable private interests to kill in the metropolitan area for the local market. When that legislation has been prepared I will submit it for discussion by Cabinet.

Mr. BYWATERS: On Sunday morning I had a telephone call from a constituent who was very much concerned at the near-drought conditions in his area, where the feed is almost nil and the lack of rain has depleted the crops considerably. He was concerned about the position at the Gepps Cross abattoirs, and he drew my attention to a public notice of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, which reads:

Notice is hereby given that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board has, pursuant to section 52 of the above-mentioned Act, fixed the maximum number of sheep and lambs to be sold on Wednesday, September 19, 1962, at a market under the control of the board to be held on that date at the abattoirs, Gepps Cross, at 27,500 head, which is equivalent to 250 rail vans, and will refuse to receive into such market any stock in excess of such number. No sheep and lambs will be accepted by road or road transport.

This constituent is not situated anywhere near the railway, and he has been in the habit of bringing down his stock by his own transport. He wonders whether something cannot be done to overcome this problem at the next market and whether he can bring at least some stock by road transport. Can the Minister of Agriculture help in this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: While there is a ban on overtime at the abattoirs it will be difficult to kill the stock offered. As I said before, this is a most inopportune time for such a ban, because primary industry will suffer severely, as will the consumers and the State in general. At 8 a.m. today there were 34,000 lambs and 13,600 sheep on hand, and with the estimated slaughtering for today it is expected that there will be 27,000 lambs and 13,600 sheep awaiting slaughter tomorrow. In addition, there will be the stock to come in for tomorrow's sheep market. That explains the abattoirs authorities' attempt to limit the market to 27,500: the board does not want stock standing around in the paddocks.

Mr. BYWATERS: With all due respect to the Minister, I do not think he answered my

question. I am not debating the merits or otherwise of the position at the abattoirs, but I am concerned about how producers can get their stock to market when no rail transport is available. I realize that most of the stock must come by rail, but I ask the Minister to investigate the possibility of allowing some road transport to provide for the people who are not served by rail transport.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What I have outlined is what has happened, and all that is to happen regarding the public notice the honourable member has quoted refers to tomorrow's market. If the honourable member will give me the details of this case I will forward them to the board to enable it to be guided as to what it might do next week, but I point out that the board cannot foresee what the position will be then. The notice that was given affects tomorrow's market only.

DAIRY REGULATIONS.

Mr. CORCORAN: I have been requested by the South-Eastern Dairymen's Association to ascertain why the draft amendments to the regulations under the Dairy Industry Act have not been brought before Parliament. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether these amendments have been drafted, and if they have, when they will be gazetted and become effective?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The regulations have been finalized in principle, and their final preparation for submission to Executive Council is now proceeding. I regret that my reply on this subject for some time has been that these regulations are due very shortly, but it has been impossible to finalize the matter any more quickly. A tremendous number of regulations are involved, and it is not easy to get them prepared and published quickly. However, their preparation is proceeding, and I do not think it will be long before they are submitted to Executive Council for the consideration of the Governor in Council.

WATER POLLUTION.

Mr. FRED WALSH: It was reported in the Sydney press last week that, because of fears for public health, seawater was being tested in the eastern suburbs of Sydney for harmful pollution because of the bacteria caused by sewage content. The local doctors said that the incidence of ear, nose and throat infections every summer was due to the pollution of the water with bacteria. It was reported that they

had said that the pollution also caused poliomyelitis. This matter causes councils in my electorate, the Port Adelaide council and, to some extent, the Glenelg council, some concern every summer. I know from what I have been told by the department that because of more advanced scientific treatment our effluent is more highly purified than the effluent discharged into the sea along Sydney beaches, and that there is no need for concern. However, to satisfy the councils and the people who use beaches where effluent is discharged, will the Minister of Works have testing done on the beaches from Glenelg to Semaphore in the coming summer and every summer? The cost of this testing would not be of any consequence. Will he also see that a report is submitted to the councils concerned?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I did not see the report to which the honourable member has referred and I am not sure what type of discharge occurs in the water adjacent to the eastern suburbs of Sydney. Although I do not know, I presume it is raw sewage.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Various types.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I did not know. Conclusive tests have been made over the years regarding the action of active seawater on raw sewage, and it has been found that the action is positive and rapid. It may be, however, that, because of the occurrence of certain tidal flows, wave action, and so on, around the Sydney waterfront on the ocean side, insufficient time elapses after the discharge of sewage to allow it to be completely decomposed and oxygenated by the action of seawater and rendered bacteria-free. However, no raw sewage is discharged along South Australian metropolitan beaches. The treatment plant deals with the sewage, and I understand (although I am subject to correction) that the treatment is complete as any discharge of effluent from the treatment works is regularly tested for bacteria count and that it is virtually, if not completely, bacteria-free before being discharged. However, I do not discount the risks implied by the honourable member's question, and I shall be happy to ask the Engineer-in-Chief to have the Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment take up the matter so that no assurances will be lacking with regard to the practice along South Australian beaches.

COOKE PLAINS ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked recently relating to tenders and time of commencement

of work on a new single wire earth return extension to Cooke Plains?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Assistant Manager of the Electricity Trust reports that it is expected that the contract for the construction of the Cooke Plains No. 1 single wire earth return extension will be let within two weeks and that the work will commence in six to eight weeks.

TAILEM BEND WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: During the debate on the Loan Estimates I asked a question relating to the Tailem Bend water supply, as two departments supply water for that town. I said that the sum of £10,000 appeared on the Estimates this year for the pumping station at Tailem Bend. As the Minister knows, there is some dissatisfaction about the supply of water, and there are areas in the town, particularly in the business section, which do not have a main passing their properties. With summer coming on, there is always the danger of fire, and it would be disastrous if no water were available. Has the Minister of Works more information about a water supply for the Tailem Bend township, and can he say whether the pumping station has anything to do with the Tailem Bend to Keith water main, or whether some other site has been suggested?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Investigations have been in progress for some time into a proposal to take over the domestic water supply to the railway properties at Tailem Bend. The total estimated cost of the proposal is about £41,000, and this includes an item for a new pumping station and associated pipeworks with a capacity equal to twice that of the existing station. This pumping station will not be required when the Tailem Bend to Keith scheme is in operation, as the pumping station for that scheme will be large enough to supply the Tailem Bend township as well. In view of this, the expenditure involved in constructing a new pumping station that would operate at the most for only a few years would not be justified, and it would appear that the taking over of the railway reticulation supply should be deferred until the new Tailem Bend to Keith pumping station is in operation. I think that covers the matter, and that on reflection the honourable member will see the wisdom of this procedure.

I have discovered from further reading of the docket that the proposed improvements detailed for this year include the transfer of a pump and motor from Loxton, which is estimated to cost £7,500, the roofing of the

100,000-gallon elevated tank, and a new inlet within the tank structure. That is a permanent improvement. Chlorination has also been included in these improvements. The estimated cost of £7,500 is within the amount that has been allocated for the work from the Loan programme. When these improvements are carried out the pumping station will have adequate capacity to supply Tailem Bend, and some water will also be available for the construction of the first part of the Tailem Bend to Keith trunk main if and when required.

Mr. BYWATERS: I stress the need for a water main adjacent to the business premises in the main street of Tailem Bend. In view of the department's delay in taking over the water supply, can the Minister of Works say whether provision could be made for a water main in the main shopping centre of the town?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will take up this matter with the Engineer-in-Chief to see what the possibilities are. I know that he appreciates, as I do, the desirability of having a water main for fire protection and for other purposes. I point out, however, that the Loan programme for the department this year is under severe strain, particularly because of emergencies in some country districts where we are extremely hard-pressed to maintain stock supplies to existing consumers. That has added a further strain to the department's activities, and we have had to divert some funds from some proposals to other proposals which in the opinion of the Government and the department are more urgent. I cannot convey any hope for the honourable member that more than the £7,500, plus other incidentals that I have already outlined, will be spent this year.

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads to a question I asked recently about the maintenance of the Birkenhead bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from my colleague, the Minister of Roads, who states that the practicability of re-decking the bascule span of the Birkenhead bridge outside normal hours will be investigated and a further report submitted when a decision is reached. The investigations have been completed and it is considered impracticable to carry out the work at night. However, the

Highways Department will work on a 10-hour day seven days a week basis, thus cutting down the time occupied by this work to about two months. The co-operation of owners of fishing vessels to avoid opening the bridge during peak periods as much as possible will also be sought.

ENTERTAINMENT TAX.

Mr. RICHES: Some time ago I asked the Premier whether he would obtain a report on the admission charges for picture shows, particularly in country areas where that type of entertainment still forms an important part of the social life of the community. Has the Premier been able to obtain a report from Sir Edgar Bean?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Sir Edgar Bean reports:

The following table shows a comparison between the prices charged for admission to *The Sundowners* at Port Augusta and the normal prices charged for admission to the same picture theatre:

Seats.	Normal price. s. d.	<i>The Sundowners</i>
		price. s. d.
Dress circle . (216 seats)	5 0	7 6
Back stalls .. (396 seats)	4 0	6 0
Front stalls . (127 seats)	2 0	4 0

It will be seen that the table does not bear out Mr. Riches's statement that some of the charges were 200 per cent above normal.

The admission prices were determined by the distributors of the film—i.e., representatives of the producers—and it was a condition of the lease of the film to every exhibitor that those prices must be charged. *The Sundowners* was a special film, and the terms of leasing were on a uniform basis throughout Australia. Exhibitors were not able to make individual bargains in this matter, particularly as there are at present insufficient feature films to supply the requirements even of the limited number of theatres now remaining in business. In my view there is no authority in Australia which is able to coerce distributors to make films available to exhibitors who will not agree to pay the standard price.

The following facts about the screening of *The Sundowners* at Port Augusta were obtained by my colleague on the Motion Pictures Committee, Mr. Clyde Waterman. They are as follows:

The capacity of the theatre which the exhibitor leases from the town council is 739. The rent payable by the exhibitor for the lease of the film *The Sundowners* was 60 per cent of takings to a figure, then 70 per cent in excess. He was obliged by his contract with the distributors to exhibit the film for 10 nights.

The actual attendances were as follows:

Division of Seating.	Price of Admission.	Total Seating.	Total Attendance for 10 Nights.	Per cent of Capacity.
	s. d.			
Circle	216	2,160	1,146	53
Back Stalls . . .	396	3,960	922	23
Front Stalls . . .	127	1,270	90	7

739

It is clear from these figures that there were ample seats for *The Sundowners* available at relatively low prices, but a majority of the patrons preferred to pay for the higher priced seats. They also had the alternative of patronising an opposition theatre.

On the general question whether the admission prices charged were reasonable, it should be noted that since the outbreak of the war consumer prices generally have more than trebled, but charges for admission to picture theatres at Port Augusta are only about double what they were. Both the producing and exhibiting branches of the industry have made substantial losses and have suffered a serious reduction in business.

Looking at all the facts there seems no reason to suppose that the citizens of Port Augusta were treated unreasonably in connection with the screening of *The Sundowners*.

PARKSIDE TRAFFIC LIGHTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question about Parkside traffic lights?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that the calling of tenders, financing and installation of traffic lights on Glen Osmond Road is the responsibility of the local government authorities concerned, viz., the cities of Burnside and Unley. It is understood that the city of Unley is to act on behalf of the city of Burnside in these matters. The only departmental contribution to the work will be limited roadworks at two of the sites; this work will be carried out by the Unley council on behalf of the Highways Department. The commencement and completion of the whole scheme thus rests primarily with the city of Unley.

WHYALLA PETITION.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has Cabinet yet come to a decision on the petition received from Whyalla relating to all-road transport to Adelaide?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, but I will see if I can expedite a decision for the honourable member.

REMARK SEWERAGE.

Mr. CURREN: My question relates to country sewerage, and in particular at Renmark. This matter was the subject of promises by the Government throughout the 1959 election campaign and was referred to in these words:

Renmark town sewerage: This is a recognized necessity aggravated by the flood. Steps have been taken to obtain a priority which will start a scheme within months, not years. What priority has been allocated to this project?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will check on the priorities for sewerage in country towns, as recommended by the advisory committee on country sewerage, and let the honourable member know where Renmark stands. It forms part of a group of River Murray towns listed by the advisory committee as a group. I am not certain what position on the list those towns occupy. The advisory committee has been reconstituted by the Government. It has completed its original task. It made its original recommendations some time ago, but it has since been reconstituted on a more or less permanent basis so that, where circumstances have arisen since the committee last took evidence on sewerage matters in country towns, in particular localities where councils felt that new circumstances had arisen over a period which would justify a reclassification or a reconsideration of the priority for those towns, then the committee would consider a report, and the committee has looked again at a number of country towns at the request of the authorities concerned to see whether or not the priority should be up-graded in respect of those towns. I will, therefore, check on the report of the advisory committee to ascertain the latest information on the river towns, especially Renmark.

ADELAIDE CENTRAL MARKET.

Mr. LAWN: I propose to ask the Premier two questions regarding the Adelaide Central Market.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is permitted to ask only one question at a time.

Mr. LAWN: Both questions concern the Adelaide Central Market.

The SPEAKER: Proceed.

Mr. LAWN: Can the Premier inform the House of the circumstances that ultimately resulted in the Adelaide City Council's acquiring the present site or of having control of it? What circumstances preceded the purchase of the land? I understand that recently discussions have taken place concerning the council's leasing the site to an overseas interest. It has been suggested that before a lease can be entered into the agreement will have to come before this Parliament for ratification. That was also my understanding of the position regarding the Adelaide Oval. In view of his reply this afternoon, is the Premier of opinion that the council's proposal requires only the approval of the Minister or does it need Parliamentary approval?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The lease of the Adelaide Oval comes within the terms of the Local Government Act, but the proposed lease for the market is for 99 years and the maximum permissible under the Local Government Act is 50 years, so that before a 99-year lease can be granted a special Act of Parliament is necessary. The council could not give a lease for a longer period than 50 years without a special Act of Parliament or a general amendment of the Local Government Act. The Central Market area was purchased by the Adelaide City Council in, I think, 1870. The purchase price was £4,000 for four acres of land.

Mr. Lawn: From whom was the land purchased?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know, but if the honourable member wants that information I can have the title examined.

MENTAL HOSPITALS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to my recent questions regarding additional staff for our mental hospitals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following report from the Director-General of Medical Services:

By arrangement, the Director of Mental Health (Dr. W. A. Cramond) has already forwarded individual submissions requesting increases in the staff establishment in the mental hospitals in various categories such as nurses (male and female), domestics, kitchen staff, gardeners, etc., for which provision was included on the Estimates for 1962-63. The majority of these submissions have already been

forwarded, recommending approval (some have already been approved) and generally the remainder will be forwarded for approval within a few days.

Dr. Cramond has indicated that as each approval is received, prompt action will be taken regarding advertising the additional positions. However, it is not to be expected that all the additional positions would be filled immediately as it is intended to exercise every care in an endeavour to select the right type of person. Furthermore, supervisory staff could not cope with a sudden large influx of inexperienced staff which would also present a recreation leave problem in approximately 12 months' time.

I have also received the following supplementary report from the Public Service Commissioner:

The appointment of additional medical officers to the mental hospital staff is receiving my urgent attention. I have spoken to the Director-General of Medical Services and he will deal immediately with the question of advertising for additional nursing or attendant staff.

PAPER PULP MILL.

Mr. HARDING: On July 17 I asked the Premier whether he could report on the progress being made with the proposed paper pulp mill in the South-East and he said that the Canadian company had intimated that it did not want to proceed with the undertaking. However, he was optimistic that good news about the project could be released within a week. Can the Premier say whether negotiations have taken place and whether they are sufficiently advanced to enable him to report on them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Negotiations are proceeding but they have not reached the stage where it would be possible for me to report to the House.

TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOLS.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 28 regarding what effect the amendment of the definition of "metropolitan area" would have on schools in the Salisbury area?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: A report which I have received from the Secretary of the Education Department states:

Following the recent amendment to Education Regulations, children residing in the Salisbury and Elizabeth areas are no longer eligible for travelling allowances as these districts are now included as part of the metropolitan area. Mr. J. S. Clark, M.P. has pointed out that this will have the effect of increasing the enrolments at Salisbury High School, as parents will be unwilling to pursue their intentions to send their children to Elizabeth Boys and Girls Technical High Schools in view

of the fact that they will not be assisted by travelling allowances. Mr. Clark therefore asks the Minister to consider amending the regulations so that they do not operate next year, or failing this, to arrange for additional accommodation at Salisbury High School. The Salisbury High School Council has also written to the Director of Education in similar vein. The council points out that of 260 now in Grade VII in the Salisbury area, it is estimated that an additional 45-55 children will enrol at Salisbury High School. It is also suggested that the cost of providing extra rooms at Salisbury, together with extra teachers, might be more than the cost of fares of students to the Elizabeth technical high schools, where they might be absorbed more easily. This problem has already been considered by the Superintendent of High Schools and the Director of Education, and arrangements are in hand to allow for accommodation if needed at Salisbury.

That is the opinion of the Secretary of the department. In my opinion it would be most undesirable to waive the provisions of the regulations to allow Salisbury children to claim allowances, as they are in a position no different from that of children in the rest of the metropolitan area, where high schools are closer than technical high schools and no allowances are paid. By mid-October details of Grade VII children to attend secondary schools will be known. This will allow sufficient time to plan for accommodation at Salisbury High School.

HOUSING TRUST ACT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Acting Minister of Lands an answer to my recent question regarding an amendment to the Housing Trust Act in relation to subdivisational land at Whyalla?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not yet received a reply. As I said just prior to the show adjournment, apart from getting the Housing Trust's view on this matter I would have to discuss with the Government any possibility of amending the Act. Just before I left my office this morning in haste I understood that there was a letter from the Housing Trust about this matter, but I have not seen the letter. I will try to get the reply for the honourable member, if not tomorrow, as soon as possible.

ELIZABETH LIGHTING.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that the Minister of Works has a reply from his colleague concerning a question I asked on August 30 about the lighting of the Main North Road through Elizabeth.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that it is proposed to erect standard guide posts complete

with reflector delineators on both sides of both carriageways of the Main North Road from Pooraka to Smithfield. Through the town of Elizabeth, guide posts will be placed at closer intervals than normal on rural roads. Consideration has been given to the use of short posts, as it was thought that standard length posts might detract from the general aesthetics of the road, but this has been found unsatisfactory as it is difficult to keep the delineators clear of splashings from tyres, and they might be obscured by grass which grows quickly between shoulder maintenance periods.

