

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, July 31, 1963.

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

QUESTIONS.**NUCLEAR POWER.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: When the Premier returned from overseas recently he indicated to the House that it would be necessary to discuss with the Prime Minister certain matters associated with nuclear power. Following the Premier's visit to Canberra this week, has he anything to report to the House?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I saw the Prime Minister in Canberra yesterday. Actually, there were some matters on which we wanted a decision from the Commonwealth Government; one was the large question of the various functions of the Commonwealth and the State Governments regarding nuclear power. The conferences were amicable. I have always made it a rule not to announce a Commonwealth decision before it is made, and under those circumstances I will now say only that I made certain submissions to the Prime Minister. Later, I will give the House details of those submissions. Obviously, one or two matters will probably have to go to the Commonwealth Cabinet. I sometimes find that it is a good thing for Cabinet to get a submission first-hand rather than to see it first of all in the press.

Mr. Frank Walsh: You will do the same with us; you will give it to us?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As soon as it is possible to traverse the grounds of the discussions I will most certainly let honourable members have the information.

CAMBRAI WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Works inform me what progress has been made with the investigations into a reticulated water supply for Cambrai, Sedan and the contiguous areas?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This has been a very difficult matter. A series of investigations have been made over some time to try to evolve a scheme that will give a reasonable service to the areas desiring it, and at the same time to have a scheme based on a cost that would not involve the users in a heavy commitment for rating above the normal. The matter has been referred to the councils concerned through the members for the dis-

tricts. Once, or perhaps twice, the district councils have called ratepayers' meetings to discuss it, and we told councils that we would be pleased if they could suggest to the department how the scheme could be modified to reduce the costs. Unfortunately, the ratepayers' scheme that was submitted involved an increase rather than a decrease in costs. That is understandable for various reasons. A week or two ago, however, I again discussed the matter with the Engineer for Water Supply, and at the conference I made a suggestion, which the department thought was worth examining, that we re-cast the scheme on a basis different from that of the Mannum-Adelaide rising main. This would affect pressures, pipe diameters and so on throughout the scheme. That aspect is being examined but, until I have a report, I cannot take the matter further. I hope that a useful result will come from this examination.

Mr. BYWATERS: This matter has concerned people at the Palmer end of this scheme, particularly landowners near Milendella. Originally there was to be a small scheme to supply only that area, but the people agreed to make it a larger scheme to go on to Sedan. Because of the delay of some years, these people think the smaller scheme to supply only the Milendella area should be proceeded with, but they are awaiting the decision of the department on whether the larger scheme is to be forthcoming. In view of the Minister's reply to the member for Angas, can he say whether it would be practicable for them to proceed with a plea for another scheme or whether they should wait to see the outcome of the proposals the department has in mind?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not aware of the details of the proposed smaller scheme. Since I became Minister of Works, I have not been made aware that the smaller scheme has been advocated, although I may be wrong on that. I think almost certainly that the provision of a smaller scheme would have an effect on the larger scheme if it would serve country that would otherwise be served by the larger scheme, so that if the people closer to the source of water—the Milendella people—were prepared to wait a little longer it might be to the advantage of the scheme as a whole. However, without seeing the smaller scheme in some detail, I cannot say definitely that that is the case. I hope we can come to some conclusion about the larger scheme as early as possible, because I believe it has been under investigation for

some time, but as it has been presented by the departmental officers to the Engineer-in-Chief it is not a scheme that the Engineer-in-Chief has recommended, and we are trying to solve that problem.

MENTAL HOSPITALS.

Mr. JENNINGS: This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report of a statement apparently made by Dr. L. M. McLeay when addressing a meeting of the Student Christian Movement at the University of Adelaide. The Premier knows, and I think most honourable members know, that Dr. McLeay is an employee of the Hospitals Department. She said that the conditions at the Northfield and Parkside Mental Hospitals were archaic and that public as well as Government inattention was responsible. The report continued:

"There are many students who break down and some of them who were sent to mental hospitals years ago are still there," she said.