INSECURE LOADS.

Mr. RYAN (on notice):

1. How many reports of insecure loads were made by police in the last three years, in accordance with section 142 of the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1959?

2. How many of these cases were prosecuted under that section?

3. How many of these prosecutions were successful?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1 to 3. The carrying of an insecure load was an offence under section 141 of the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1960, not section 142 of the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1959. Section 142 provided for the width, height and length of loads carried on motor vehicles. The figures set out hereunder are the number of prosecutions and convictions for all offences against section 141 during the past three years. They include prosecutions where projecting loads could cause injury or damage to other vehicles or persons and for failure to provide suitable wrapping material for these loads as well as the carrying of an insecure load.

	Prosecutions.	Convictions.
1959-1960	56	55
1960-1961	55	53
1961-1962	67	67

The number of reports which did not warrant prosecution is not available.

JET SPRAY INOCULATION.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to arrange for the Public Health Department to adopt the system of inoculation against influenza by jet spray, instead of the use of the hypodermic syringe?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Health Department has no proposal to adopt the jet spray system of inoculation against influenza instead of the hypodermic syringe. The only influenza inoculation done by the department is for members of its own staff and the Hospitals Department.

PARATOO BRIDGES.

Mr. CASEY (on notice):

1. What was the date of commencement of work on the bridges half a mile east of Paratoo?

2. What is the likely completion date?

3. What is the estimated cost of these bridges?

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

1. August, 1961.

2. End of September, 1962.

3. Bridges on sections of this road were grouped, and separate costs for individual bridges were not kept. To date, £23,000 has been spent on the reconstruction and widening of bridges between Paratoo and Yunta.

PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice): Will the Government give early and favourable consideration to making arrangements for a representative group of members from this House to make periodical visits to the under-mentioned institutions in which persons are held against their will:

- (a) gaols and prisons instituted under the Prisons Act;
- (b) mental institutions established under the Mental Defectives Act;
- (c) institutions and asylums established under the Maintenance Act;
- (d) treatment centres and alcoholics centres instituted under the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act; and
- (e) reserves instituted under the Aborigines Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Any member desiring to make an inspection should make an application to the appropriate Minister.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1962.

Ordered to be printed.

WOODVILLE NORTH, MANSFIELD PARK, ATHOL PARK AND WINGFIELD SEWERAGE SCHEME.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Woodville North, Mansfield Park, Athol Park and Wingfield Sewerage Scheme.

Ordered that report be printed.

BANKS STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to provide for the amendment and extension of the authority and obligations of banks including savings banks and for that purpose to make certain amendments to The Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1959, the Succession Duties Act, 1929-1959, and the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1960, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to amend and extend the authority and obligation of banks, including savings banks in various respects, and I will deal with its clauses (other than clauses 1 and 2, covering short title and interpretation) in order.

Clause 3 is designed to enable the Savings Bank of South Australia to open and operate cheque accounts for ordinary personal depositors. Section 42 of the principal Act now provides only for certain deposit accounts, and the bank has no general power to open cheque accounts. Clause 3 will add a new subsection to section 42 which will empower the bank to open and keep accounts to be drawn upon by cheque. The new subsection will provide that such cheques will be subject to stamp duty except in respect of trust estates, insolvent estates or companies in liquidation. Cheques drawn by depositors under other provisions of the principal Act (local government bodies, trade unions and non-profit organizations) are already exempted from stamp duty by the general provisions of the Stamp Duties Act.

The trustees and administration of the Savings Bank of South Australia have had under examination, for a considerable period, a proposal to widen the extent of its cheque-operated accounts which are at present restricted to local authorities and a range of non-profit societies and trusts. The savings bank trustees have been aware of an increasing demand on the part of their normal depositors for such extended facilities. The matter was brought up for more urgent review when private savings banks commenced operation in this State and were able to offer to their

depositors cheque facilities within the same premises, and at the same time their parent banks were able to offer their ordinary trading bank customers savings bank facilities within those same premises. In recent years, too, the Commonwealth Savings Bank has been able to offer its customers cheque account facilities within the same premises, for it has been the practice latterly for the Commonwealth Banking Corporation to concentrate its expansion activities on the opening of savings bank branches and to provide therein an agency of the Commonwealth Trading Bank, which would provide cheque account facilities.

With the increasing competition being given in this way by both private savings banks and the Commonwealth Savings Bank, and the evidence that the ordinary public find cheque facilities increasingly desirable and convenient, the trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia have sought the authority to give this added service and to recover a competitive disadvantage that has developed. Before deciding to submit this legislation the Government has, separately from the savings bank administration, had a close examination made of the practicability and desirability of the proposals. Inquiries were made of the experience elsewhere, and in particular with the Victorian Savings Bank, which has operated such a scheme since March, 1958. That scheme has proved highly popular and has extended now to over 80,000 personal cheque accounts, apart from the cheque accounts of non-profit societies of the kind already operated in the Savings Bank of South Australia.

It has appeared from such material as could be obtained that the operation of personal cheque accounts in the Savings Bank of Victoria was probably, if the project were considered in isolation, somewhat a losing proposition. How far this may have been offset by the profitability of retained or added deposits made by those same customers in the ordinary savings bank section is not determinable. The Victorian authorities believe that the indirect gains and protection against competitive losses have been considerable. In addition, they point to a clearly desired service to the public.

The Government was particularly concerned, however, that the Savings Bank of South Australia should not do anything which would, by adding to its costs, in any way endanger what is clearly its greatest competitive advantage. This is its ability to pay a rate of interest to ordinary depositors of one-quarter per cent higher than other savings banks find possible.

Accordingly, the administration of the Savings Bank of South Australia has, at the Government's request, had a number of conferences with the Under Treasurer and made detailed surveys of the best and most economical methods of implementing the bank's proposals. The administration has, as a result, made proposals to the trustees which have been endorsed by the trustees and which they believe will enable the scheme to operate profitably apart entirely from any indirect gains in the increase and retention of ordinary savings bank deposits in the face of competition. In these circumstances the Government considers the proposed legislation to be most desirable and in the public interest.

In respect of the personal cheque accounts to be authorized by these amendments, no privilege is proposed that is not equally available to the trading banks. It is provided that cheques issued under the extended powers shall be subject to ordinary stamp duty, and it is anticipated, on Victorian experience, that the duty received may after the initial establishment period approach £10,000 a year. Further, the bank proposes not to allow interest on balances held in such accounts, and to make service charges either in accordance with the same pattern as the trading banks have hitherto applied or some appropriate variant therefrom. It is not proposed to alter the conditions under which cheque accounts are operated by the Savings Bank of South Australia for local authorities and certain non-profit organizations, and of course persons who may operate the new personal cheque accounts will be permitted, and indeed encouraged, to avail themselves of the opportunity to make interest-bearing savings bank deposits.

Clause 4 of the Bill amends section 59 (1) of the Savings Bank Act to make it consistent with the new provisions concerning the release of deposits by savings banks in the case of deceased estates. At present the Savings Bank of South Australia may, after reasonable inquiry and on the expiration of one month, release without the approval of the Commissioner of Succession Duties a deposit made by a depositor who has died, provided that the deposit does not exceed £600, and such a release may be made to any person believed to be entitled to it. The amendment will restrict such releases to the cases of a widow, husband, parent or child of the deceased depositor. Persons other than these are ordinarily liable for succession duties on such a sum and it is considered inappropriate that a release of a deceased depositor's moneys should be made

without the commissioner's approval other than to a widow, husband, parent or child.

Clause 5 amends section 60a of the Savings Bank Act to permit the bank to accept special deposits as deemed proper from time to time by the trustees at a variety of rates and for a variety of terms. The existing provision has been shown by experience to be unduly restrictive.

Clause 6 amends section 63a of the Succession Duties Act in two ways. The amendment made by subclause (a) is designed to provide against the evasion of duty. A person can open an account at the Savings Bank of South Australia and simply make a declaration that the moneys deposited therein are held in trust for the benefit of some other person. It is conceived that this is done on occasion with a view to avoiding duty and that there is no trust in fact. The amendment will not interfere with legitimate trusts made by declaration in this way, but will ensure that no amounts are released on the death of a person holding as trustee except after reference to the Commissioner of Succession Duties, who can then satisfy himself whether the deposit is in truth a trust deposit.

Clause 6 (b) restates the present provisions of section 63a (3) of the Succession Duties Act so as to bring all private savings banks within its provisions as well as the two Government savings banks so far as concerns the release of deposits of deceased persons without the approval or certificate of the Commissioner of Succession Duties. It also makes clear the position of joint depositors one of whom dies in this respect.

Clause 7 is designed to remove an administrative anomaly in section 48 (a) of the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1960. With its present construction the Treasurer may issue to any bank a licence to issue to its customers cheque forms having the words "Stamp Duty Paid" printed thereon. The Treasurer is not authorized to license a bank to issue its own cheques for its own purposes similarly printed. This restriction was never intended, and is removed simply by the deletion of three words.

Clause 8 extends to private savings banks the authority for duty free cheques on certain non-profit accounts. For very many years cheques drawn upon the Savings Bank of South Australia by local authorities and a range of non-profit organizations have been free of stamp duty. The Government has, quite understandably, had representations made to it by the private enterprise trading banks and savings banks that they should be placed on a similar basis in this particular connection.

The representations were renewed with some special emphasis when it was rumoured that the Savings Bank of South Australia was seeking authority to operate ordinary personal cheque accounts so as to overcome a competitive disadvantage with the private enterprise banks. In most other States the exemption from stamp duty for such non-profit and charitable accounts is not confined to Government savings banks. Apart from the aspect of equalizing competition, there is merit in the claim that a local authority, a union, or a charitable body should be free from stamp duty on its cheques, irrespective of whether its bank is a Government savings bank or not. As all trading banks now have their savings bank counterpart, the situation is adequately met if the stamp duty is removed from cheques upon such accounts in savings banks generally, and not extended to trading banks. The present Commonwealth regulations covering private savings banks restrict their power to operate cheque accounts to such as are at present free from stamp duty at the Savings Bank of South Australia, and accordingly those regulations are adopted to define the extent of freedom from stamp duty. However, that freedom will not extend more widely should the authority given by Commonwealth regulations be extended.

In connection with the foregoing amendments, which are designed mainly to place private savings banks upon a reasonably equal footing with the State Savings Bank, I would mention that the Government does not object to the entry of private banks into the savings bank business—indeed it could not, in the face of Commonwealth legislation, prevent them from entering into this field. If competition can bring about greater efficiency, improved service and an increase in savings, the State and the community will gain. The new private savings banks have already given evidence of their desire to co-operate with the Government in making fair and reasonable contributions to semi-governmental and local government loans in the State and in the financing of the purchase of private dwellings.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand Total, £96,854,000.
In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 4. Page 864.)

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £12,632.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): At the outset I indicate that it is not

my intention at this stage to move for the reduction of the first line by £1, which is customarily regarded as a vote of no confidence. However, I assure members that the Opposition will carefully examine the lines. Whilst I am prepared to debate the Budget now, I think that in all reasonable fairness the debate should not proceed until a proper perusal of the Auditor-General's report is possible. I am one of the privileged few who have received a copy of that report this afternoon. Members cannot be expected to properly consider the lines until they examine that valuable report.

In introducing the Budget, the Treasurer used some of his usual glowing remarks about the rate of recovery in South Australia, but he appears to have at last accepted the inevitable that because of the unpredictable actions of the Commonwealth Government there is a nation-wide reluctance to trade and operate in an expansive fashion. I endorse his remarks that in such a situation it is the duty of the State Treasurer to frame financial policies within the limit of the resources available to him that are designed to encourage and expedite a return to full employment of our labour and other productive resources. But what action has this Government taken to bring about this desirable situation? We have had plenty of statements from time to time, but little effective action from either this Government or its counterpart in Canberra to revitalize the economy which they dealt a severe blow about two years ago.

Because of its effect on our financial recovery, first let us study what the Commonwealth Treasurer attempted in his Budget last month. The main emphasis appears to have been on investment concessions, but whilst there is a large amount of unused plant capacity in Australia, together with a large pool of unemployed, the concessions on private investment, boosted by Government investment, are not the answer to restoring business confidence and thus revitalizing the economy. In addition to increased Government investment, emphasis should have been placed on consumer demand, and the stimulation of this sector would have been best achieved by reduced taxes and increases in child endowment and pensions. In addition to boosting the economy, increases in child endowment and pensions are well overdue, and increases in these payments would have tended to rectify the financial injustice, which is being imposed on the people who receive these payments, brought about by deflated money

values without any compensating adjustments to the social service payments.

I think the Treasurer agrees with this analysis of the position as far as this State is concerned, because in his Budget speech he said that during the last financial year the Government decided to do all in its power to maintain and promote employment by pushing ahead vigorously with a programme of capital works, and, at the same time, avoiding increases in taxes and charges which may have had an adverse effect on business activity. As I mentioned previously, we have had many statements from this Government which recognize the weaknesses in the economy, but we have not had the necessary final action to rectify these weaknesses. These statements made by the Treasurer sound very fine, but like many other of his promises and his statements, they are made for effect and are not subsequently put into practice by the Government.

Because of the unsatisfactory economic position, £970,000 additional Revenue funds were made available last February to boost the economy in this State, but the Government saw fit to earmark two-thirds of this amount for developmental works, whereas if the Government was sincere in attempting to prevent its taxes and charges from having an adverse effect on the business activity of the community, it could have then introduced the policy which would have removed some of the anomalies caused by the Government with its amendment of the land tax legislation last year.

During the discussion on the amending Bill last year, I pointed out clearly some of the anomalies to the Government, and sought to introduce amendments, but it was not prepared to do anything. The first amendment I sought proposed to grant the same preferential treatment to all small landholders in this State, whether the small section of land was held for the purpose of primary production or not. The second amendment I sought was to reduce the land tax rate in the pound from 3d. to 1d. on all land which had an unimproved value of £5,000 or less. The Bill presented by the Government has destroyed the basis of the original Act, because the new provisions cancel the absentee land tax and also grant a half-penny reduction in the land tax rate on all land which has an unimproved value of more than £5,000, but comparable preferential treatment is not granted to the small landholder. Although the valuations have been increased threefold to fourfold by the latest assessments, the rate in the pound has remained unaltered

for the small properties, whereas the larger properties have been granted a reduction in the rate of one halfpenny in the pound.

The explanations I made when presenting our proposed amendments last year would now appear to be substantiated by the excessive increase in land tax payments which small landholders are being called upon to pay. Certain concessions were promised to genuine rural landholders, but apparently it is not working out in practice. Only recently, 12 primary producers' organizations added their objection to the method of land tax assessment by means of a deputation to the Treasurer, but he refused their request that a committee of inquiry be appointed to investigate the method of assessing land values and rating those assessments. Last year, when speaking on this subject, you, Mr. Speaker, said that the whole Act should be completely overhauled by a committee that could recommend a new approach to land tax assessments.

The public generally is complaining bitterly about the new land tax assessments because, in addition to the exorbitant amount of land tax involved, people fear that these inflated values will be used as a basis for future council and waterworks assessments. Some of the increased assessments are due solely to the rapid industrial expansion in commercial areas in close proximity to domestic dwelling sites. The sites, as such, have great commercial potential for industrial expansion, but many of the people living in those areas do not wish to be forced to sell the houses in which they have lived for many years solely because of the excessive land taxes being imposed. I have personal knowledge of hardship being caused by rates based on artificial values.

When the legislation was being debated last year, I said that there was a grave doubt in my mind whether the position would not be further aggravated when future council and waterworks assessments were based on inflated land tax valuations which would result from the Government's legislation. Now, the first stage of the increases has occurred because some of the councils have increased the property assessments in their areas by approximately 20 per cent, and this increase has been forced on the councils solely by the inflated land values used by the Government in its land tax valuation. By charging the same rate in the pound as last year, the councils have found that their revenues would be excessive, and therefore they have reduced considerably their tax rate in order to offset, to some extent, the inflated valuation.

This is what I said the Government should have done last year with respect to land tax and I recommended it again this year, but all members opposite voted against that recommendation. I have no doubt that the increased land tax assessments will be reflected in the waterworks assessments this year, although the Treasurer has assured us that there will be no increases in taxes and charges this year. He said the same last year, and he has the effrontery to still maintain that he did not increase taxes and charges last year in an effort to revitalize the South Australian economy. Let us see what the facts tell us. In 1960-61, land tax receipts totalled £1,400,000, whereas last year they totalled £2,388,000—an increase of £988,000, or 7⁰ per cent. This is certainly a fine example of the Government's keeping its taxes and charges stable in an effort to aid the recovery of our economy.

In view of the foregoing, I still maintain that the Government should have adopted the recommendation from members on this side to reduce the rate in the pound when the land tax assessments were so substantially increased, and if it was distasteful to the Government to accept the recommendation from the Labor Party, it should have at least agreed to a committee of inquiry to investigate the whole subject of land tax. I understand that this is the position in Queensland, and that there is the intention of abolishing land tax on small holdings altogether.

Another example which is not consistent with the statement that the Government did not increase its taxes and charges is that of patients' fees for hospitals. During 1960-61, the Government received £1,227,000, whereas last year it received £1,430,000—an increase of £203,000, or 17 per cent. I would have thought that, if anything, in view of the severe unemployment in this State during the last financial year, this was one line on which the Government could have received less last year than in previous years but, apparently, it is prepared to go to any lengths to raise its revenue. I could give many illustrations of how the Government increased its taxes and charges last year, but I think I have given sufficient illustrations to prove that the actual financial result last year was not consistent with the glowing statements made by the Treasurer in the text of his Budget speech. Therefore, I am forced to conclude that the Government cannot take unto itself any praise for the recovery in our economy which is

commencing to take shape after business confidence was shattered by the Liberal Government nearly two years ago. Instead, I believe we have a vigorous and resilient business community which is determined to advance despite the ineptitude displayed by the Government administration in this State, which is merely carrying out the directives from its Liberal counterpart in Canberra.

Before dealing with the lines in the Estimates in more detail, I wish to refer to the Parliamentary Draftsman's Department and, at this point, I wish to emphasize that members on this side receive the utmost consideration from the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant with the time at their disposal. However, we also find that their time is practically fully taken up with Government business. The Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman has been absent at conferences in other States for 80 days during the past 12 months, and he has had to travel in his own time, including weekends. It would be reasonable to assume that it would take at least another 80 days to prepare for the conferences and another 40 days to make out reports and submissions. The Companies Bill, introduced recently, contains about 480 clauses, and this must have taken much of the draftsman's time.

During the debate on the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act Amendment Bill recently, I considered that the Opposition came in for most unfair and offensive criticism from the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). I have not been trained as a solicitor, so I cannot understand his going into the matter to the extent that he did. However, I am the Leader of the Opposition, which is a responsible position in this Chamber, and I believe that an examination of the personnel of the Party opposite will show that only one member opposite has ever been a member of the Opposition. In view of this, how can members opposite appreciate what it means to be a member of the Opposition, let alone the Leader? Unless I obtain a positive assurance from the Government that it intends to appoint an assistant to the Parliamentary Draftsman and the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, I shall have something to say about this matter when we are dealing with the lines. Some years ago there was an assistant to these two valuable officers. Both senior officers have retired, and I do not know where the assistant is now; presumably he is in private practice.

I am prepared to accept criticism, but I do not like criticism when it reaches the

extravagances expressed by the member for Mitcham. I want to see appointed a man whose first obligation will be to assist the Leader of the Opposition so that, when the Leader desires a Bill or amendments to be drafted, he will have first call on his services. This will ensure that intentions of the submissions made by the Opposition will be verified by senior officers and that we will be assured that Bills and amendments will at least be within the Constitution and will not need to be criticized on that account. I believe that another officer should be appointed. I have had the greatest assistance from the Parliamentary Draftsman and Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman when they have been available but, as I have said, the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman has not had much opportunity to be available here because his work has taken him away to other States.

We have been told that the proposed expenditure on hospitals for this year is £6,845,000—£568,000 greater than last year. I also notice that patients' fees for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were £61,000 greater than the estimate and it was expected that there would be a further increase of £38,000 during the current year. This is the result of the Government's increasing its hospital charges, and it is an example of the bitter pill that goes with any heavy expenditure; that is, that somebody eventually has to pay for it.

The Treasurer has also informed us that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is now operating to capacity. Nevertheless, costs of running this hospital are still excessive, and, on the information supplied, the cost for each patient is about £53 a week, whilst the estimated reimbursements, including patients' fees and Commonwealth contributions, are only about £22 a week. There is no doubt that this is a beautiful hospital, but, during the construction period, we repeatedly drew attention to the fact that the construction cost was excessive. After excluding any expense on account of capital charges, which would be about £15 a week for every patient occupying a bed, the ordinary running costs still amount to about £53 a week for each patient. I consider that our hospital policy is all wrong, but, unfortunately, the Government did not heed our earlier criticism, and we are committed to a programme for which we will have to pay heavily for many years to come.

Many years ago we suggested that the Royal Adelaide Hospital should be reconstructed and modernized and made the prime teaching and research hospital in South Australia with

provision to treat difficult cases from the metropolitan area and the country, and that, ultimately, we should provide hospitals in the north, south, east and west of the metropolitan area to treat ordinary cases. Had we done that, I believe we would have solved our hospital problem to the satisfaction of most suburban people, and at much less cost.

Undoubtedly, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a wonderful building, but can we afford many more like it? Because the running costs for each patient are not reducing appreciably despite the fact that the hospital is working to capacity, I believe that some investigation is required. If economies are impossible, then the present Government made a gross error of judgment in embarking on a hospital of this type in the first place. I am sure the Government will not admit this, but I believe this is an instance where a public accounts committee could give us a reliable lead as to where the Government is falling down on this project. We would then be in a position to make savings in the annual running costs of the present scheme, and, even if that is not possible, we could at least learn for any further projects of this type.

In the *Advertiser* of September 13 there is an article dealing with the policy of the Hospitals Department and attributed to the honorary eye surgeon of the Royal Adelaide Hospital (Dr. D. O. Crompton) who, as a politically-minded medico, is undoubtedly a very disgruntled member of the Liberal Party. Amongst other things, he has suggested that the board be increased in numbers and that it have the right of administration, hiring and firing, without any consideration of the wishes of the Government in regard to this important department. His views certainly differ from mine in regard to administration because the Government is providing the necessary finance, but the negligible protest by the Minister in control of this department in not defending his own department certainly shows a lack of responsibility on his part, particularly when Dr. Crompton has been reported as saying:

As a result of circumstances created by the Government, neither the board nor the Administrator can run the hospital efficiently.

That is a pretty drastic statement in anybody's language, and I wonder whether this doctor, when he attended the L.C.L. conference last week, was considered to be a voice crying in the wilderness.

With all due respect to the Party political allegiance, one would have expected a firm Government contradiction of such statements.

It certainly exemplifies a great disinterest by the Government when it is not prepared to defend its own administration of the Hospitals Department against criticism of this nature. It behoves the Government to improve its administration of the Hospitals Department when its own supporters are critical of its lack of interest in health matters.

I am concerned also with the reference by Dr. Crompton to the chaos in the records section of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, reported in the press article referred to earlier. However, there are two possible reasons why records may be incomplete. The first is that some medicos are more concerned with treating patients than with attending to the recording that is so necessary for efficient treatment. The second concerns the efficiency of the administration, and, in particular, the efficiency of the records section. However, in view of this severe criticism, the point at issue, so far as we are concerned, is: what evidence have we had from the Government that it has investigated this charge to see if it is well founded and, if it is, what corrective action has it taken to see that the unsatisfactory position is remedied? Dr. Crompton has raised another salient point with which one could agree, and it is his advocacy of a greater co-operation between the Public Buildings Department, the Public Works Standing Committee and the honoraries of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I believe that, as the Building Advisory Committee of the honoraries has been formed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, it should be consulted prior to any final determination associated with the additions of new buildings at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. For example, the members of that committee should know whether all operating theatres should be on the one floor, and whether the proposed theatres are sufficient in number and in size to treat the necessary surgical cases that would be admitted from time to time. Broadly speaking, I have every reason to consider that both the board and the administrative staff are doing very capable work in the interests of the community and under very trying conditions.

Again, I remind members that, in so far as Dr. Crompton is concerned, irrespective of whether it occurs in his department or comes under some other officer, if a person journeys from a country town to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for surgical treatment and the case history or records are lost—the patient has presented himself and been admitted into the theatre, the doctor or surgeon is there, he looks for the case history and finds it is

missing—it would be a most embarrassing position for any surgeon to find himself in.

Mr. Jennings: And also embarrassing to the patient, probably.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes. As I mentioned earlier, it may be that the medico or surgeon has written a case history, but it has been mislaid. As surgeons are so overtaxed in their work, let us see whether we can recommend that some other person, not so highly trained, should write up the records and keep them, which would give the honoraries a greater opportunity to examine people needing medical attention rather than that they should waste so many hours during the week in writing up case records.

Last year, Parliament voted considerable sums for the Government to give assistance to many country and community hospital building projects, but the Government did not spend the funds in accordance with the appropriation. At this stage, I shall refer to only two cases that were high-lighted by the Treasurer during the Budget address. They are the Millicent (Thyne Memorial) Hospital estimated to cost £205,000 and the Naracoorte Hospital estimated to cost £150,000. For the Millicent Hospital, we voted more than £30,000 but the Government granted £519. What a miserable contribution! This year, we are voting £50,000 but only time will tell what the Government is prepared to grant to this worthy project. Similarly, with the Naracoorte Hospital, we voted nearly £16,000 last year and the hospital received a subsidy of less than £2,000. As I pointed out with the Loan Estimates, it is no use the Government's placing items on the Estimates if it has no intention of carrying out the work. There are many more instances similar to those I have mentioned where the Government has failed to carry out its promises regarding country and community hospital building projects.

Until this year, the Government has not been prepared to admit that there were any shortcomings in its mental institutions, but, suddenly, it has realized that conditions are so archaic and there is such a shortage of medical and domestic staff that a 22 per cent increase in the allocation is required. There is no denying that improved conditions and additional staff are required. We have previously raised the matter of unsatisfactory conditions and lack of staff in our mental hospitals, and it is only natural that one would receive many letters and representations from persons who are actually working under these trying conditions in a genuine attempt to help the mentally retarded people. One such approach was made

to me about a large group of mentally retarded children: it was pointed out that there was inadequate staff to cope with the needs of these children during the week, but at weekends the staff was further reduced which made the position absolutely hopeless. These people have repeatedly pleaded for additional staff, and their contention is that the staff is required now, and not next year or some time later. Renovations may be needed to the buildings as well as improvements to amenities, but at least let us obtain sufficient staff to carry out the necessary functions in these hospitals. As far as I can ascertain, this is the general consensus of opinion of the majority of the people working in our mental hospitals, and, from personal inspections I have made, their dissatisfaction is well founded.

The position with our mental hospitals is undoubtedly grave, and I am happy that at last the Government is prepared to admit it, and that, according to a reply to a question today, a real attempt is being made by the Public Service Commissioner. However, what plans have been formulated to overcome the unsatisfactory situation? Just pouring colossal sums into our neglected mental hospitals will not overcome the problem unless the Government has some definite ideas for the efficient spending of this money. The same picture has been apparent with our educational system for many years, but until now the Government has not been prepared to admit that there is anything wrong with the system.

Before dealing with education, however, I wish to refer briefly to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, where £4,521,000 is proposed to be spent this year, or a decrease of £120,000. The Treasurer went to great lengths to explain how this is an increase in expenditure for the coming year, but I am not convinced. The particular point in which I am interested is the £150,000 special grant which was allocated to the department for employment-producing works. This is portion of the £970,000 which was allocated by the Commonwealth Government earlier this year, and of which £645,000 was creamed off to Loan expenditure, and therefore became something over which Parliament had no control. In all good faith, we appropriated the remainder, but, in particular, £150,000 went to the Engineering and Water Supply Department to be spent, as the Treasurer stated, on employment-producing works. There were many persons unemployed at the time, and I am sure all members believed that the money would

be used to employ additional wage earners. Of the £150,000 just mentioned, £60,000 was allocated to salaries and wages in this department. If members care to examine the final figures they will find that salaries and wages in this department were under-spent to the extent of £63,000. Therefore, we might just as well not have appropriated the additional sum in the first place. I do not deny that the Government spent the additional money appropriated, but it was mainly spent on the contingency lines of materials and machine hire which would not have the immediate effect of relieving unemployment.

The same criticism applies to the Public Buildings Department under the control of the Minister of Works. In April, out of the special grant referred to above, we appropriated £145,000 for the same reasons as given previously, but the final result has been as follows: total appropriation £1,936,000; expenditure £1,801,000, or an under-spending of £135,000, which tends to offset the expenditure on the public works line of this department shown elsewhere in the Estimates and which increased by £147,000 in accordance with the Supplementary Estimates passed in April. It appears to me that the Government offset the beneficial effects of this expenditure by reducing other works within the Public Buildings Department to the extent of the £135,000 referred to above. Therefore, it would appear that we achieved practically nothing in passing measures for employment-producing works.

I note that the Government intends to spend £14,665,000 on education this year. The Government can certainly boast that it is spending huge sums on education, but, as we pointed out before and we point out again, the improvements in our education system do not appear to be commensurate with the increased expenditure being undertaken. I recently examined the latest report of the Minister of Education, and, over a period of four years from 1956-1960, after excluding capital expenditure such as the building of new schools, the average cost a pupil instructed increased by 33 per cent approximately. Over the same period, the consumer price index increased by only 15 per cent. We still have overcrowded classrooms and lack of teachers and, with the unsatisfactory conditions still continuing, I am of the opinion that we are not receiving value commensurate with the increased expenditure being incurred. We hear all sorts of excuses, such as greatly increased population and a greater proportion of this increased population being of school-going age.

Both these factors would legitimately increase the total amount spent annually on education, but, when the cost is converted to a cost a pupil instructed, the figure should remain fairly constant except for general price increases. In view of the increase in the average cost for each pupil instructed being more than double the increase in the general level of prices in the four-year period 1956-1960, I maintain that the present Government has not the answer to the education problem in this State.

Whilst on this financial aspect of education, I should like to bring to the notice of the Government the fact that the independent schools have been equally as prominent in the provision of education requirements as the Government, and have removed a considerable burden from the Government in meeting its education commitments. In dealing generally with educational requirements, all must realize that there is a limit to the burden that we can expect these bodies to carry. Therefore, what does the future hold for this education problem? In this sphere of education, I believe that there is scope for a public accounts committee to inquire into why the ordinary annual running costs a student are increasing at a far greater rate than is the cost of living with the object of the Government's receiving full value for the colossal sum of money expended in this field.

The Railways Department's provision this year is £14,430,000 or a reduction of £60,000 on the expenditure last year, but, even last year, there was an under-spending in this department of £275,000. Once again, I considered that this department could have been extensively used on additional employment-producing works during the last financial year, but, in view of the substantial under-spending in this department, apparently the Government did not consider that this was desirable. I note also that this year the salaries and wages appropriation for this department is to be reduced by £73,670, although the salaries and wages expenditure last year was £179,000 below the estimate. Is this an indication that railway services are to be further curtailed? The reduction of salaries and wages appears general throughout the Railways Department, and I notice in particular that the Rolling Stock Branch is to be reduced by a further £48,000. This reduction of salaries and wages calls for a major consideration and review by this Government. The proposed reduction of £48,000 in the Rolling Stock Branch indicates to me that we are not keeping pace with the need for overhauls of rolling stock, and in this

respect I refer particularly to the Islington workshops. It seems that if we are not to spend this money the number of staff will be reduced. Men who are retiring are not being replaced.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you say we ought to reduce the staff?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Of course I did not say such a thing. I said the Government ought to closely examine the matter. I suggest that the Government, when it makes an estimate and then does not spend the money, is not paying the fullest attention to the railways equipment. I am deeply concerned about the employment position, especially at the Islington workshops. Certain sections of the sleeping vans have been converted to workshops. I mentioned last year that it was a shortsighted policy of the Government to permit the Railways Commissioner to carry on converting certain of this rolling stock, and especially that on undercarriages, which are positively obsolete. At Penfield and Mitcham, and probably at other places, we can see the rolling stock formerly used on suburban passenger services lying idle. I know that an article appeared in the press last year about the damage done to rolling stock at Penfield. During last session I said that it would be better to use some of those underframes than the type being used today.

If we are to get the best out of employees engaged at Islington, we should take some notice of their views, for with their experience they have a thorough knowledge of all trade practices. It appears to me that we are still overloaded in some directions, and that there are too many captains and colonels and not enough privates out there, because I do not notice any reductions in the appointments of the senior officers. Apparently much less labour is being used at Islington on account of men retiring and not being replaced. There is room for improvement in the Way and Works Branch. I referred to this matter last session and again this year. More employment should be created. The tracks on the West Coast are in a poor condition, and the men have found it impossible to run the trains to the time table. There is no excuse for not carrying out this essential maintenance, for the labour and material is available. Approval has been given to spend money, but the labour has not been engaged for the work. That is not very creditable to any Government in the circumstances in which this State now finds itself, and it behoves the Government, if it is to continue in office,

to do something about the matter. We should not merely take notice of the top brass all the time; let us get the views of some of those not so high up in the scale, and see what their reactions are.

In the past the Islington workshops were recognized as being most efficient, but today we are not even training the personnel we should be training out there. The Government is not even prepared to see that the necessary staff is engaged to use the money which has been approved by Parliament and which should be used to improve the conditions. I will not be told that there is no demand for rail travel. The best illustration of the demand for rail travel is what has occurred as a result of the standardization of the line from Melbourne to Sydney. Just try to get a booking on the Southern Aurora and see how long it takes! Our railways are not obsolete, and the public will support the railway system provided the Government of the day is prepared to supply the services. I do not think there was a better train than our Overland when it was introduced, but it needs some alteration now. Is the Railways Commissioner doing all he can to see that it is done, or has someone in Victoria to be consulted? We must make it a better train than it is. People will travel on it, provided there are modern coaches with all services provided. Then, instead of my having to ask why this money is not spent after approval, all and sundry will be asking for more money to be provided.

Under the Way and Works Branch there is to be a reduction of £9,000 in relation to artisans, gangers, etc. This branch must be considered one of the most important in the railway working, because if we were able to devote more attention to railway track maintenance we might not have so many derailments. At the same time, we would increase our labour force, which would make some contribution towards providing more employment opportunities. We have already been told that we are to get further information from the Treasurer concerning the gauge standardization proposal, and that certain plans have been worked upon and are to be submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee.

In view of the substantial savings being made in the Railways Department (there was an under-spending of £275,000 last year, plus a further reduction of £60,000 this year), I think the Government would have been able to allocate some of these savings to the standardization of railway gauges if it were

genuine in its attempts to push forward with this vital project.

Without wishing to detract from the splendid work being done by the voluntary bushfire organizations under "Minister of Agriculture—Miscellaneous", I point out there are several lines making grants to various bushfire organizations, totalling £65,000. The comparable figure last year was £31,000. In other words, an extra £34,000 is being provided this year. This amount, together with the savings and reductions I have referred to above, would go a long way towards making a reasonable contribution towards the expenditure that is so necessary for an immediate start to be made on the gauge standardization programme. In addition, this type of expenditure should have an appeal for the Treasurer because it can be anticipated that 70 per cent could be reimbursed by the Commonwealth Government in terms of the standardization agreement.

Although much has been said in the press and in the Commonwealth Parliament concerning gauge standardization in this State I think we are entitled to know what is in the Treasurer's mind. Did he agree with his colleagues in the Commonwealth Parliament, particularly the Liberal and Country League Senators, that he was more concerned for them to use their efforts to get the Commonwealth Government to agree to provide the diesel-electric locomotives for the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line, plus some reasonable amount for the Chowilla dam project? Did he agree that if they achieved these matters, he would not press for an immediate gauge standardization commencement? This is a matter which must be clarified, because his recent support of the unanimous resolution that was carried in Parliament concerning gauge standardization is in conflict with the views attributed to him. This debate undoubtedly will give him an opportunity to make the necessary correction. I get invitations to associate at certain functions with members of another political Party, and last week I was in the company of some L.C.L. Senators.