"Because of a lack of interest and activity they have become retarded. Three in every 100 mothers will have a retarded child through no parental fault. This child will need care all its life and this is a community responsibility. Twenty-five years ago England was looking after the mentally retarded better than we in South Australia are doing today."

Dr. McLeay said she hoped many people would visit Northfield and suggest things that patients might do to extend the range of present therapy.

This rather scathing condemnation echoes what has been said from this side of the House and by the Australian Government Workers Union, and I had hoped that, as a result of the legislation passed last session, and of the new-look administration of Dr. Cramond, the position had improved. Does the Premier agree with me that a statement such as this by an employee of a department needs some answer?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This statement is made by only one employee of the Hospitals Department. Frankly, I do not think that the head of the department would agree with it, but I am speaking from assumption. The Government has done its utmost to bring in the most qualified people possible, and has provided money far in excess of what could be spent by the department last year. The Government has pursued a vigorous policy of recruitment of the necessary staff and of the preparation of up-to-date building plans. I was recently informed by the Minister of Health that Dr. Cramond had expressed the optimistic view that he was now making rapid progress. If I can obtain further information to add to what I have already said, I will advise the honourable member.

CROSS OF SACRIFICE.

Mr. JENKINS: Recently considerable publicity has been given to the structural deterioration of the Cross of Sacrifice in Pennington Gardens. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to meet the cost of renovating the cross or to subscribe to the cost of so doing?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that a Commonwealth officer came to South Australia to examine the Cross of Sacrifice. He said that certain work should be undertaken. I believe that the Returned Servicemen's League will approach the Government. I have had no direct correspondence on this, although I saw the press report about it.

SEMAPHORE PARK SEWERAGE.

Mr. TAPPING: Last week, in reply to my question, the Minister of Works said that a plan had been prepared for sewerage areas of Semaphore Park, but that he did not know when it would be implemented. He stated the cost involved. At a meeting I attended last Sunday, more than 100 people were adamant that sewerage was necessary for health reasons. Septic tanks cannot operate and residents have to dig holes in the sand to dispose of refuse. In view of the desire of that meeting for something tangible, can the Minister say whether this project will be referred to the Public Works Committee soon?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Government, through the department, is aware of the problem in the area and is anxious to remedy it. As I said last week, the proposal has been examined and the cost factor calculated. However, the other side of the financial position has not been computed—the returns from possible rating and so forth. When that is done the matter will be ready for submission to Cabinet and, if Cabinet approves of it, it will go to the Public Works Committee. The proposal is proceeding and I will not delay it. When it can be implemented depends on the availability of funds for the entire sewerage programme that the department carries out annually. We are aware of the problem and are anxious to solve it as soon as possible.

SIREX WASP.

Mr. HARDING: Steps are being taken to combat the siren wasp problem. This matter was mentioned by the Chairman of the National Siren Fund Committee, Doctor T. H. Harrison, during an inspection of the South-East forests this week. He said that to pursue eradication measures in Victoria, £66,000 will

be spent for the six months ending December 31, 1963. Although I understand that this may be a Commonwealth matter, will the Minister of Forests say what part the State Government is playing in this programme and to what extent it contributes to the cost?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As the honourable member knows, siren wasp has never been discovered in our State's softwood forests. Since the Victorian outbreak, which occurred about a year ago, much reconnaissance has been carried out in our forests to ascertain whether or not there is infestation, but no trace has been found. However, South Australia feels that it must contribute to the cost of Victorian measures to eradicate the pest because those measures are in our own interests. Accordingly, we have joined the National Siren Committee and we have provided £29,000 of the committee's initial allocation of £200,000. The Commonwealth Government provides £100,000. Private forests contribute, I think on the basis of 2s. an acre of plantations. The work being done in Victoria is under two headings. Firstly, there is survey and eradication work. About 3,000,000 acres have been surveyed, and, whilst I think it would be premature to suggest that the pest will be eradicated, every effort is being made not only to contain it but to eradicate it. Secondly, research work is being undertaken in Tasmania and also at the Waite Research Institute. This work involves studies of parasitic control, the breeding of pest-resistant trees, tree physiology and the development of lures to attract the pest. It will be a long-term project and we will undoubtedly be required to make further contributions to the fund, but we believe that the work we are subsidizing is in our own interests.

RAILWAY STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Minister of Works obtain from his colleague, the Minister of Railways, a detailed plan showing the proposed route of the standard gauge line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill? Further, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, could a copy of that plan be placed on the notice board in this Chamber for the benefit of members?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will bring the question to the notice of my colleague to see what information can be obtained.

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR.

Mr. LAUCKE: It appears that the South Para reservoir will fill this winter. Can the Minister of Works indicate its present holding?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The return supplied to me two days ago by the Engineer-in-Chief shows that South Para was then holding 10,454,000 gallons. As its total capacity is about 11,300,000 gallons, it was about 800,000 gallons short of capacity two days ago. It is nearly full and will probably fill this week. If it does not, there may not be much further intake until we have some more refreshing rain.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked last week about the supply of Grade IV English books at the Blackwood Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have been informed that supplies of the revised Junior Word Books for primary schools were received in the Education Department from the Government Printer on June 1 and that all outstanding orders were completed within one week and the books delivered to schools. Unfortunately, through a human error, the books were not delivered to Blackwood as early as to other schools. This human error occurred because the headmaster's name was Middleton and the books were wrongly delivered to the town of Middleton. However, they were distributed on Friday last, and the child to whom the honourable member refers has his copy. Incidentally, the headmaster states that his results in English have not been adversely affected while he has been waiting for his word books.

URRBRAE AGRICULTURAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education say whether the provision of living-in accommodation is being considered for country boys attending Urrbrae Agricultural High School and, if it is, can he say when he expects this matter to be referred to the Public Works Committee for inquiry?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This is a hardy annual that has been discussed ever since I became Minister of Education and it was being discussed for a considerable time before then. I understood that the council of the Urrbrae school was not pressing the matter, and I have not heard anything of it recently. In fact, two or three years ago preliminary plans were prepared for buildings suitable for accommodation without any commitment by the Government or by the department, but I have heard of no recent proposal. On the contrary, I have been informed unofficially that

the council is not pressing the matter as it is more anxious to get additional school buildings.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that the school council favours the principle of providing living-in accommodation at the school, but it is also aware that most of the present buildings are temporary and it would therefore give priority in a building programme to providing permanent structures at the school. In order to clear up any misunderstandings, can the Minister of Education supply any information about the department's intention to build permanent structures at the school in the future?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I think the honourable member has clearly expressed the attitude of the school council, because it has been made plain to me that what the council is pressing for this present year is not boarding accommodation but much needed classroom accommodation. I took the matter to Cabinet a few months ago and Cabinet authorized the preparation of plans for new buildings. It is not usual for me to anticipate the Treasurer's Loan Estimates, but I have every confidence that that item will appear in the next Loan programme. When the work will commence is another story, but I do not think there is any room for misunderstanding. The present aim of the council is for the provision of urgently required classroom accommodation and ancillary rooms. Cabinet is of the same opinion and instructions have been given to the Public Buildings Department to prepare the necessary plans. About two weeks ago, when I was discussing the design list with the Deputy Director of Education, Mr. Walker, we discussed these buildings in some detail. I hope that clarifies the position.

TELEVISION IN CARS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The Australian Motor Vehicles Committee has set down provisions specifying conditions governing the installation of television receivers in motor vehicles which, I understand, form the basis of legislation controlling the use of television receivers in motor vehicles in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. These receivers are likely to be on the market in South Australia soon, and possibly some are already available. In the interests of road safety, it is most important that a driver's attention be not unduly distracted when driving a motor vehicle. Will the Premier say whether the Government will consider amending the Road Traffic Act to control the installation of television receivers in motor vehicles?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Although I am not sure, I believe I have seen some reference to this matter in a report of the Commissioner of Police; it may be illegal at present. If there is any doubt about that, I will undoubtedly comply with the honourable member's request and submit the matter to Cabinet. I agree that it would be distracting to a driver to have a television screen in front of him, that is, in the front of his car. I am not sure about the position if there is a screen in the back of the car, but having it in a place visible to the driver should be strictly prohibited. If that is not already the case under the Road Traffic Act, I will see that steps are taken to have the matter brought before Cabinet for that purpose.