Mr. Lawn: The company was not too good.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I cannot help that. I was invited to the same function. Without reflecting on them in any way, they told me (and I have already referred to some of it) that they were taking up the matter as a Senate team from South Australia and were under instructions from our Premier that if they could get diesel-electric locomotives for the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line, and some money for the Chowilla dam, he would not press for

the standardization of the gauge between Port Pirie and Broken Hill.

Mr. Lawn: That is what the Commonwealth Ministers say.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I do not know about that. I am repeating what I was told at the function. I did not solicit it: it was offered to me voluntarily. I suppose someone has to take the blame and I will take the blame for introducing the subject on behalf of the Labor Party, which I was pleased to do. If the Treasurer and all other members saw merit in my proposal, why is there this controversy between the L.C.L. Senators and this Parliament? I do not understand the position.

As can be gathered from the tenor of my remarks today, the Budget presented by the Treasurer is similar to the Budgets presented to us in recent years, and it does not offer any direct or immediate stimulus towards the recovery of industry and trade in this State. It is purely a continuation of the trend where the Government is steadily increasing its expenditure over the years, but it has not come forward with any evidence that it has adopted policies to relieve the unemployment position during the last financial year. It is merely following the dictates of the Commonwealth Government and adopting the line that an up-turn in business activity will soon occur. I believe, as I mentioned earlier, that we have a vigorous community and that there will be an up-turn in business activity, but the Government should have made its contribution towards the recovery when it was one of the parties to the destruction of business confidence in the first place. In other words, the economy will recover in spite of, rather than because of, Government action.

Last session and again this session I have questioned the Treasurer about matters of Government policy. I have pointed out that there is a desire amongst young people to become efficient chefs, and some desire to be trained as drink waiters. There is no opportunity in South Australia for young people to be trained as chefs. There is a need for an apprentice school to be established. Until we have an investigation into this matter we shall have to depend on overseas people to do the work of chefs. In another debate I gave an illustration of what could be an effective method of constructing school buildings. We are fast approaching the time when we will not have sufficient artisans to complete our building programme. Bricklaying and plastering, in particular, are trades which need personnel. We in this

State will pay dearly in future for not having trained sufficient of these tradesmen. Under the policy adopted by the department, a contractor from another State who has established here is doing a tremendous amount of school-building work, yet there are building contractors who have established their homes here, whose whole interest is in this State, but who are unable to compete with him. This is not fair to our contractors. I consider that there is an obligation on us to see that in the interests of this State something is done about this.

Certain phases of this matter must be investigated. In this State we have both high schools and technical high schools. At high schools students can study to Intermediate standard or higher and be examined by the Public Examinations Board, but we are fast approaching the time when that system may have to go overboard. In technical high schools, where there is an internal examination up to third year, there seems to be a dispute somewhere in the Education Department about whether the standard is acceptable to certain employers, and, if students wish to go further with their studies, the curriculum is set so that they can compete in examinations set by the Public Examinations Board for the Leaving and Leaving Honours certificates. Bricklaying has a positive value, and many students attending technical high school could well learn it. Many of these students have not been able to determine whether their abilities lie in the direction of bricklaying, carpentering, plastering, or fitting and turning. Although the best equipment that can be provided (machinery for fitting and turning and woodworking machines for carpentry) is available in technical high schools, this does not necessarily mean that the students will become efficient in the trades they take up but, if they are given the opportunity, many of them may become first-class bricklayers or plasterers. The Minister of Education could ask headmasters of technical high schools whether they think it would be wise to give instruction in bricklaying and plastering as well as in fitting and turning. The Government has a responsibility to the people of this State, who, as taxpayers, are making available the money to build schools, hospitals, and so on, and we have an obligation to see that contractors pay a fair dividend to the people of this State. Unless prepared to engage apprentices, they should not be given contracts.

Yesterday I reviewed some tenders and, although there were several of them, there was

not £2,000 difference between them in a contract for a building project worth about £88,000. This shows that the industry within itself is competitive. I inquired about the personnel of the successful tenderer, and found that he had apprentice bricklayers and plasterers. Many of his employees who desire to become carpenters find after 12 months' training that they are only wasting their time, unless he is prepared to send them back to school. However, they could have made the grade if they had taken on bricklaying or plastering. I shall not be content until this Government takes more notice of the value of apprentice training, particularly in the building industry, which is as vital to this State as it is to the whole of Australia and the world. I know that the position is becoming desperate.

I have been told over and over again that it is the policy of this Government to pay appropriate award rates in a particular industry. I know, and other members know, that it became fashionable for a certain trade union secretary, who has now retired, to calculate labour-only prices for members of his union. He maintained that that was the only way he could maintain the membership of the union. What has been the result of the piece-work system? No time has been available in which to train apprentices under that system and that lack of training is not in the best interests of the building industry. What is the reaction of the Chairman and the General Manager of the Housing Trust to the methods forced on the trust (I believe on instructions from the Treasurer)? What is the outlay on contracts let on a piece-work basis? Is the Trust achieving a satisfactory result from the work let out? As long as the State provides money, a fair share of it should be diverted towards training personnel for industry. I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of the first line.

Mr. COURCE (Torrens): I, too, support the adoption of the first line, believing that this State Budget is remarkable in several ways. First, it provides for a record expenditure and a record level of receipts. Secondly, it provides for a deficit of about £603,000 compared with an actual surplus last year of £507,000. It also provides, despite an all-time high in expenditure, for no increase in rates and charges for services provided by the Government to the community. Additionally, it is the twenty-fourth consecutive Budget presented by the Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford). After examining the Budget I would call it a "confidence" Budget, because it gives a fillip to

recovery and reflects confidence in the future of this State to grow and expand. I say that, because over recent months we, in South Australia and throughout Australia, have experienced a greater stability in costs, and I am sure that this greater level of stability is welcomed by all honourable members because a stable cost structure means better living conditions and enables future planning to be carried out with greater confidence and certainty. Also, I believe that this stability is a most important factor in the economic recovery being made in South Australia and the rest of the country. During the recent debate on the Loan Estimates I mentioned the employment position in South Australia and the announcement by Chrysler Australia Ltd. of its intention to expand production here. Last week General Motors-Holden's Proprietary Ltd. announced that it was employing more men than ever before in its history, and the level of employment in the South Australian motor industry constituted a record. That most important announcement indicates the improved conditions we are experiencing.

Last Friday the Savings Bank of South Australia issued its annual report, which indicated a general rise in the number of depositors' accounts. The average balance of personal accounts was rising and the average for each depositor was the highest of any savings bank in Australia. I mention those two items to emphasize the recovery that is occurring, and when we read in today's press that there has been a further drop of about 6,700 in the number of unemployed and that the level is now 1.9 per cent of the total work force, and when we consider that in conjunction with the other two matters I have mentioned, we can see that recovery is well on the way. The annual Royal Show was held last week at Wayville with resultant record spending and record attendances—surely an indication of recovery! Record spending and record attendances would not be achieved at any show if conditions were on the downgrade. I am sure that these four instances—General Motors-Holden's Proprietary Ltd., the drop in unemployment, the Savings Bank report and the Royal Show attendances—all point to rapid and spectacular recovery being made in South Australia. All this shows that we are rapidly approaching higher levels of employment and trading activity.

I have mentioned these things because this Budget appears to have been deliberately framed to permit the recovery to advance even

farther. It is also apparent that the Budget presented by the Treasurer follows the same pattern and trend in many ways as the Loan Estimates we considered recently. We have an indication that the expenditures to the various Ministers and departments are to be stretched to the limit, that we have a deficit Budget, and that emphasis is being placed upon certain types of works. We had a deficit Loan Account and now we have a deficit Budget; just as we have provided Loan moneys to the fullest extent for public works, so we have stretched the resources of the State to its utmost in providing similar moneys for this Budget.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Does the honourable member remember what he said last year about deficit Budgets?

Mr. CUMBE: I recall, and I shall have something to say on that shortly. The Treasurer, obviously, could have tried to balance this Budget, but it is apparent to all members that if he had done that someone would have had to go without. On the other hand, an alternative would have been for the Government to court a little popularity and give some tax reduction or hand-out. That could have been expected, but I am sure that such action would, at this time, have led to justifiable criticism in the present circumstances, and I believe that this Committee as a whole will support the Government in its move to go into deficit in its 1962-63 Budget. The Government is obviously maintaining its efforts to encourage a return to full employment by means of this Budget, just as it did with the Loan Estimates. This is obviously reflected in the fact that in the second half of the 1961-62 financial year this State had the lowest rate of unemployment in the Commonwealth, an achievement that all members of this House should acclaim.

In this Budget the Treasurer has been able to avoid higher charges, rates and taxes, only by budgeting for a deficit. The alternative was to have higher taxes and some retrenchments. If such action had been contemplated I am sure it would hardly have been likely to promote confidence and expansion in industry and trade. In my view the Government has resolutely set its face against such action and has avoided any course that would tend to retard recovery. In the light of the present circumstances of our economic climate, it is interesting to look at the effect of this deficit budgeting on our community. A deficit Budget is, of course, always indicative of increased Government

activity in the various spheres that it can influence or command. Deficit budgeting also means development, and development, which I have spoken of before, always means more jobs, more money in circulation and an all-round lift and fillip in trade and commerce. That is one of the main effects of deficit budgeting when we are experiencing the economic trends of today.

I agree with one comment made by the Leader of the Opposition a moment ago: that there appears to be in some sections throughout Australia a hesitancy to trade and operate in a really expansive and confident manner. It is just as well that this view is not shared by most producers. There is a shortage of confidence in a few firms rather than a shortage of money for development. Also, the present buoyancy and upsurge of mercantile activity would be increased if businesses, traders and companies were to strike out boldly, lift their sights a little, and look for new horizons. That is most important. I consider that this Budget gives the spur and sets the example. It is now up to some members of the private sector, which is, after all, the largest sector of our business community, to carry it on to its natural conclusion.

There appears to be at present money available for expansion to occur in the business community, and, after all, if business communities expand, it means that more jobs will be made available, thus ensuring a higher standard of living. Savings bank deposits in Australia rose last year by £157,000,000. Hire-purchase companies now have more cash to finance additional projects and business. The banking position today is far more liquid than it has been. No doubt many businessmen as well as members of Parliament find it much easier to get overdrafts today than they found it six months ago.

In the next few months we shall have another interesting aspect, in that the spending power of the Australian public will be strengthened and enlarged by the receipt of thousands of tax refunds, which have been estimated this year to be worth about £90,000,000. This will come on to the market in the next month or two. Some of these tax refunds are already being paid. Most of them will be in the taxpayers' hands (and, we hope, in their banks) before Christmas, so that will tend to give another fillip to Christmas trading and will provide another record spending in the stores at Christmas time. Therefore, I submit that, when we take all

these factors into consideration, we can confidently expect an early return to normal activity, possibly sooner than some of the more despondent members of the business community expect.

Turning to the actual Budget papers, we find that in 1962-63 it is estimated that receipts will bring in some £96,251,000 against an estimated expenditure of some £96,854,000. If my arithmetic is right, that leaves a deficit of about £603,000 which, when added to the Loan deficit of almost £1,000,000, gives a total deficit this year of £1,600,000 which has to be paid back sooner or later. This contrasts with the position in 1961-62 when there was an estimated Budget surplus of £3,000, but the actual result was a Budget surplus at June 30 of £507,000. Members are all aware of how this surplus was used. We know that £500,000 of it was appropriated to the Electricity Trust for expenditure under the Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Bill, and that the remaining £6,736 was taken into the Consolidated Revenue Account to offset an estimated Revenue deficit for this year (1962-63) of £603,000; so that has given us an estimated deficit on the Consolidated Revenue Account as at June 30, 1963, of £596,264, the figure we are considering today.

Looking at the Consolidated Revenue Account, we see where the money to run the State comes from and in what proportions. According to my figures, State taxation this year represents 13.5 per cent of the total of £96,000,000, and public works and services represents 46.1 per cent; territorial, which takes in a host of items, is 0.9 per cent, and Commonwealth 38.2 per cent. These ratios are fairly constant compared with last year, with only minor variations apparent. One significant variation is that under the heading of "Commonwealth", where the taxation reimbursement grant rose by only 4.7 per cent compared with 8.1 per cent last year. This has resulted in a slight decrease in the total percentage that the Commonwealth line bears to the total of £96,000,000, despite (and this is important) the supplementary additional assistance grant of £1,312,000 made during the year. This Commonwealth line, representing as it does some 38 per cent of our total revenue in this year, shows how we in South Australia depend on Commonwealth taxation reimbursements, and high-lights our utter and complete reliance on Commonwealth assistance and hand-outs.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you say that is good or bad?

Mr. COURCE: I have certain views on that. I do not think any State should be completely reliant on another Government.

Mr. Loveday: I thought we were not a mendicant State now.

Mr. COURCE: That is so. The honourable member should know better than to ask such a question. He and his colleagues are enjoying themselves and agree that there is no doubt that this State would benefit enormously from increased Commonwealth grants for development works in South Australia.

Mr. Riches: We are not a claimant State any more.

Mr. COURCE: I am talking about special grants. I suggest there is no doubt in the mind of any member that South Australia recently has not been receiving as much of these special grants as it should. To put it another way, I do not think we have been getting our fair share of these special grants compared with the rest of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Loveday: Senator Paltridge does not agree with you.

Mr. COURCE: I do not always agree with Senator Paltridge. I am sure that the resolution unanimously passed in this House and directed to the South Australian Senators can do nothing but good. It will press home to the Senators the crying need in this State for more financial assistance of the special grant type.

Mr. Lawn: Do you think the resolution can be effective when the Treasurer intimates that he wants the Chowilla dam in preference to railway standardization?

Mr. COURCE: I am referring to special grants, and no doubt the honourable member would agree with me when I say that I would welcome special grants for both projects. I expect that ultimately we shall get both projects. South Australia has few natural resources, but we are prepared to help ourselves. The emphasis in all our financial measures has been upon development, and I am sure that before long we shall receive additional special grants for our essential projects.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Would you agree that it is up to the Commonwealth Government to make more money available for capital development?

Mr. COURCE: I would like more money to be made available in various parts of the Commonwealth, but particularly in South Australia. We are prepared to help ourselves, but apparently that is not the position in some other States. The Chowilla dam and railway standardization—as well as other projects—are

important not only to the State but to the Commonwealth as a whole. They are of national importance, and involve the export potential of the country. I urge that more recognition be given to South Australia's claims for special grants, and I am sure that it will be given if sufficient clamour and more representations are made.

It is interesting to note that in the last financial year the variations from the estimated revenues generally were in an upward direction. The overall increase was £1,655,500, or 1.01 per cent, with increases in most categories of the Consolidated Revenue Account. This compares with a decrease in actual payments of £139,000 as compared with the vote in the authorized appropriations for both the special Acts and Appropriation Accounts for 1961-62, and is a decrease of .99 per cent.

On the Expenditure lines we find some spectacular departmental increases, both in the total vote and in the percentage rise compared with last year. For the Hospitals Department, the proposed total expenditure of £6,800,000 represents an increase of nine per cent: the expenditure on mental hospitals is increased by 22 per cent. The total of £14,600,000 for the Education Department represents an increase of 11.2 per cent. The expenditure on the university is increased by 9.9 per cent; on education services by 10.7 per cent; and on the Institute of Technology by 14.3 per cent. This year the total expenditure on the Police Department will be £3,000,000, an increase of seven per cent; on the Sheriff and Gaols and Prisons Department, £559,000, an increase of six per cent; on the Harbors Board, £1,500,000, an increase of 5½ per cent; and on the Mines Department, £760,000, an increase of 18 per cent. These are not small increases, but are extraordinarily spectacular and reveal that this Government is seized not only with the desire to spend more money, but to spend money on the Government departments, thus indirectly speeding our recovery through greater employment.

I appreciate the proposals to expend money on work in my district, particularly in subsidizing the many private hospitals there, the principal one being the Children's Hospital. It is also proposed to expend money in improving various schools. However, I am disappointed that no grant is proposed for the Senior Citizens' Club with which I have been associated. I have read much of the work that this organization has done in other States. It is rendering a worthwhile service to the community and next year the Government

should provide some assistance to this organization whose work is greatly appreciated by many of the elderly members of our community.

I was interested to hear some of the Leader's comments, particularly regarding land tax. I waited in vain to hear him suggest how money could be obtained to replace that which we would lose through reducing land tax. The Leader suggested lower taxation charges as a means of overcoming unemployment. It is a novel way of creating more work and creating confidence. It is contrary to common sense and all accepted practice. He suggests less Government expenditure to overcome unemployment. I might call this the "Walsh Plan"—less spending and more work. I contrast that with the proposals enunciated in this Budget which have been deliberately planned to create confidence in the community and to stimulate employment.

This Budget, in the economic conditions and economic climate that we are experiencing today, can truly be described as a recovery Budget. The Treasurer has deliberately planned a Budget deficit; he has avoided any increases in taxation and charges; and he has framed a financial policy within the limits of the resources available to him that will promote more trade and encourage and expedite a return to full employment and normal conditions.

Mr. Lawn: Are you trying to win the electorate? You want more confidence following the elections of last March.

Mr. CUMBE: I conclude by saying that this Budget is without doubt a very sensible and very courageous document, and I commend the Treasurer for its preparation and presentation. I have much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the first line.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I listened with great interest to the member for Torrens. He gave great credit to the Government for the recovery from our economic ills, but I remind him that if the Government is to be given credit for such a recovery it must be branded as being responsible for those economic ills: it cannot have it both ways. The honourable member referred to the additional expenditure to stimulate our economy and to provide employment. What an amazing statement to make! The Leader of the Opposition has already pointed out that a considerable amount of money granted to the Railways Department last year was not expended, and if that is so, how can the member for Torrens claim that this money is provided for the

purpose of stimulating and creating employment? The money was there and it was not used. The Leader said:

The railways provision this year is £14,430,000 or a reduction of £60,000 on the expenditure last year, but, even last year, there was an under-spending in this department of £275,000.