AUBURN CROSSING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, whether he has any proposals for re-planning the dangerous railway crossing on the Main North Road immediately north of Auburn?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will inquire.

WHYALLA CITY COMMISSION.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Recently, I drew the Premier's attention to the fact that the Auditor-General had decided that the arrangements hitherto operating between the City of Whyalla Commission and the Housing Trust regarding the pre-payment of rates to enable rapid construction of roads were not in order. Will the Premier say whether legislation will be brought down as early as possible to amend the City of Whyalla Commission Act to enable these arrangements to continue?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not remember seeing the Auditor-General's comments on this matter but, if it is merely a technical problem because the Commission's or the Housing Trust's powers do not permit this, I assume that it would be in the interests of both authorities that the technical embargo be removed. I shall have the matter examined for the honourable member and, if it is merely a technical problem because Parliament has not given authority for what is a suitable local arrangement, I think it can easily be solved.

SCHOOL OVALS.

Mr. RYAN: This question is also a hardy annual. I have made numerous representations to the Minister of Education on behalf of schools in my district for the payment of a subsidy or for some other reimbursement to school committees for the maintenance of school ovals and playing grounds, which is

especially important now that the Government has given its approval to school committees and schools to allow these ovals to be used by people other than those attending the schools. Has the Government further considered this question, and if it has, does it intend to adhere strictly to its past policy not to allow a subsidy, or will it relax this policy and make some reimbursement to the school concerned?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The department has further considered this matter, but it has decided not to make any extension to the existing arrangement because, although we have a large sum to spend, it is necessarily limited and, if we become more expansive regarding one subsidy, we have to take away money from another one. It is not intended at present to alter our present decision.

HIGHWAYS CAMP.

Mr. HALL: A Highways Department gang has recently established a camp on the road between Mallala and Balaklava and is commencing work preparatory to sealing that road. I understand that this job will take about 12 months. As planning for future work must be done some time prior to that work being completed, will the Minister of Works ascertain what the future jobs for this camp will be when that road is completed, and whether included in those plans are further local district roads from Balaklava to Halbury or the Brinkworth roads?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will inquire for the honourable member.

CRAFT CENTRES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Last session I asked the Minister of Education a question concerning the closing of woodwork and domestic arts centres in primary schools. Many Opposition members voiced their disapproval of the curtailment of these subjects, and the department decided that these courses would be continued for a further 12 months. Can the Minister say whether these subjects will be further continued in primary schools?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The decision at that time, as the honourable member said, was to continue those courses for another 12 months. I have not had to consider this matter just recently, but I personally strongly favour the permanent continuance of these courses.

LEASEHOLD LAND.

Mr. CURREN: I was approached recently by a land agent in Renmark who complained of long delays in obtaining permission from

the Minister of Lands to transfer leasehold land. I was informed that one transaction the agent was handling dates from July 29, 1962, and another dates from October 3, 1960. Another land agent in an Upper Murray town has also complained along similar lines. The minimum time for permission for these transfers to be obtained appears to be three months, and much inconvenience and hardship is caused sellers and purchasers by the undue delay. Will the Minister have this matter investigated and if possible introduce some system of transfers that will ensure that delays are eliminated?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: If the honourable member will give me the particulars of these transfers that have been so long delayed I will have them investigated individually, because unless some factor is involved other than the direct transfer of these properties there is no reason for that delay. In view of the time that has elapsed, I am of the opinion that there must be something other than a simple transfer involved. It is not unusual for transfers to take three months because of many other factors, but at present transfers are going through my department practically every day that are only a week or two old. I assure the honourable member that I, as the Minister of Lands, do not delay any transfers.

EAST GAMBIER SCHOOL.

Mr. BURDON: Recently the East Gambier Primary School Committee's President and Secretary discussed school matters with me and informed me that the committee had been endeavouring over a considerable period to get sunshades placed on the north-western side of the school. Having made inquiries, I believe that these sunshades were approved during 1961 and that directions were sent on to the Public Buildings Department for the carrying out of this necessary work. Will the Minister see whether it is possible to have this work carried out before the coming summer? I am also concerned about the erection of an additional classroom on the east wing of the school. We believe that this school will have about 1,000 students next year. I believe that this building has been approved, and the committee is most anxious to know if it will be erected by the start of the 1964 school year.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to investigate both the matters raised by the honourable member. My own recollection is that both of them have been approved by the Education Department and that the request has gone on to the Public Buildings Department. It may be that that

department will do both jobs when it has a gang working in the locality. I will obtain a specific reply for the honourable member, probably next Tuesday.

EXAMINATION FEES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The regulations relating to increased fees for public examinations were laid on the table of this House on July 23. These regulations were presented to Executive Council on February 7 and again on April 4 this year, when clauses 5 and 12 of chapter IX were disallowed. Incidentally, these two clauses refer to charges for matriculation examinations that are to come into operation in 1966. Following on my earlier questions on this subject, I have perused section 18 of the University of Adelaide Act, particularly subsection (3), which reads:

All Statutes and regulations made pursuant to this section shall be reduced into writing, and shall, after the common seal of the university has been affixed thereto, be submitted to the Governor to be allowed and countersigned by him. After any Statute or regulation has been allowed and countersigned by the Governor, it shall be binding upon the university and upon all candidates for degrees to be conferred by the university, and upon all professors, lecturers, examiners, officers, graduates, diploma holders, and servants of the university, and upon all students of the university.

This indicates to me that the Government will now accept the recommendation of the University Council. Is the Minister in a position to agree with my contention that the Government has now accepted the increases, or do I understand that, as a result of yesterday's question, it is his intention to take the matter back to the Cabinet for further consideration in anticipation that they may either be reduced or not recommended in view of the section of the Act quoted by me?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The regulations were submitted to Cabinet for the approval of the Governor-in-Council in the normal way, as are similar regulations made by regulation-making bodies. I informed the Leader yesterday that Cabinet had the inherent power to allow regulations and send them on in the ordinary way to the Governor-in-Council: that is, the power to review them. In this case, it reviewed one aspect, that is, the submission by the University Council endorsed by the University Senate: that a matriculation committee for the new matriculation proposals to come into operation in 1966 be substituted for the Public Examinations Board. That was breaking entirely new ground and was taking away the powers and the duties of the Public Examinations Board,

which had stood the test of time and had been approved with all its faults and failings by the Parliament and people at large. Cabinet was not prepared, on this question of major policy, to approve of that.

The second thing was that included in the regulations were some new fees to be imposed in respect of this new matriculation examination in 1966. Cabinet thought it was premature to fix fees for an examination that was not likely to come into force until 1966. But on the other matters, there was an accompanying explanation from the university which stated that the Public Examinations Board derived its income from fees which were paid by candidates who presented themselves and which were fixed in 1956, as were the rates paid to examiners. It is necessary now to increase the rates of payment to examiners and accordingly to raise candidates' fees. The new fees perhaps correspond closely to those obtaining in other States, and they represent a smaller proportion of the basic wage than did the fees payable before the Second World War. The actual increases are 15s. in the entrance fee, 2s. 6d. for each subject at the annual examination, and 5s. for each subject, plus 25s. entrance fee for the supplementary Leaving examination. I repeat that although Cabinet has the inherent power to disapprove of recommending those to the Governor-in-Council, it considers that it should not capriciously withhold its approval to regulations made by regulation-making bodies having almost autonomous powers, and therefore it did not disapprove of these. Yesterday the Leader asked me a specific question, and, out of deference and courtesy to him, I said I would refer the matter to Cabinet at its meeting next Monday for further consideration.

TRAFFIC ISLANDS.

Mr. LAUCKE: The provision of lighting on traffic islands on highways in country areas is placing a heavy burden on local government authorities, particularly when a number of these islands are in one council area. I understand that the relevant Acts do not at present permit the Highways Department to meet the cost of traffic island lighting in country areas, and I ask the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, whether consideration will be given to taking such action as will relieve district councils of this lighting obligation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is, to some extent, a matter of policy. I will refer

the matter to my colleague, the Minister of Roads, for a report.