The Leader went to great pains to point out that what was most necessary for the development of this country was adequate transportation, especially railway services, and that such services would no doubt assist both primary and rural industries to develop and to expand in a way that would result in additional employment and in additional money being circulated. Yet the member for Torrens tries to justify the action of a Government that, by his own admission, has been responsible for the economic ills that we have for so long suffered, and he now claims that the Government is stimulating the economy of this country. The honourable member went to much trouble to tell us that the Government did not propose any increases in charges. For a long time we have heard much about there being no increased charges.

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

Mr. HUTCHENS: Prior to the adjournment I drew attention to some remarks by the member for Torrens. I understand that they were made somewhat under pressure. I referred to his statement that no extra charges would be made under the Budget proposals, but John Citizen would be hard to convince of this fact. He often hears that there are to be no increased charges, but on receiving accounts for services he gets a surprise. The Auditor-General's report suggests that there is every possibility of an increase in water charges, because of a deficit of about £2,000,000. All members appreciate the need to keep down charges as much as possible in order to encourage existing industries and to induce others to come to South Australia. For the development of our economy the establishment of new industries is essential. The Opposition will support any policy aimed at keeping down costs. It is estimated in the Budget that expenditure this year will be £96,854,000, which will be an all-time record high. With our developing economy we must expect increased expenditure, and it must result in higher receipts, the estimate for this year being £96,251,000.

Mr. Jennings: It is inevitable with the increase in population.

Mr. Quirke: Nevertheless, it is welcome.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I would encourage it all the way, and that will be evident from my later remarks. The estimated deficit is £603,000. The Government intends to overspend on Loan Account and to achieve something like a balanced Budget. We must agree with many of the Treasurer's statements. First he referred to the decision to push ahead with a large programme of capital works. He said it was right and proper and that it would be necessary for many years to come. Australia, and South Australia in particular, is in its infancy in connection with development. In this modern age we must be prepared for alterations. With the entry of the United Kingdom into the European Common Market it will be necessary for the Governments of Australia and New Zealand to supply services in greater quantities than ever before, and with much greater rapidity. With the consent of this Parliament, and to some extent the people of the State, I was able last year to see many parts of the world. I am reluctant to give my impressions of what I saw lest it be said that I am boastful, but that is not the case. My experience has made me far more appreciative of my position as a member of Parliament and how difficult it is to fill that role with any degree of efficiency. I wish that every member of this Parliament could have the experience I had. It would be of great benefit to the State. Since the Hon. Mr. Hookings returned from his rushed and brief trip overseas I have had several talks with him and it is clear that we think alike regarding world affairs. I shall make some observations with a view to showing that this Parliament, with its faith in the country, the people and itself, and acknowledging our importance in a rapidly changing world, faces a terrific challenge. I am convinced that the United Kingdom will enter the European Common Market. I believe she will make strong endeavours to protect the economic interests of the Commonwealth countries. Even if she fails to do that, she will be compelled to join for both economic and political reasons. I am afraid that this will happen.

Mr. Quirke: You can take it for granted that she will join.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The honourable member is right. It is easy for us to feel that this part of the British Commonwealth has been let down, but one has only to be in the United Kingdom for a short time to get some appreciation of what the United Kingdom has

done in making sacrifices for the Commonwealth. The people in the United Kingdom are great, but their standard of living falls much short of ours. Their industries, except those that are specialized, such as Imperial Chemical Industries and the Bristol Aircraft Company, are, by comparison with Australian industries, antiquated, and I say that with all sincerity. To prove my point I shall refer briefly to the textile industries in Australia and Scotland. In Australia the testing of cloth by employees is done by running the cloth over a glass table with a fluorescent light underneath. We can appreciate the poor light in Scotland, but in testing there the cloth is rolled down manually past a window. Britain's most modern housing estates do not compare with ours. Taking all things into consideration, I am sure our housing, in capital cost and design, compares more than favourably with anything in the world, but we have much to learn about home-building finance. The aristocracy in England has almost been taxed out of existence. These are my impressions about Europe from what I saw and heard.

After the Second World War, the United States of America pumped money into France, Belgium, Luxemburg, Italy, the Netherlands and West Germany, thus enabling them to develop their productive potential. These countries, now united under the Treaty of Rome, can under-sell the remainder of Europe. Russia, as we all know, has emerged in recent years as a world power. Without giving further detail, I think that from an economic and political point of view the United Kingdom had little choice and, after taking stock, applied to join the Common Market.

Will there remain a British Commonwealth? I think most people in Australia hope there will. In this regard, may I ask whether Queen Elizabeth II may reside in Australia in the future as Queen of the British Commonwealth? I am certain it is not impossible.

Mr. Fred Walsh: What about "Bob's your uncle"? He may be keen.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I have no uncle of royal blood, so I am not anticipating that.

Mr. Jennings: He should be crowned.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I did not see the relationship my friends did. There will be some great changes in our trade, and I fear that some of our well-established industries, particularly primary, may well go out of existence. We must be ready to go to great lengths to meet these changes. This is, of course, the responsibility of the Commonwealth Parliament, which should be doing something about it, but its

inactivity in respect of public works in recent years has been disgraceful. Accordingly, the States have to proceed with all the vigour possible in capital works, supplying service for industries.

This Parliament, I believe, has shown its desire to see the State develop. It is with far more than a little concern that we, over the years, have seen the Menzies Government make it impossible for this State to develop, which it must do if we are to meet the challenge. Of course, I give members opposite credit for having the courage to squeal, but their cries of pain do not gain my sympathy in any way. However, my sorrow for this State is deep and real, for there can be no doubt that the South Australian Liberal and Country League is the most glaring example of political insanity in the world. Since 1950, from members opposite we have heard continual complaints, condemnation, and emotional squealing against the Menzies Government, but is there one who has not poured money into funds to have the Menzies Government returned to power? Is there one who has not stumped his district or the State asking for support for the Menzies Government?

Mr. Shannon: It shows what we think of what our opposition would be.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I think it shows the lack of intelligence of members opposite. The Frankenstein monster is the creation of men of evil intent, and it must be made clear that this state of affairs can be retained only by the self-seeking men who have been guilty of keeping it in operation. It must be made clear that the retarding of this State's progress is not entirely the fault of the Menzies Government; it has been aided and abetted by those who have kept it there. Of course, words like these in the Treasurer's speech sound nice to those who do not think. He said:

During the first half of 1961-62 the degree of unemployment in this State was kept lower than any other State except Western Australia. Unemployment is the result of bad planning or of no planning at all.

Because of what I said a few moments ago about the European Common Market, I shall now say something about what I saw in the Asian countries. Recently, this State was visited by the King and Queen of Thailand. On the way home we spent a little time in Thailand, although admittedly most of it was spent in Bangkok. Thailand is an old and, to us, a backward country, but we should not be deceived by this because, in the city of Bangkok, the difference between the outlook of

the teenager group and the parent group is difficult to appreciate. The advance in thinking is so great that it is hard to realize that they are the same people. The little children going to and from school are alert by comparison with their elders, and they show most clearly that standards are on the way up. The teenagers are talking about what they will do to raise their standards of living, and they are demanding a standard similar to that enjoyed in the Western World.

At Kuala Lumpur (in Malaya), we saw the advancement that had taken place in a short space of time; teachers' training colleges, universities, housing estates, highways and freeways were being constructed. This will be a modern country in the near future. Large sections of the population are living under high standards. In Singapore, Hong Kong, and even in India, a distinct upward movement in the standard of living could be seen. In these countries, and in others like them, appears to be our future. Nevertheless, I would not plan on these impressions alone. The great difficulties of foretelling the future with any accuracy place serious limits on what can be expected from national economic planning. The planners are, in effect, planning for a future of which they can at the best have only an imperfect and incomplete knowledge. Plans that appear right today can be lamentably wrong tomorrow. Some new unforeseen influence raises its head—some great discovery, some world shaking event, some entirely unexpected occurrence—and the most carefully laid elaborate plans are rendered fit only for the pigeon-holes. Because of this we can not be caught napping.

In my Address in Reply remarks I drew attention to the need for a national committee in an endeavour to assist in national planning. I do not suggest a committee with any real power—far be it from that. We are all aware of one thing. We as a State have to go right to our limits to provide services and efficiency that will enable us to meet every change. This cannot be done without cost. Therefore, we must speculate and I say this in supporting a deficit and the spending from the Loan programme.

But, while it is wise to keep costs down, it is certainly faulty economy to deny ourselves the right of proving our efficiency on the basis of cost alone. I do not believe that we lack skill or the will to work. That is acknowledged by most people. Our costs must, in respect to manpower, be the most reasonable and under most other States in the

Commonwealth. The *Commonwealth Year Book*, at page 447, shows that the male basic wage weekly rates at July 7, 1961, were:

State.	City.	£	s.	d.
New South Wales	Sydney	14	15	0
Victoria	Melbourne	14	7	0
Queensland	Brisbane	13	10	0
South Australia	Adelaide	14	3	0
Western Australia	Perth	14	14	0

South Australia has the lowest figure in the Commonwealth excepting Queensland.

The low wage rate and the efficiency of our workers have no doubt been partly responsible for Chrysler Aust. Ltd. and General Motors-Holden's deciding on an expansion programme in this State. This was mentioned this afternoon by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe). It is gratifying to see that some big manufacturing concerns have some confidence in South Australia, which is more than the Government has. It claims that because of costs diesel-electric locomotives must be built in another State. This is far from sound. It is an admission of the failure of the Minister to provide management to do the work that is so essential for our self-sufficiency in a service vital to the welfare of the State. The Leader made much of this point this afternoon.

Few industries can progress unless we are assured of a completely satisfactory transport system. There must always be a doubt unless replacements can be provided by our own workmen. It must not be overlooked that we did in the past build diesel-electric locomotives. Why not now? We have lower wages than the other States; we produce our own steel; we have skilled labour, but the Government says it would cost us more.

Mr. Lawn: We have cheaper workmen's compensation premiums.

Mr. HUTCHENS: That may be so. We know of many reasons. Well, there can be only one real reason: poor administration at Government level. We hear much at election time about industrial expansion. The last thing I would do is decry the efforts of South Australia.

In the Loan Estimates debate I provided tables showing the difficulties of developing this vast and dry State. In many respects our achievements are a credit to our people, but to say that our percentage increase is higher than any other State is stretching the truth just a little. The *Commonwealth Year Books* of 1938-39 and 1958-59 indicate that N.S.W. has increased her factory output by about eight times; Victoria by 9½ times; Queensland by seven times; South Australia by 9¾ times; Western Australia 10

times; and Tasmania 10 times. Of percentage increases in factory numbers, I think it is true that our increase is equal to the best. Even Western Australia and Tasmania have increased their percentage increase. It must be acknowledged that the Eastern States had industry established to a much greater degree than South Australia had in 1938-39. However, it is true to say that our increase is equal to the best.

Figures of factory production a head in 1958-59 are as follows:

	£
N.S.W.	216.14
Victoria	219.38
Queensland	109.02
South Australia	153.93
Western Australia	110.58
Tasmania	159.11
Australia	185.14

Those figures indicate that New South Wales and Victoria are well ahead, and Tasmania is also ahead of South Australia per capita. The pastoral figures a head in the four years to 1959-60 are as follows:

	£	s.	d.
N.S.W.—Increased by	5	19	7
Victoria—Increased by	6	14	1
Queensland—Increased by	2	3	2
S.A.—Increased by	0	3	1
W.A.—Decreased by	0	0	4
Tasmania—Decreased by	0	4	7

I do not quote these figures other than to draw attention to the fact that to obtain these figures a huge costly public works programme was needed. Accordingly our Public Debt has increased from £185 3s. a head in 1939 to £414 a head in 1961—the highest of the mainland States. In 1957 it was £340 a head, rising at an average of £18 10s. a head each year. But, in the brief time I have had at my disposal to study the Auditor-General's report, I find that for the year ending June 30, 1962, our public debt had risen to £435 a head, a rise of £21. Therefore, the future events and the public debt demand care, courage, planning, development, decentralization, immigration and an understanding of other peoples of the world as well as our own. This is not possible under our present set-up. We need something in the nature of the committee I suggested in the Address in Reply debate. It should consist of members of both sides of each Parliament in the Commonwealth with expert advisers to guide us to meet the challenge which is ours by planning wisely. So far the public have been most co-operative.

I notice with pleasure that our overseas indebtedness is reasonable. It is for this reason that I urge a national committee of members of Parliament, for I am convinced

of two things: if the people are well informed they will co-operate; with co-operation from all classes, great advancement in world affairs can be our achievement. If we fail, a great part of the world will fail with us.

This brings me to the operations of our own legislature. I noticed on the lines covering the Legislative Council, the House of Assembly and the Parliamentary Library an amount of £39,000. I should like to express my appreciation to the officers and the staff associated with Parliament. In this State we have men and other personnel equal to any. Our Clerks have to cover a much wider field than Clerks of larger Parliaments. During my period as a member of this place, I have found that the work of members has increased tremendously over the years. I was glad to hear that acknowledged this afternoon, and I believe that the work will increase. So many are the calls upon an individual member that very limited is the time available for one to do the necessary research to make a proper and full investigation of the operations of the various departments. The Parliamentary Library staff are most helpful, but I point out that, as members of Her Majesty's Opposition, we are at a great disadvantage, for the Ministers of the Crown have many experts to advise them. I believe the time is approaching, if it is not already here, when the Opposition will have to be supplied, as they are in the United States of America, with panels of advisers. I am not advocating that we go as far as the United States but I feel that at least the time has arrived when officers of Her Majesty's Opposition should have a staff to help them. The difficulties facing us were made evident this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition. We are now discussing, I suppose, one of the most important parts of our Parliamentary procedure. The lifeblood of the operations of our Parliament is money, yet we find ourselves, as an Opposition this afternoon, discussing the Budget, and every item of expenditure of the Budget, without the assistance of the Auditor-General's report. I admit it was tabled earlier but I have not received a copy and the Leader of the Opposition is, I believe, the only member on this side of the House who has had a copy presented to him. However, neither he nor we, the other members on this side, have had time to peruse it in detail.

An item that gives me some concern is the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement. I appreciate the necessity for such a committee but I feel, as I know members of

the committee do, that it would be much better if they could justify their existence by having some work to do. In view of the heavy burden of the Public Works Committee, there is a good case for changing the constitution of both these committees and permitting the present Land Settlement Committee to assist in some of the inquiries now referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. No Parliament can justify the expenditure of £2,000 per annum for no activity whatsoever.

This brings me to a point raised by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). I am glad to note that the reply he received in regard to the Transport Advisory Council indicates that it is to be discontinued. It seems from the reply to his question that it has been in operation since 1957. Its three members have had nothing referred to them. The committee has made no inquiries but has created an expenditure of £1,619. Therefore, if one committee is to go out of existence because of inactivity, it should behove the Government to do something to see that some work is given to a committee that is operating.

Referring to the line under Police Department, where the proposed expenditure is over £3,000,000, I should like to express my appreciation for the work done by members of this department. We members have some reason to contact this department. We admit that mistakes are made in all departments but I would say that from the Commissioner to the most junior officer I have always received the greatest courtesy, and I believe that we in South Australia are fortunate in having a Police Department of such a high standard. Recently my district has received the services of a branch of the Criminal Investigation Branch, which is stationed at the Hindmarsh police department buildings. I have seen the conditions under which these and other police officers are working and, to say the least, I admire them for the uncomplaining way in which they carry out their duties. The rooms in which the members of the C.I.B. are working are very small, and I feel that they are quite inadequate for the proper functioning of such an important department. While I shall deal with the various lines as they come before us, I should like to take this opportunity of urging that some press publicity be given to the need for pensioners to obtain coverage under some of the hospital association funds. I, with other members, am continually receiving requests from pensioners to approach the Hospitals Department in respect to their accounts. There are still many

who believe that, as pensioners, they are entitled to free hospitalization. While I have found the department most considerate, I appreciate that it has to work under regulations, and this places many pensioners who are ignorant of the facts in great difficulties and distress. I never miss an opportunity of explaining this to pensioners but nevertheless some still hold to these false views.

In connection with the Attorney-General's Department, I believe the time is long overdue when we should review the method and tenure of appointment of justices of the peace. Such an appointment is for life, and many of our justices have grown old. They have served effectively in the past but many are no longer able, due to increasing age and the disabilities associated with it, to perform the functions of their office effectively. This, of course, often results in a long list of justices in certain areas, which is misleading. The Government should consider granting a title to such persons. It could be in the nature of a token of appreciation for valuable services rendered and would denote that the justice had served with distinction, but was no longer able to do so through no fault of his own.

The Tourist Bureau is a department that has a greater value to the State's economy than many people realize. In other parts of the world it is the tourist trade which sells a country. I offer my congratulations to our Director and his staff for the mighty job they are doing, but I suggest that they consider making available to people travelling to other States by car stickers advertising South Australia to be attached to the rear window. This is done in Queensland and it is most effective. We have many valuable tourist attractions in South Australia, but several are not being used to the best advantage. For instance, Kangaroo Island would be used much more if we had a passenger boat leaving Cape Jervis and calling at Penneshaw. We have a good road from Adelaide to Cape Jervis and the distance from Cape Jervis to Penneshaw is not great. I realize that some difficulties would be involved, and that the *Troubridge* cannot be regarded as a passenger vessel. I believe that many people living on the mainland would enjoy having holidays on Kangaroo Island if such a service were available.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I agree, but what would you suggest?

Mr. HUTCHENS: Endeavours should be made to provide a service. I think that private enterprise could be encouraged, if the service were subsidized.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Very good.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to have the Minister's support. I notice that over £14,000,000 is provided for the operation of the Education Department. Such an amount, and percentage of our revenue, is necessary for education and it provides a good reason for preparing a case for Commonwealth assistance for State education. It cannot be denied that those who avail themselves of the department's services are qualifying not to serve in a limited capacity but to serve for the good of Australia as a whole. There should be no difficulty in convincing the Commonwealth authorities that they have a responsibility in this matter. I appreciate the great advances that have been made in education and I realize the difficulties that have been created by our increasing population, but few people are aware of the advantages of the adult training classes associated with our technical schools. I think the Minister of Education would be grateful if the press publicized these classes. The achievements of those who attend such classes are often sensational. It is easy for the press to write about those people we term delinquents. The press could render the country a service—and also relieve us of the problems of these delinquents who are only rebelling against imaginary repressions—by drawing attention to the classes which could be used as a means of absorbing energy and finding an outlet for expression, and which could lead to a more satisfactory state of mind and be of great advantage to the State.

I congratulate the new Deputy Director of Education, Mr. Walker, who for years was Superintendent of Technical High Schools. He has great ability and is dedicated to his work. He has never spared himself in seeking to improve the education of our young people and I am sure the department will progress under his leadership. Mr. Bone, who has been appointed Superintendent of Technical High Schools, is a young man of great ability, much energy and understanding. I will defer discussion of other features of the Budget. I have pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I rise to express briefly my appreciation of two specific lines, both mentioned under "Chief Secretary and Minister of Health—Miscellaneous" and both dealing with somewhat similar subjects. An amount of £4,667 is provided for the Mentally Retarded Children's Society of South Australia as part contribution towards the establishment

of a sheltered workshop at Brompton. I think honourable members may know something of the work done by this organization, which continues providing some sort of occupational therapy for children who pass through the occupation centres of the Education Department. As honourable members might know, these children are at present carried on beyond the normal leaving age to the age of 20, and the society has taken the responsibility of providing them with some sort of work to keep them occupied. It already has one workshop in the district of the member for Unley.

I do not know whether members are conversant with the workings of that organization. Now, following the success of the first workshop, the organization has bought this property at Brompton, and has thereby provided accommodation for an additional 30 children. This grant actually came as a result of a deputation earlier this year to the Minister of Education who, as you, Mr. Chairman, know, has always shown a sympathetic understanding of the problems which confront not only the parents of these unfortunate children but the children themselves. At his suggestion, this matter was brought before Cabinet. I express my appreciation to the Government for the sympathetic attitude which it has shown to this request. Actually, the offer made by the Government was that two-thirds of the cost of establishing this centre at Brompton would come from Government funds. The total cost of about £7,000 covers not only the purchase of the property but the alterations and additions and the equipment necessary to set up the centre in working order. I sometimes feel very humble that I am given the opportunity in this place to express appreciation, more or less as spokesman for the organizations which are doing this very fine type of work, and I make no apology for the fact that I sometimes hark back to this particular subject.

The second item to which I wish to refer is the grant of money for a similar purpose, namely, the allocation of £5,000 to the Phoenix Society, again for a sheltered workshop. If I might make the observation, Sir, I think this is a very welcome and very humane departure on the part of the Government in making this sort of provision for these people. We all know the old saying which can be paraphrased as, "The Government helps those who are prepared to help themselves." I think that these two cases I have cited are instances of just this sort of thing. The name of the Phoenix Society is very aptly applied to this organization. The Phoenix was a fabulous

bird, I think of Arabian mythology, that had the capacity to destroy itself and, having destroyed itself (I think every 500 years or thereabouts) it then had the capacity to rise from its own ashes. I think that the name given to this organization is a splendid one, for its members have had the capacity and courage to rise from the ashes or from the chaos of their own very tragic lives, and many of them have had tragic lives through having been stricken with some kind of infirmity or another. Once again, I pay my personal tribute, and I am sure that I would have the support of all the people associated with the Phoenix Society in expressing thanks to the Government and to Parliament for this very timely grant.

If I might just tell you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, the Phoenix Society functioned in very small and dingy and completely unsatisfactory quarters in Carrington Street, but with great courage it carried on and was able to attract from manufacturers and industrialists in this State a number of contracts that were within the power of its members to execute. It was fast becoming evident that this small sheltered workshop was bursting at the seams. At that stage I was very happy to persuade the Treasurer to come with me one morning to have a look at these people at work in their small workshop. He came, and I think he was most impressed. I know he gave these people a tremendous fillip in that they felt spurred on to greater effort because he said he was impressed by what he saw and that if it was within his power to help them he would do so.

I should also like to thank the members of the Housing Trust and the General Manager (Mr. Ramsay) to whom the Treasurer turned for suggestions as to the type of building that would be available and suitable for these people. Both these grants were approved of recently in the one week, and I was a very happy person as a result. The Phoenix Society is now hopeful that the Treasurer himself will open that workshop sometime in November. I am grateful for this opportunity of expressing my personal appreciation and, I am sure, the appreciation of the people associated with both the Mentally Retarded Children's Society and the Phoenix Society for the grants which the Government has made in this year's Estimates.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore): I support the first line of the Estimates. I extend credit to the Government for having made available £15,000 for the Spastic Welfare Association at Woodville. As a life member of this very fine

organization I am cognizant of the excellent work it has done over the years, and because of the progress it has made the Government undoubtedly has recognized its worth and from time to time made money available to assist it. The organization started many years ago in a meagre way; it had an ambulance for the purpose of conveying disabled children to the Crippled Children's Home. Eventually it grew to such magnitude that it acquired an old house on Woodville Road, Woodville, and today, with the many extensions that have been carried out, it is performing excellent work for children throughout the State. Dark children come down from the Northern Territory for two or three months to be cared for in the home, and thus are enabled to see something of life. We realize that these spastic children are incurable. The work being carried out to try to improve the lot of these children is something I am proud of, and I always commend those in the organization who have played such an important part in making life worth while for those children.

Condemnation is sometimes levelled because of the fact that officers have been paid for their work, but we realize that if we are to attain something worthwhile we must pay for it. The secretary, of course, receives a remuneration, and the usual officers in the administration are paid. However, the committee works voluntarily, and I know that its members are really satisfied with the progress the organization has made in this State. Some few years ago I helped the association in its overtures to the Minister of Education in order that a teacher might be obtained to tutor some of the kiddies who could assimilate some knowledge to help them in their future lives. In the Estimates last year the Education Department provided money for a teacher to impart to the children something which might make their lot better than it was before.

Another matter which I should like to refer to—and I have done so on a number of occasions—concerns the South Australian Fire Brigades Board and the contributions paid by the Government and by municipal bodies throughout the State. This year I notice that the allocation to the board is £61,244, an increase of £5,641 on the previous financial year. I have advocated the adoption of a more equitable system for the allocation of contributions by councils, some of which are paying more than should be expected. I believe that the Port Adelaide City Council suffers mostly in this respect. It covers an area from Woodville to Semaphore and Outer Harbour. This

year the council will pay £16,716, which is £1,309 more than in the previous year. Over the years the contributions have increased steadily, and now the council is finding it burdensome. This contribution must be met by the ratepayers and they are complaining bitterly. They feel that the expense should be met by insurance companies and more by the Government. In 1961 Port Adelaide had a population of 38,906. Last year Unley had a population of 40,205, and the council's contribution was £1,782. It has a greater population than Port Adelaide, yet pays a smaller amount. Last year Woodville, with a population of 70,000, paid about £7,000. This year Port Pirie with a population of 14,190, will pay £7,526.

Some years ago when this matter was discussed here the Treasurer said he had written to the councils asking whether they would agree to a scheme that was considered more equitable, but more than half the councils written to had not replied, and those that had were satisfied with the existing position. Of course, whenever a new scheme is put to a council, and it will cost more than previously, the council will always oppose it. The Government should introduce legislation basing the contributions on a population basis. In the Port River the *Fire Queen* is used extensively to quell outbreaks of fire on ships and in sheds. For years the *Fire Queen* has performed a yeoman service. She is maintained by the Government, insurance companies and the Port Adelaide council, but the council pays more than it should pay.

Mr. Ryan: The *Fire Queen* also protects Government buildings.

Mr. TAPPING: Yes. It protects cargoes and Harbors Board sheds.

Mr. Ryan: For which sheds the council receives no rates.

Mr. TAPPING: That is so. We should pass legislation for a scheme fairer to all councils. In the main the councils are satisfied that their contributions are not burdensome, but to be fair we must increase the contributions by some councils and reduce those by other councils that are now paying too much. The member for Hindmarsh referred to the work of the justices of the peace. I want to refer to their method of appointment. When I entered Parliament years ago a person desiring to become a justice of the peace sought the assistance of the member for the district. The document says, "This nomination should go through the member for the House of

Assembly district." To my amazement that has not been the procedure for some years.

Mr. Quirke: Does it say "should"?

Mr. TAPPING: Yes. Two months ago I was advised by the Attorney-General of four appointments in my district. I had sponsored one, but the other three were apparently sponsored by the Attorney-General. In other words, someone had made personal overtures to him, and in due course the three were appointed. I have no disregard for these people, but the Attorney-General should respect custom and put the nominations through the member for the district. If I had been approached I would have made favourable recommendations and the Attorney-General would have made the appointments. If this habit is allowed to develop there could be developments in other directions. It happens in all districts. The Attorney-General should respect the member for the district and the custom that has been followed over the years.

I now refer to the stealing of motor vehicles and the leniency extended to the transgressors. The other day in conversation with a policeman I was told that it would not be regarded as stealing a car but only having the loan of it. Under the Act a person is not considered to have stolen a car but to have had the loan of it, and that is perhaps the reason why the offence is not considered as seriously as it should be. Radio and press reports refer to more and more cases of stolen cars. In many instances the vehicles are recovered through the good work of the Police Department, but many are in a deteriorated condition. Although they are insured, the amount paid by the insurance company is not in keeping with the damage sustained.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Maximum penalties have been fixed by Parliament.

Mr. TAPPING: Yes. I suggest that the matter be reviewed because the penalties are not severe enough.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are the courts imposing maximum penalties?

Mr. TAPPING: I do not think the courts ever impose the maximum penalty for any offence. It is almost always three-quarters of the sum provided in the Act. The Government should consider this matter, otherwise the number of offences will increase rather than decrease. From time to time I have referred to the need for the Government to donate as much money as possible for the building of swimming pools, and I am pleased that in the last three or four years subsidies for this purpose have been made available in both country and city.

This year £28,496 is to be made available as subsidies for swimming pools, which is an increase of £528 on the previous year. In view of the development of this State and the consequent need for more swimming pools, I believe we should face up to the responsibility of making more money available for community projects. When I spoke on the Address in Reply, I mentioned the increase in drowning fatalities.

Although I have not the figures on hand, I remember that in the last financial year there was an increase of 18 per cent in drowning tragedies in this State compared with the previous year. This morning's *Advertiser* reported that an expert said that he was disappointed at the lack of swimming facilities in this State. This has been the position for many years and, because we have insufficient facilities, more fatalities will occur. I have always commended the Education Department for its swimming campaign, and I believe this year's campaign will be better than those in previous years. If a project for a swimming pool takes three financial years to complete, £1,500 is made available for each of those three years, which means that each project can be subsidized only to the extent of £4,500. Some swimming pools, even though voluntary labour is used, cost between £35,000 and £40,000, so members can see that £4,500 paid over three financial years is inadequate. I believe we should do all we can to increase this amount so as to encourage those who perform voluntary work to build swimming pools. I also believe that, if swimming is taught extensively, the number of drowning tragedies will decrease. I support the first line, but reserve my right to make criticisms later on the remaining lines.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): In supporting the first line, I shall give some attention to the Education Department, particularly in relation to the National Fitness Council. I have spoken about this in most Budget debates since I became a member of this council, having been appointed by the Labor Party to represent it from Parliament. From time to time I have made pleas on behalf of the youth of this State for the Government to pay more attention to the important work done by the National Fitness Council over the years, and I have consistently advocated that more money should be made available. Apart from the representations I have made, the council has itself applied for more money from time to time. Just before this Budget was presented, the Minister of Education made a statement after

a parade in Adelaide streets. Under the heading of "Courses Offered to Youth Clubs", the *Advertiser* reported:

The Minister of Education (Sir Baden Pattinson) announced on Saturday that his department would co-operate with South Australian youth clubs in providing free arts and crafts courses for youth leaders. The Minister was speaking at the *Advertiser* sound shell, Elder Park, to a gathering of more than 1,000 members of South Australian youth clubs. Students in the classes would not be charged any fees, Sir Baden Pattinson said. Courses would be provided in public speaking, drama, arts and crafts, and projector operating. The courses could start in the week beginning September 17 and would be part of the Education Department's adult education service.

This was asked for by the National Fitness Council, which was pleased to see that the matter had been taken up by the Minister of Education and that these things had been provided. Unfortunately, however, that is as far as I can extend my thanks to the Minister for his statement, because I am disappointed about it. The article continued:

Similar youth leaders' training courses were run by local education authorities in the United States and the United Kingdom with outstanding success. The Government, through the Education Department and the National Fitness Council, was taking important steps to assist the work of all youth organizations in South Australia. Two years ago the Government grant to the National Fitness Council was £8,000. It had now been decided to increase this grant to £16,000. This included a special grant of £5,000 for additional subsidies and assistance to youth clubs and similar bodies, such as South Australian Youth Clubs. It would be provided through the National Fitness Council.

This is the most disappointing statement I have ever heard from the Minister. The National Fitness Council and allied bodies had asked for much more than that, as I shall indicate later. Before doing so, however, I shall refer to further statements made by the Minister. The article continues:

The Government was prepared to transfer to the council, for a purely nominal or token price, temporary dwellings which had become available as a result of their replacement by the Housing Trust. The buildings could be used by the council and its constituent clubs for camping accommodation. The important Government decisions which he had announced should lead to a marked expansion in the welfare work of youth organizations and give further encouragement to their officers and committees who had rendered splendid services in the interests of the youth of South Australia.

I agree with the Minister about the splendid service rendered by these people in the inter-

ests of the youth of South Australia. Apart from paid employees of the National Fitness Council, many people in this State give their time and services free for the welfare of youth organizations; they do this to such an extent that many have incurred much expense. If I may draw myself into this, it has cost me quite a bit to be a member of the National Fitness Council, but I do this work willingly because I believe in the cause it is trying to represent. However, some statements, although not perhaps misleading, have given the wrong impression because, after the announcement, the council has received many requests for funds from these extra grants. Another confusing statement is that two years ago the Government grant to the council was £8,000. Although that is perfectly correct, the Minister did not say that this amount had been increased by another £2,000, and after agreement with the National Fitness Council an increase of £1,000 was made for administrative expenses.

There was no concession in the transfer of temporary buildings, as similar buildings have been given as a concession to various welfare organizations for some time for £50. In any case, although three of these buildings were requested, the council has been endeavouring to build up the standards of its camps, and providing buildings of this type is not the right way to build up standards. From the remarks about the £8,000 and the £16,000, it would appear that the grant had been doubled this year, but that is not so. In effect, £2,000 was given to the council last year to distribute among youth organizations. This had to be meted out carefully indeed because it was a meagre amount. As I said before, a request was made by the youth organizations to the Treasurer for a grant of £60,000, and all we received, in effect, was another £3,000.

This is only playing with the whole situation. We are not taking this thing seriously and, if we carry on in this meagre way, with £1,000 here and £1,000 there, when there is so much to be done, we will not even get started. The need is there, but we are only playing around on the surface because of lack of finance. This is a serious matter and I bring it forcibly to the Government's notice for future deliberations. On this occasion the youth organizations stated their case and I refer to some of it. This petition was presented by 18 youth organizations and a case stating

their requirements was set out and presented to the Treasurer. The document is as follows:

Since 1959 heads and representatives of church and non-denominational youth organizations have been meeting to discuss their common needs and the problems of youths. As a result of these meetings they now submit the attached report on the needs and welfare of youth in South Australia. In spite of devoted and self-sacrificing work by a great number of people, the present needs of youth in our community are not being met adequately. The constant increase in the youth population and the development of new urban centres present an impossible task for the future unless financial help becomes available from Government sources.

The work of youth organizations extends its effect beyond the actual membership by developing leadership within the community. This helps to create the necessary social climate in which our young people can freely come to maturity and grow in social responsibility. It is therefore considered reasonable that the community should assist both morally and financially. Help is desired on lines which will be developmental and lasting. The organizations concerned have already proven their ability, experience and permanence. They depend chiefly upon voluntary work and contributions and, even with financial help from the Government, will continue to do so. The representatives of the following organizations present this report and unanimously ask for the urgent consideration of its contents and the recommendations concerning a grant of £60,000 per annum and the provisions for administering same.

The sum of £60,000 would still fall far short of the amount provided in other States even if that amount were provided, and I shall draw some comparisons. I wish to quote figures from the report and appendices. Some of the figures have been provided by Mr. Westerman of the Town Planner's Office and they refer to the metropolitan and Salisbury areas only. In 1959 we had 192,592 young people between the ages of five and 24 years. By 1964 this figure will have increased to 237,357; by 1969 to 283,360; and by 1974 it will be 326,310. Therefore, throughout the State, we will have nearly 500,000 young people and the population will be centred on youth.

I draw attention, too, to appendix 2 which refers to the annual report of the Juvenile Court for the year ended June 30, 1960. It states as follows:

While it can be seen that there had been a fairly steady rise in population the court figures have fluctuated considerably thus emphasizing the difficulty of predicting the trend and of assessing at any one time the seriousness or otherwise of the problem. However, over the past 10 years the increase in delinquency has been relatively much larger than the increase in the juvenile population, from which it can be

inferred that the delinquency rate has risen during that period. As has been stated in previous reports, an increase in the rate is only to be expected while the proportion of older children is increasing in relation to the younger ones. Children are a minor problem—so far as crime is concerned—until they leave school and we are now feeling the impact of the large number of those who were born in the post-war years. In 1953, for example, the senior group (14-17 years old) which was then smaller in relation to the junior group than it is today, contributed 73 per cent of the delinquents. Today they contribute 86 per cent.

The comment on report for the year ended June 30, 1961, is as follows:

The delinquency figures show an increase during the past 12 months from 741 to 1,041 offenders, a rise of 40.5 per cent. Such a steep rise—the largest recorded in this court—must be a matter for concern, especially as it follows rises of 26 per cent and 12 per cent in 1959 and 1960 respectively. The present figures are double what they were three years ago and treble what they were 10 years ago.

The tables are listed in the summary, which proceeds as follows:

The most active age group is that of the 14 to 17 years old children who contribute approximately 80 per cent of the offenders. Children rarely reveal delinquent traits by overt crime until they leave school.