PARKING.

Mr. HARDING: I refer to the publicity given to the habit of double ranking of Government cars in front of Parliament House. Will the Premier obtain a report on this dangerous practice, and will he take steps to have it discontinued?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will obtain a report on this matter. I think the report will show that the accommodation in front of Parliament House is totally inadequate for the present requirements and, as a consequence, honourable members have been severely handicapped in attending the sittings of the House and in undertaking their duties here. What the remedy for that is, I do not know.

Mr. Lawn: Let the Commonwealth Government take care of Commonwealth members.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have the matter examined to see whether any useful steps may be taken. I, personally, am opposed to double ranking in front of this House. I will see if any useful action can be taken. The last information I had was that there was accommodation for 35 cars and that 131 cars required to be accommodated. That did not seem to me to be a practical proposition. However, I will obtain a report.

INSULATORS.

Mr. HALL: I understand that some of the single wire earth return services in the country have been constructed with secondhand insulators from the Municipal Tramways Trust. I have in mind a scheme near my home. This has created difficulties in the past, and these insulators, in some instances, have been defective and caused much trouble, such as blackouts in the rainy periods of winter. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether it has been found that these insulators have been defective and, if they have, whether they will be replaced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am surprised to be told that the trust has used secondhand materials from any source, particularly on the s.w.e.r. lines, as they have become known. Before this system was developed in South Australia, the trust took great care to examine its possibilities and its defects. In the course of the investigations special materials were developed and standardized for the transmission of this type of current, so that costs could be reduced as much as

possible and so that the system could effectively meet the special demands on it. This service usually carries 19,000 volts, which is convenient for the tapping of a three-phase line. That is by the way, but my point is that the equipment used in this type of installation is generally specialized and I would be surprised if secondhand materials were used. It is impossible to avoid some breakdowns in power transmission. These may be caused by weather conditions and other factors. Severe storms this winter were probably responsible for blackouts, rather than the quality of the material used. However, I will bring the matter to the notice of the chairman of the trust and ask for a specific report.

ADELAIDE JUVENILE COURT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Twice during the Parliamentary recess I wrote to the Minister of Works about what can only be described as the appalling congestion outside the courtroom of the Adelaide Juvenile Court, caused because those whose cases are awaiting trial are not permitted in the courtroom while other cases are being heard. The area at the top of the stairs provides room for about 15 people to sit. Once when I was there I counted 70 people waiting. Some would have had to wait for two to three hours. Has the Minister of Works yet been able to take steps to alleviate this situation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I recall the honourable member's letter, and I assure him that I asked for a report on the position. I do not recall having seen the report, but I will check and let him know tomorrow. We have made many improvements to various courts in the last year or two and are endeavouring to make still further improvements as fast as we can. I will let the honourable member have a report tomorrow or next Tuesday.

GAWLER BY-PASS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Whilst road users appreciate the new Gawler by-pass highway, there are inherent dangers at the road crossings. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, whether it is planned to provide "stop" signs or "give-way" signs at these crossings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask for a report on the matter.

FREEWAYS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Tomorrow I intend asking a question about freeways. I have in my possession maps compiled by the Town

Planning Committee indicating the route of a proposed freeway through the West Torrens Corporation area and my district. Have I your permission, Mr. Speaker, to place these maps on the notice board in the Chamber to help explain the question I will ask tomorrow and also for the information of members?

The SPEAKER: The Leader is seeking permission to display a map of a proposed freeway in his district—in the area of the District Council of West Torrens. The purpose of the notice board is to enable information on matters of business before the House to be displayed. As this question relates to freeways, which I assume involve town planning, has the Leader leave to display a map on the notice board?

Leave granted.