This is borne out by the fact that they are actively engaged, and the way to overcome this problem is to keep children actively engaged. If sufficient money were made available the way to achieve this objective would be through youth organizations. Probably, many things lead up to this but the need is for more money to be spent on youth work in South Australia. Last year £10,000 was given to the National Fitness Council as a grant towards its work and this year the council has received £11,000, but that sum does not cover even the salaries of the organization's officers, as it costs £12,000 to pay those salaries. Here we are getting less than that from the Government. The council's only other grant is £5,750 from Commonwealth grants. That sum is paid into the State departments and is passed on through them. That is how the council gets the £12,000 that is paid for salaries. This sum has not met requirements. The point is that the £5,000 given to the National Fitness Council will not in any way assist it in its work to provide extra facilities, amenities, and all that is associated with the requirements of physical education.

In Victoria, which I visited last year, I was told that the Victorian Government was so concerned over the delinquency problem that it immediately introduced a Bill to provide £200,000 in grants for the National Fitness

Council to distribute. The deputation that waited on the Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford) did not ask for money to be passed through the National Fitness Council, but the recommendation was as follows:

1. That the Government of South Australia establish a Youth Organizations Assistance Fund providing initially for an annual sum of £60,000 to be administered under the direction of an appropriate Minister along the following or similar lines:—

(a) The Minister may, from time to time or regularly every financial year, grant to any organization institution or authority approved by him financial assistance for the purpose of assisting such organizations, institutions or authorities.

(i) To provide salaries, scholarships or other means intended to assist in the training of youth leaders. Such assistance shall not exceed one-half of the annual moneys made available to the assistance fund by Parliament.

(ii) To provide, acquire, construct, extend or repair, buildings and equipment, therefor, intended principally for the training of youth leaders. Such assistance shall not exceed one-half of the annual moneys made available to the assistance fund by Parliament.

(b) A grant shall not be made unless the Minister is satisfied

(i) that the activities of the applicant will not be conducted for profit.

(ii) that the purposes for which assistance is required will make an effective and reasonably permanent contribution towards the training of youth leaders.

(iii) that there is a reasonable proportion between the assistance desired and the number of leaders to be trained in the particular project.

(iv) that any grant shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Minister may, as he thinks fit, impose, and in reference to any grant under section 1. (a) (ii) above, shall not exceed one half of such amount as the Ministers to be the fair and reasonable cost of the project.

2. That the Government establish a Youth Organizations Assistance Council which shall include at least some young persons representative of activities concerned with the moral, intellectual and physical development and welfare of youth.

3. The functions of the Youth Organizations Assistance Council shall be in consultation with the Minister:

(a) to recommend the making of payments out of the Youth Organizations Assistance Fund for or towards the establishment, maintenance and assistance of youth clubs and organizations, and other bodies concerned with the welfare of youth and in particular for or towards the training of youth leaders for such clubs, organizations or bodies; and

(b) generally to promote, assist and co-ordinate the activities of such clubs, organizations and bodies, and any other activities which the Council considers to be for the welfare of youth.

This was the request that this group of people put up but, in the discussion that ensued, it was suggested that the National Fitness Council handle this money to be distributed to youth organizations. This is an embarrassment at the moment, with only £5,000 to distribute and this publicity given by the Minister's report in the *Advertiser* of September 3. There are people in the community who feel now that they will be able to receive large sums of money towards this work. That was my impression when I first read that. However, as soon as I saw the amounts, I realized how farcical it was. This has caused me much concern. I realize I have been wasting my efforts year after year in the Budget debates trying to get some further assistance for this worthy organization. This is just playing with it, as I have said before.

In Victoria £200,000 is available towards youth organizations, besides other money given to the National Fitness Council itself, which is far in excess of what we get in South Australia. I have not the actual figures, but I know it is in excess. In New South Wales all the officers of the National Fitness Council come under the Education Department, which has provided them with a suite of offices taking up practically one floor in the Mutual Life and Citizens building in North Sydney, so much so that they have a really wonderful set-up there and everything required for assisting youth. The Education Department pays for the entire set-up; it pays the rent on the building and provides money for the necessary purchases and all the wages and salaries incurred. In addition, they have a system whereby youth camps are provided during school hours for children who want to go to the camps to get to know one another and live in that environment. It is an education besides looking after their physical wellbeing. Here again, the leaders

of the groups are from the Education Department; they are physical education teachers, men qualified to do this work. All this is provided through the State Government of New South Wales, besides the expansion that has taken place.

I went across and saw some of their camps at Narrabeen, Commodore Heights and Broken Bay. They put our camping to absolute shame. When we see some of the outmoded buildings we are using, relics of the last war, where the Minister is, in fact, offering us this temporary accommodation, it only accentuates this lack of standing that should be demanded for youth camps as they have them in New South Wales. Apart from this money that was asked for by the youth organizations, in which they have been let down so badly, the National Fitness Council itself feels there is a need to train youth leaders. Any person who has been associated with youth work will know that the leaders of youth organizations can stay only for a certain time. In country towns it is particularly noticeable that youth leaders are mainly bank clerks, public servants of some sort or other, or people associated with the town in a temporary capacity. When they leave the town, that gap is there and often there is no-one to take their place; so there is no training. There is nothing worse than an untrained group of children or adolescents. It is necessary to train personnel. We have suggested from time to time, and we will do it when we can afford to, that we provide trained personnel in different parts of South Australia, in country areas—one at Port Pirie, one at Renmark, one at Mount Gambier and perhaps one somewhere else on the Lower Murray. These men could then supervise the work of the youth organizations, because frequently these organizations are lacking because of poor leadership. After all, this is quite understandable because these people give up their time voluntarily. Many of them are dedicated people who are anxious to help but have not the time to train. As it is, they are giving their time to youth work, but we should have trained personnel. How can we do it on the miserly amount of money provided by this Government for this work? I suggest that the Minister look into the position in other States to see what is taking place there in relation to their youth welfare. If we carry on like this and persist in treating this problem in so niggardly a fashion, we shall touch the fringe of it only. I suggest it is time we stopped playing around with this, got stuck into it and did something in the cause of youth.

Another line that has been discussed a little this evening is the Tourist Bureau. On page 55 of the Estimates of Expenditure, we see an amount allocated for the Tourist Bureau towards recreation areas for the State. Last year £32,000 was spent on recreation area purchases throughout South Australia; this year we are budgeting for £5,000. This is something about which not only have I been speaking in Parliament but we have had much good publicity from the *Advertiser* and other newspapers. Various prominent people in the community have commented on this and letters have appeared in the press from time to time stressing the need for more recreation areas. I have here a letter from last Saturday's *Advertiser* headed "Deep Creek area as reserve".

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BYWATERS: I should like honourable members to pay me the courtesy that I pay them in this House.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Murray.

Mr. BYWATERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not think we should have any laughter in the House at this particular time. This is a serious matter. This letter states:

Sir—It is very gratifying to read of the awakening interest in South Australia to the need for the preservation of our dwindling native flora and fauna. Progress and land usage must go on, but such needs should be balanced with the requirements of those native plants, animals and birds which are losing the battle for existence. The only effective way to ensure that many of the rarer and more specialized species can be preserved is to provide large enough areas of suitable native habitat, free of disturbance and any interference, so that nature's balance is maintained. Without this, many species face inevitable extinction.

The flora and fauna of this country is not only a national heritage but of world-wide interest. Once a harmless and beautiful native animal, bird, or wild flower becomes extinct, the ingenuity of man cannot restore it. Congratulations to the *Advertiser* for the publicity given to this subject, in particular for the series of articles (22/6/62, 6/7/62, and 7/7/62) on the proposal of the National Fitness Council, the Field Naturalists' Society and other interested bodies to preserve about 3,000 acres of natural scrubland in the Deep Creek area near Cape Jervis. With the interest shown by the Government in this proposal, and with increasing support from all interested people, it should make the speedy achievement of this project possible.

How is it going to be done on £5,000? From time to time the *Advertiser* and other people have proclaimed the necessity to purchase this land before it is too late. We know there is a man down there who is anxious to clear all

this country and, once it is cleared, it cannot be restored. As the correspondent who wrote this letter said, it is just impossible to restore it once it has become extinct. It is a God-given national heritage and we must preserve it. Unless we do, our children will curse the day we had the opportunity and rejected it. The Government has frequently stated that if a council provided half the cost of an approved area the Government would subsidize its purchase. Many councils do not have large areas and they cannot acquire land. Other newly developing councils are anxious to acquire land, but have not the finance to do so. I believe that if all metropolitan councils paid into a fund on a population basis and this amount were subsidized on a pound-for-pound basis by the Government, approved land could be purchased from that fund. In the last few years, because money has not been available, land has been lost. It has been used for subdivisional purposes by persons seeking to make money.

Last year £23,943 was paid to municipal authorities for developing tourist resorts, but this year the amount proposed is £16,504—a decrease of £7,439. With the decrease of £27,000 in respect of subsidies towards recreation areas, this represents a total reduction of almost £35,000 on two lines. Many councils are seeking to develop, yet this meagre amount is provided. How can councils progress and undertake work in their district? Sheet piling work is to be carried out at the Mannum foreshore. Last year, because of circumstances, the council could not spend all the money voted for that purpose. The balance was transferred to this year but the council received a letter stating that no further grants would be made available because of the reduction in the line. The council cannot do any more work this year. It was pointed out that the grant this year represented one-fifteenth of the total grant for council areas for the year. Pity help the other poor councils in South Australia! These things are happening and yet this is supposed to be a progressive Budget—a “confidence” Budget, according to the member for Torrens. I am not confident about the matters I have mentioned tonight. I urge the Government to heed what I have said because unless it does, it will not receive the assistance it seeks from voluntary effort throughout the State. Voluntary assistance must be encouraged, but there is no quicker way of breaking people’s hearts than by stinting them in the work they seek to do. We realize that we cannot get all we want immediately. We asked for £60,000 for the Youth Council. We thought that was a

meagre amount—an initial amount—but we are to get a miserly £5,000 for this important work. I am disgusted with the whole position and I feel strongly about it.

I have been reading a copy of the Auditor-General’s report which I borrowed from the Leader of the Opposition. We were promised a copy of this report before this debate commenced, but only two or three copies are available in the Chamber. The debate on the first line will probably conclude this evening, yet the valuable information contained in this report is not readily available. The Country Secondary Industries Fund is available to assist the establishment of industries in country areas, either by way of loan or grant, and an amount of £88,200 is held in that fund. According to the Auditor-General’s report that amount has remained constant during my term in this Parliament. It has not been drawn on. Why? If we are not going to use this fund, we should put the money back into the Treasury. We should not kid people that it is available. Not one penny of this money has been spent in the last five or six years. It is time we did something with this fund and encouraged industry to go to country areas.

Mr. Hall: You will admit that much assistance has been given by way of bank guarantees?

Mr. BYWATERS: Some money has been made available by that means, but this fund is for country development, and bank guarantees relate to the whole State.

Mr. Hall: Has any industry, which has had a good chance of success, been knocked back?

Mr. BYWATERS: I have not the knowledge to answer that question. The Treasurer has that information. However, I do know that an industry in my district has been knocked back. I would not have referred to this but for the interjection. A small fruit cannery started at Murray Bridge with a limited capital and in a small way. It tried to do the right thing and it showed a profit this year. Last year it sought assistance from the Industries Development Committee and put forward a case, but it was advised to go away and come back with a further report after a year’s operations. It applied for assistance this year but the Treasurer replied stating that he was not prepared to refer the question to the Industries Development Committee and he quoted extracts from the Fruit Canning Industry Inquiry Committee’s report. This industry has been knocked back, and others may have been. The industry made a slight

profit this year and proved that it could progress despite the adverse conditions in the canning industry. This industry should have been supported. At least its application should have been referred to the Industries Development Committee for investigation.

Mr. Quirke: It had better watch out that it does not grow much bigger or it won't make a profit.

Mr. BYWATERS: It did not seek assistance to enable it to grow bigger. It wanted money to enable it to carry on its operations during the trading season. There is room in the Murray Bridge district for such an industry, not only to process fruit, but vegetables and other produce. It has experimented with celery powder, onion powder and dehydrated poultry, and it has found markets for these products. During last year's fruit canning season £700 a week was paid to the employees of that factory. This is a large sum when spread over a season. Had it not been for the interjection of the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) I probably would not have made these remarks. I am afraid that I cannot agree with the statements by members on the Government side, particularly by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), that this is a "confidence" Budget. I have lost confidence in some things I have spoken about tonight.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I rise to charge this Government with deliberately withholding information from members; it has deliberately withheld from members the Auditor-General's report, which should be available to members during this debate. We all know that every Minister has a copy. During question time this afternoon, the Leader, just prior to his rising to speak in this debate, was handed one copy for himself and the Opposition. Since he finished speaking at about 5 o'clock we have had one copy to share between 18 Opposition members. No-one can say that copies are not available to all the Ministers, for we can see that they are; they are printed and bound, and they are available, but they are being withheld from the Opposition deliberately.

During question time earlier this afternoon I inquired about copies of this report and I was told they they would be made available to the Opposition next week. Mr. Chairman, this withholding from members of Parliament copies of the Auditor-General's report during a Budget debate is almost criminal. In years gone by members used the report considerably when speaking in the Budget debate. Every member knows that the debate on the first line usually lasts a fortnight or longer, but so far as we

can tell this debate is to close tonight. The debate on the first line is to finish in one day! It is the Opposition that is keeping the debate going, because following the Treasurer's introduction of the Budget about a fortnight ago only two other Government members have spoken. Many members on this side of the House would have spoken, and I would have spoken at much greater length, had the Auditor-General's report been available for a longer period; I have had it only since the dinner adjournment, and I have been able only to browse through it, at the same time trying to share it with four or five other members. We have not had much chance of looking through it.

One member who will speak later is still trying to go through the report before he speaks, but he has not a dog's change of getting half-way through it. It reminds me of the old thimble and pea trick: copies are available, but they have disappeared until next week, and then they will come to life again. I am prompted by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) to say that the report probably contains something the Government does not wish us to see, and that is obviously the position, otherwise why would the Government withhold it? After the Budget debate closes the copies will be made available to us, but it will then be too late to make full use of the information in the report.

Mr. Ryan: In the past the Opposition has asked that copies of the Auditor-General's report be made available before the Budget debate.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. This is my thirteenth year in Parliament, and on several occasions during that period I heard the late Mr. O'Halloran, just prior to commencing his remarks on the Budget, ask the Treasurer when the report would be made available, and he was always promised that it would be made available as soon as possible. To my knowledge, the distribution of the report has never been later than the day the Leader of the Opposition speaks: it has never been later than that day that copies have been made available to every member of the House. On the experience of the last 13 years, every member of this Parliament should have had a copy distributed to him today at the very latest. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) is reading a copy now, and I have seen a copy in front of every Minister.

Mr. Coumbe: You can come and borrow one.

Mr. LAWN: Why should I have to come and borrow one, and how do I know it would be

made available? Of course it would not be made available; I would be told, as I was this afternoon, "You have a copy over there, and you get the rest next week." Had I gone over to the other side and begged for another copy, that is what I would have been told.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't it just as easy to print 40 copies as it is to print six?

Mr. LAWN: We all know that it is proportionately cheaper to print 100 copies than it is to print six copies, and no printer would print six copies when he knows that he has to print about 100 copies. Altogether there are 59 members in the Parliament, and with the spare copies that no doubt would be available I should say that at least 100 copies would be printed. Does anyone suggest to members on this side that any businessman would print six copies when he knows he has to print 100 copies? Of course not, Mr. Chairman.

I am voicing my protest. Members on this side are protesting that the report is not available; we are all trying to use the one copy, and that is impossible. The Government has been late enough distributing this report to us in years gone by, when it has been made available on the day the debate commences, which has meant that the Leader has not had the opportunity of looking through it before he speaks. It also means that the first two or three members following the Leader have not much opportunity of looking through it. This will be the shortest Budget debate that I have known in 13 years, and the contributing factor is that the Auditor-General's report is not available. I have had a chance of looking briefly at some of the contents of the report. The Treasurer, in introducing the Budget, said:

The Budget which I introduced to Parliament in September, 1961, envisaged a nominal surplus of £3,000, whereas the actual result for the year was a surplus of £507,000.

The policy of the Australian Labor Party, as is well known to members opposite, is democratic socialization of industry, something I have always subscribed to and been proud of. During election campaigns members opposite, in the 200-word article that they are allowed in the *Advertiser*, always make sure that they disclaim any association with **Socialism, State enterprise, Government enterprise, or anything of that nature**; they would not touch that with a 40-foot pole, so they tell the electors. I shall make a few comments regarding the £507,000 surplus we had last year. This surplus indicates that had it not been for State enterprise in South Australia, which is at least

part Socialism, the people of this State would have been taxed much more heavily than they were.

On page 132 of his report the Auditor-General said that the final figures for the Radium Hill undertaking were not yet available, but that sales of the products obtained there amounted to £17,826,460 Australian, two-thirds of which was held in dollars and one-third in sterling. The total cost of the Radium Hill establishment and subsidiary works at Port Pirie was £7,630,696. In other words, up to the present the State has shown a surplus of £10,195,764 on the Radium Hill operations. This was a State enterprise, worked by the people for the people, and not handed over to private enterprise. Dollars are hard to obtain and the dollars earned in this way helped to keep Australia going. If the Radium Hill undertaking had been run by private enterprise the profit would have been more than £20,000,000. The Government did not try to make big profits in a short time. It carried on the work in the interests of the people, and it is a pity that the work was not continued for some time.

Mr. Quirke: There was a world fixed price.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but the Government would have had some say in fixing the price. If the honourable member suggests that the price was not high enough, probably that is why private enterprise was not interested in the establishment.

Mr. Quirke: I make the point that private enterprise could not have made more.

Mr. LAWN: It would probably have made more by not providing the same amenities for the workmen. I do not know how many hours they worked.

Mr. McKee: Thirty-seven hours.