NARACOORTE SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about progress being made at the Naracoorte South school, particularly in providing top soil on the oval?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that all of the subcontract work referred to by the honourable member as being behind schedule has been investigated by officers of his department and that steps have been taken to ensure that all of the work will be completed in time to allow occupation of the school at the beginning of the September school term.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 30. Page 203.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): When I was given leave to continue yesterday, I had concluded my remarks about railways and was about to turn to the subject of education, with which I shall deal now with a full knowledge that education matters have been fully discussed recently. I join with those who support Commonwealth aid for education. Last session I drew attention to the increasing demands by our neighbouring countries in the Near East in respect of education and to the progress they were making.

I congratulate students of the University of Adelaide on their efforts to draw attention to the need for Commonwealth aid for education. In addition to the journal they distributed through South Australia and, I believe, every other State, I have a copy of a

report of the National Education Congress held in May this year. From this report it is clear that all State Premiers have asked for a committee of inquiry to investigate the needs of primary, secondary and technical education on a national basis, and have suggested a long-term basis of assistance and some special assistance as an interim measure. I believe this is an urgent matter. Only a few days ago the Australian Broadcasting Commission, in the "Four Corners" programme, drew attention to the need for Commonwealth aid for education. I believe that the demand for this aid is ever increasing and that it has the support of most people.

This matter was discussed recently at the South Australian Labor Party Conference, which pledged support for a move in this direction. I understand that there are no constitutional difficulties and that constitutional authorities have made it clear that section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution enables Commonwealth aid to be given. I do not want to go over all the arguments that have been advanced, and I now know that the Minister of Education is lending some support to the claim for Commonwealth aid; at least, I am led to believe that. I know that many people who have a great knowledge of the requirements of education have stated their desires very clearly, and it would be well for this House to note what the South Australian representative at the conference said on behalf of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The South Australian report was presented by Mr. M. Haines, president of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and it was as follows:

Despite the increased percentage of the State Budget that is being spent on education, the amount of finance available is insufficient to bring the services up to generally accepted present day standards.

Primary schools: New schools of fine construction have been opened each year. These would compare most favourably with most in Australia. They are provided with first-class library accommodation and new infant schools have a general activities room. However, lack of finance precludes any provision for the proper handling of art, craft, choir and indoor physical education even in the new schools. There is a need for more schools available earlier and the discontinuance of temporary wooden rooms. Many old schools require modernizing or replacing to meet present day standards. A gradual and continued reduction of class sizes is noted, although the large schools still average over 36 per class.

The supply of teachers from the teachers' colleges has improved considerably. Indeed, in some schools in 1963 classes could have been

reduced in size had accommodation been available. Teaching equipment and aids are provided through parental finance on a subsidy basis, and some schools are forced to do without equipment because school bodies cannot always raise the money. No provision is made in any school for specialist teachers, librarians, or clerical assistance.

High schools: At the beginning of 1963 there were 10 high schools with an enrolment in excess of 1,000 and, of these, four had more than 1,500, while one had 2,000 pupils. Most high schools have classes in excess of 40 pupils; some Leaving Honours classes are as large as 48. The permanent solid construction buildings, which have been erected by the department, are fine structures, but, because of the lack of finance, they have not been erected quickly enough to accommodate the increasing enrolments. As a result, wooden rooms are still being erected; some new schools are opening with wooden buildings only. Some schools are on two sites, which are in some cases up to two miles apart.

Because of the shortage of finance, it is not the policy of the Education Department to provide school halls; hence the unifying influence and the lasting effect of properly conducted indoor assemblies is missing from the secondary education of most of the pupils in South Australian high schools. The ratio of pupils to teachers in our high schools is far too high for efficient teaching. While we are pleased that the entrance requirements for the teachers' colleges this year are more selective, the need for highly qualified teachers is still very great. Of the 1,268 teachers (of all kinds) in our high schools in 1961, only 592 had academic qualifications of a diploma or higher. The staffing position is very tight; the shortage of qualified senior teachers is acute.

Technical high schools: The Technical Branch is pioneering new type courses for schools. Finance is needed to provide greater opportunities for department officers to study trends overseas, to conduct research, and to train staff for the implementation of these courses, more time to be available for the training of teachers for the teaching of these new courses, and more research for teaching aids and the provision of same.