Mr. LAWN: Private enterprise would have made it a 40-hour week and got the same production with fewer men. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) can tell us of the conditions enjoyed by the men, but they would not have been enjoyed under private enterprise. The State was able to do what it did without exploiting anyone. This speaks volumes, without debating the matter at length. The enterprise was of value to the people and there was no exploitation of the workers in the industry. A substantial reward was reaped by the people, instead of the surplus going to private enterprise. On page 164 of his report the Auditor-General referred to the operations of the Woods and Forests Department. He said the department made a surplus for the year of £658,000, £300,000 of which was paid into

general revenue. The State surplus for the year was £507,000, and this department contributed £300,000 towards it. We are told that State enterprise does not pay and that everything should be left to private enterprise, and that with competition there would be greater benefits, but this competition does not exist. In the last two years I think the department has contributed £260,000 to general revenue. This year it was £300,000. The reports show that a considerable amount of money earned by the department is ploughed back into the industry.

The Electricity Trust is not a complete State department, and it had a surplus last year of £228,000. I thought members would have said that it was previously about £400,000. According to the Auditor-General on page 194 of his report the surplus was £228,000, a decrease of £186,000 compared with the previous year. The Auditor-General said that the operating expenses rose by £862,000. Despite this increase the reduction in the surplus was only £186,000. What caused the rise in operating costs? The Auditor-General said it was the debenture interest charges, which increased by £434,000, or 12 per cent. If the increase had been due to wage increases members opposite would have attempted to make political capital out of it, but much of the increase was due to interest. On page 201 of his report the Auditor-General referred to an amount of £75,000 from the working of the Leigh Creek coalfield. On page 221 he referred to the working of the Housing Trust, which finished the year with a surplus of £263,000. The trust is not a direct State undertaking, but it is certainly not private enterprise. This surplus will be ploughed back into the industry for the building of more houses. The £263,000 would have gone to private enterprise if Parliament had not set up the Housing Trust. Now that money belongs to the people.

I come now to the State Bank. The Labor Party has been told that it knows nothing about banking, yet the Commonwealth Labor Government established the Commonwealth Bank. When our Party attempted to set up the bank it was ridiculed and laughed to scorn, and the ten shilling notes were called "Fisher's flimsies". It was said that a bucketful of them could be bought for a few pence. Our State Bank had a surplus of £167,000 in the past year, which was an increase of £34,000 over the previous year. On the other hand, expenditure exceeded receipts in such departments as the Children's Welfare Department. Of course, one would not expect private enter-

prise to go around doing good and helping people in necessitous circumstances by providing financial assistance if it were not going to receive some dividend. Another department that lost money was the Agriculture Department, which lost £631,835. I am not criticizing anyone for this as I do not expect the department to show a surplus, but I do not hear any comment from members opposite about the deficit. No-one is complaining that the people of this State have contributed over £600,000 to primary industries through the operations of this department.

Private enterprise would not establish libraries, an art gallery, a museum or other cultural requirements of the people; only the State would do that. Then, of course, the health services and Tourist Bureau showed deficits. Tourist services do not cost the Government much, and they add to the wealth of the State as well as providing benefits to private industry. I have not had time to study the references to the Mines Department, the Railways, and other departments, all of which are working in the interests of the State. As the Budget provides for the Children's Welfare Department, the Agriculture Department and other departments that will not show surpluses, why should it not on behalf of the people be indulging in industries that will show a surplus?

Mr. Jennings: But they say we should run the things that cannot show a profit and leave the rest to private enterprise.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. It is all right to run the Agriculture Department, which will assist primary industry, to provide an art gallery and museum—all of which cost money—and to have the Children's Welfare Department and the Railways Department, which operate at a loss. The Railways Department develops the country by carrying produce. Private enterprise would have closed many lines that are now operating, but it is all right for the State to operate them in the interests of primary industry and passengers, yet we should not touch industries such as the Radium Hill project, Woods and Forests Department, Electricity Trust, Housing Trust and Savings Bank!

Why should not the State touch the items that are profitable? Why should it handle only undertakings that show a deficit? Why should the others be reserved to private enterprise? That theory is going out. People have shown in the last 20 or 30 years that they will not swallow the bait that Socialism or State enterprise is bad, and that everything should be left to private enterprise. It can

be seen from the results of each election that the people are not swallowing that sort of talk from Government members. The people should be told the results of State activities more fully as set out in the Auditor-General's report. They should be told what enterprises are working on their behalf, the profits from which go into revenue and save further taxation. As I said last year, another £500,000 would have had to be levied on the people to provide the same surplus if these State undertakings had not been operating. However, this was obviated because of the contributions to general revenue by some of the departments to which I have referred, and that will happen again this year. I hope (and I know it is only hope) that the Government will see that in future the Auditor-General's report is distributed to members and is not held downstairs or in the vaults of the Treasury. I hope that in future it will be available well before the Leader is called upon to speak in the Budget debate.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I have listened with interest to previous speakers. I assure the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) that I have no wish to be a party to keeping away from him the Auditor-General's report and, if it gives him distress, I trust that this will be remedied in future, because I do not like to see him distressed. However, I hope he makes better use of the report next time than he did tonight in referring to one item. That item is the Radium Hill project, which the honourable member said had made a clear profit of £10,000,000 for this State, whereas this was not so. I admit that what he read may lead one to believe at first glance that this is so, as the Auditor-General said:

The expenditure on the establishment of the Radium Hill mine and township, the Port Pirie treatment works, preproduction and working expenses amounted to £7,630,696.

The member for Adelaide, however, has taken that to be not only the establishment costs but the whole of the working costs during the lifetime of the operation, whereas that is not so. I am sure that working expenses must mean working expenses applied to the work of establishing the capital works of that mine and its associated treatment plant, because page 134 of the report shows that the funds are represented by fixed assets under three headings: establishment of Radium Hill mine and township, at cost; establishment of Port Pirie treatment works, at cost; and powerline to Radium Hill—balance of cost not charged to production.

There we have substantially the same in establishment costs as the sum the member for Adelaide referred to as the total establishment and operating costs of the mine. Although the final figures are not published here, when they are published it will be found that little profit accrued to the Treasury from that operation. That does not mean that the State did not benefit greatly from exports of ore and concentrates: it undoubtedly did. Nobody regrets the establishment of that project, but it is idle to say here, in a responsible assembly, that the project netted this State £10,000,000; if it netted anything, it was a negligible sum. That is referred to on page 132 as follows:

The financial position at June 30 may be summarized as follows: Sufficient funds are available to meet the balance of the Loan expenditure not yet repaid and £248,647 of the sum spent from Consolidated Revenue on preliminary investigation work. This leaves an amount of £519,176 as the balance of the expenditure from Consolidated Revenue. To offset this are net amounts of £108,254; realization of further assets at Radium Hill; proceeds of sale of some houses at Port Pirie, and the value of the remaining Port Pirie assets which will cost more than £1,500,000.

Therefore, the profit to this State may lie in the £1,500,000 treatment works at Port Pirie. I hope that those quotations have removed the mistaken impression created by the other paragraphs, that we are the benefactor to the extent of £10,000,000 under this project.

The honourable member's reference to Socialism is in line with many other thoughts expressed from the Opposition benches. I am sure that much changing of emphasis is occurring in relation to our policy. It has been misconstrued—I hope not deliberately but perhaps inadvertently—and some speakers opposite think that we are opposed to all forms of Socialism. Once more I point out that, in considering Socialism, we must consider the form and environment under which it operates. If we consider the extent of our economy, taking both South Australian and Australian as examples, we find that those items to which members opposite refer as Socialist enterprises are operating in the far larger private sector of industry and commerce and, in fact, they are creations of the private sector. This cannot be denied, because the funds that build the necessary machinery and provide the technicians brought to this country come from the dynamic sector of our economy—the private sector.

That statement does not decri the industries run by the Government, but they do provide the basis and framework on which the private sector produces. Of course, that is a partnership that we in this State and in Parliament

are pleased to support and further if necessary. We have seen the results of this partnership, which is growing from day to day, in the number and variety of industries established in our country. This, again, was carried a step farther in the thoughts expressed by the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) when he answered a question by me whether any industry in his district had been refused assistance by way of a Government guarantee. He pointed out that one industry had been refused. I am not able to say whether it should have been refused assistance. It all gets back to the question of decentralization and how much risk we should take with public money. This question will not be resolved simply by debate. It is a question involving non-advocacy of Government support for an industry that showed a slight profit the year before last. That is the question the member must face in his advocacy of such a cause. How much risk shall we take with the money entrusted to us for wise expenditure?

Earlier in his speech the member for Murray decried the small sum provided for a venture in which he was interested. The member cannot have it both ways. If he wishes to have the money for one purpose, in view of our limited resources, can he have it for the other purpose? The demand for money will always be greater than our capacity to meet expenditure. That is a natural consequence of human nature and we know that constant demands are being made on us. We hope that, at times, we are able to satisfy those demands. However, the demands will always be greater than our resources can satisfy and in that case we must consider how much of our resources we can risk. We must risk some, but the question is how much risk should we take?

The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) referred to his travels overseas. Apparently, the member was most observant in his travels and he said that our houses and housing organizations were the best in the world. He then said that the Government that had created this scheme was a Frankenstein monster, but those statements do not add up. How can we have the best scheme in the world, on his observations in a very important field in our lives (in a field that he would term a Socialist field), yet still have a Government responsible for its administration and successful operation described as a Frankenstein monster? That statement leaves me rather puzzled.

When considering the Budget this year, as always, we should consider it from two angles:

what it spends and what it does not spend. Usually complaints are made about what is not spent or what honourable members consider to be too small a vote on certain items. I congratulate the Treasurer on his presentation of this Budget and on stretching our resources and reserves as they have been stretched. I deny that this is in any way a "stay-put" Budget. Undoubtedly the deficit at which we aim is a risk when we consider the possible droughty effects of this year. I trust that the deficit will not be exceeded, but that is a risk we must take in this State. I hope, even at this late stage, that the situation will be retrieved by good late rains. It cannot be said that this is a "stay put" Budget when the Education Department vote is raised by 11 per cent, the Hospital Department vote by nine per cent, and the Mines Department vote by 18 per cent. These are all facets of our administration that greatly interest us, especially education with which we are all closely connected in one way or another. Hospital administration has enabled the country, as well as city districts, to enjoy a high standard of hospital treatment.

Mr. McKee: Which country district are you referring to?

Mr. HALL: I am not in the habit of unnecessarily knocking South Australia, or my district. I say in all confidence and truthfulness that the hospitals established in my district are good hospitals and much appreciated by the residents in that electorate. I am pleased to see that the Railways Department had a more favourable result than that anticipated, and I hope this position will be maintained this year.

Mr. Clark: The Railways Department last year carried the fewest passengers for 40 years.

Mr. HALL: I hope that the more favourable result achieved by the Railways Department was not achieved at the expense of maintenance. I have heard that some maintenance gangs have been reduced, but I hope that is not one result of economies. I notice that highway patrols and the Road Traffic Act are mentioned in the Treasurer's Financial Statement. I have as yet got only a third of the way through the Road Traffic Act regulations for 1961, but I hope that we as a Parliament have not given too much of our power over to the Road Traffic Board. I know these regulations will be studied by the committee charged to examine them and I trust that members will give their best attention to them as they are most important to all phases of South Australian

life. I am alarmed by the broadness of several of the proposed regulations.

Mr. Millhouse: Which ones?

Mr. HALL: By the fact that they do not define the purposes for which they are published. Having glanced only fleetingly through one-third of the regulations, I can say I am concerned about the one dealing with parking control signs, a most important regulation in the metropolitan areas.

Mr. Millhouse: What is its number?

Mr. HALL: Its number is 2.04. Another one in which I was interested when this Bill went through was that concerning safety sally signs. In each case the type of the sign and its use will be left entirely to the Road Traffic Board. In all the other regulations I have so far been able to read a full definition of all signs is included. Why define nearly all of these signs and purposes, yet leave vague blank cheques for several others?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not know that the honourable member is in order in speaking of a regulation that is subject to disallowance.

Mr. HALL: I was referring only to the Treasurer's Financial Statement in which he mentions highway patrols and the Road Traffic Act. Two items missing from the Financial Statement are: funds for our rail standardization project and funds for our Chowilla dam project. That would be illustrated by the Treasurer's statement on the second page where he deplores the fact that we as a State have received only one per cent.

Mr. McKee: Which one of those projects will be *sub judice*?

Mr. HALL: I am willing to run the risk of your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on that. However, the absence of any concrete financial assistance in those matters has, to put it mildly, caused a controversy in this State and brought about a unification of minds in this place—at least for a short time, one afternoon. It must have given members opposite a great thrill. Recently, two prominent men pointed out that South Australia was receiving 10.7 per cent of Commonwealth money, on a national basis, although it had only 9.24 per cent of Australia's population. I suggest that this matter needs to be looked at.

Mr. McKee: Does that account for the low percentage of unemployment?

Mr. HALL: It needs to be looked at in a far greater and wider context than the matter of population and a Commonwealth document called, I think, "Commonwealth payments to the States". That same document, I believe,

refers to defence expenditure in various States—a matter which it is easy to assume should not enter into allocations and financial reimbursements or disbursements of Commonwealth funds to the States, because undoubtedly defence measures, while increasing local industrial activities to some extent, provide a common defence cover for all Australia.

There appear to be three main avenues of finance for the States from Commonwealth sources—Loan moneys, tax reimbursements and special grants. There are other more or less minor avenues, such as aid to aged people's homes and university grants (roads come under another category) but those are the three main avenues. It is important to remember the enlargement in recent years of the amounts paid out in special assistance and therefore the impact of those moneys on the ultimate share that each State has from the available national resources. Surely each method of distribution must be on a fair basis and acceptable to all participants, if most citizens are to have a more or less equal standard of living and the same opportunities of real progress and development. The fact that they should have a more or less equal opportunity does not mean that they need an equal amount of the nation's resources to obtain that opportunity. That is best illustrated by the views of the Prime Minister himself.

On March 4 and 5, 1959, a special conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister was held at Canberra, the purpose of which was to discuss generally Commonwealth and State financial relations. When uniform taxation was being discussed, the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) said:

The sound general principle was that each Government should raise its own taxes but that principle could not be strictly applied in Australia. If, for example, Western Australia could spend only what was raised in Western Australia, the development of the State would be impaired. Nevertheless, the Federal Government remained willing to enter into arrangements with the States for the resumption by them of taxing powers, just to the taxpayers.

At a further stage of these discussions Mr. Menzies said:

While it would be a good thing if the States which spent the money should have the responsibility of raising it by their own taxes, the rule was subject to some exceptions. It would not apply to Western Australia and it could not practically apply to South Australia and to Tasmania. Whatever might be done about the return of direct income-taxing powers to the States, the need for Federal subventions to at least three States could not be got rid of, and those subventions must be raised by Federal taxation in all States.

These are significant views that embody those of the larger State Governments of Victoria and New South Wales, which willingly accepted these views in a practical form; and in June of 1959, the same year, they approved of a new formula for State tax reimbursements which at that time on a per capita basis gave New South Wales £22 2s. 9d., Victoria £21 2s. 10d., Queensland £25 2s. 3d., South Australia £30 4s. 2d., Western Australia £35 6s. 7d. and Tasmania £31 16s. 11d. Incidentally, this was the year in which South Australia ceased to be a mendicant State. The main point to be deduced from such apportionment was that it was agreed upon unanimously as being a fair and just system. At the same conference a Loan programme was agreed upon and the following allocation of Loan moneys to be guaranteed by the Commonwealth Government was made: £70,000,000 to New South Wales; £56,000,000 to Victoria; £26,000,000 to Queensland; £30,000,000 to South Australia; £20,000,000 to Western Australia; and £15,000,000 to Tasmania. This, of course, seems to give South Australia a big advantage in her share of Loan moneys, but it is interesting to add to these figures the allocations agreed upon for semi-governmental loans, which are an important factor in all Loan considerations. I think that as a fair basis of comparison of allocations between States we should add the amounts available for semi-governmental purposes. If we do so the figure is less favourable for South Australia. Instead of the comparison being £30,000,000 for South Australia and £56,000,000 for Victoria it becomes £35,000,000 for South Australia and £93,000,000 for Victoria. One can see that the advantage that we seemed to have in the share of Commonwealth Loan funds is not nearly so great when semi-governmental loans are considered.

The only conclusion that one can draw from all the complexities surrounding State and Commonwealth finances is that these schemes (the method of tax reimbursements and Loan Council allocations) are the fairest, and most just and equitable that can be arrived at at this stage. If that is a fair conclusion, any third method that upsets the balance will upset the fairness of that distribution, and if the method of special grants breaks down in its reasonable fairness as between States the just system of distribution in the first two schemes breaks down and is circumvented. No-one would be so unreasonable as to deny that special circumstances arise in different States that

possibly need individual assistance, but I am equally sure no-one would assert that a share of one per cent of a total of £131,000,000 over a four-year period is anywhere near a fair and just share for South Australia. If such a share continues, the whole system of fairness in tax reimbursements and the allocation of Loan funds from the Commonwealth will break down and will be circumvented.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you suggest?

Mr. HALL: It is up to all members of this Parliament to bring as much pressure as they can to bear, by reasonable argument if possible, on our Commonwealth members to see that they put our case as fully as possible in the national capital. I was recently asked: why bring the Snowy scheme into the calculation of allocations when the electricity supplied to Victoria and New South Wales will include in its price a proportion to pay for the capital cost of the power stations? That is no argument in this case because we are paying back all the loans that we have had from the Australian people through the Commonwealth Government. We have a financial agreement whereby they are paid back over, I think, a 50-year period. We would be only too willing to secure more money and to have a chance to repay it. The fact that other States are paying back their loans is no argument why we should not have our share of these resources.

Too much has been made of the so-called message from this Parliament to our Commonwealth Senators. Undoubtedly some politics was associated with its transmission and with the thought behind it, but I am sure that every member here was sincere in wanting these two important works—gauge standardization and the Chowilla dam—to proceed. It is futile to speak of preferring one to the other. That is not the question before us. We want funds to enable us to get on with one project so that eventually we can get on with the other. We know that it is not possible to proceed with two important and mighty projects simultaneously. We cannot expect the flow of funds necessary to produce that result, but at least we must proceed with one if we are to get on the road to progress. It gives me much pleasure to support the Budget and I trust that its results will be regarded favourably this time next year.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 19, at 2 p.m.