Specialist services: Lack of finance is particularly strongly felt by the specialist services such as library, psychology, visual aids, speech and hearing, and physical education.

Looking ahead: The present situation reveals an education system modern in outlook but limited financially in what it can do. The raising of the school attendance age, the new matriculation and the introduction of decimal currency will all add to the present aggravated situation. Immediate financial assistance is needed to ensure, among other things: the provision of suitable accommodation for all types of schools and teachers' colleges to meet the needs as they arise, and not after they have been with us some time; the general lifting of teacher qualifications by increased courses of training; better provision of ancillary services, of equipment and facilities generally.

I submit that that is a very fair and comprehensive report, and I think the Minister might agree that the reporter was quite fair and, in some instances, complimentary to the department.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: I do not necessarily agree with everything in that report, but I consider that it is a substantially fair and balanced report and, as it comes from the President of the Teachers Institute, I think it does him credit.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I thought that would be the Minister's attitude. One could not expect that the Minister, because of the different position that he holds, would agree with every aspect of the report. I am convinced that we in Australia are charged with a great responsibility in respect of education, and I believe the desires of the Minister are to see vast improvements as quickly as possible. We acknowledge that most people connected with education are concerned about the demands and the inability to meet them because of lack of finance. I submit that it would be agreed that the States are somewhat limited in their scope in raising finance. Education now is certainly a national problem and cannot be limited entirely to the States, and as the Commonwealth has the greater scope and the greater power it is up to the Commonwealth Government to come to the party and assist in this great problem. I am certain that this is the view of most people charged with the responsibility of finance and of education in Australia. I have a copy of the submissions on education that were made to the Premiers' Conference in 1961. I believe that the Premier of New South Wales, following some agreement, was the spokesman for the States in this matter. The report of that conference states:

The Ministers of Education considered that what was first needed was a reliable and dispassionate statement of the facts of the situation. The statement prepared had purposely been made as brief as possible, and it has been limited to those aspects of the educational problem in which lack of resources is the prime consideration. It does not attempt to cover such matters as school organization or curriculum, vital though these matters are for any complete prospectus of education in Australia.

Rather than read the report in full I will turn now to paragraphs 35 and 36, which I consider most important. Those paragraphs state:

The finance available to Education Departments in recent years has increased annually. Compared with urgent needs, it has been inadequate, and this limitation has caused much that is essential to a satisfactory service to be

deferred from year to year. This cannot go on indefinitely without serious effect on Australia as a whole. The finance available in the future, both from general revenue and from Loan money, should not only provide a full rather than a limited educational service for the increasing enrolments each year, but should be also of such dimensions as to allow the accumulated deficiencies of the last 10 years to be systematically reduced.

It is well realized that the matter is a national problem. I am glad to note that so many people are making their voices heard in this matter, and I trust that we in this House will be quite enthusiastic regarding any endeavours that are made in this direction.

I appreciate that there is a possibility of a change of venue for our Intermediate and Leaving examinations. I am not at all happy about the attitude generally of the Public Examinations Board. The Minister rather stole my thunder yesterday—although I believe he had every justification for doing so—when he referred to correspondence that he had received from the past chairman, I think it was, of the Public Examinations Board. I wish to relate to the House a problem that arose in my own district. A young lass was contemplating entering the Teachers Training College and desired to train to teach at the very highest level in the department. This course depended on whether or not she was successful in the subject of Italian. She had to decide whether to wait for the results in that subject to be announced or to apply immediately and commence her duties. She had received the results of every other subject and she knew that she had qualified to make her application, but she particularly wanted to go on and be able to develop her knowledge, particularly in Italian.

When her mother rang the office of the Public Examinations Board, she was rudely told that it was just too bad if a scholar sat for a subject that was not marked in this State because we had no examiner here, and that she would just have to wait; their whole manner and their remarks suggested an attitude of "Don't bother us any more." Following that I wrote to the Minister, who is the only person to whom we, as members of Parliament, can go on behalf of our constituents. I must say in all fairness that when I have approached a Minister I have always been courteously received and given a courteous reply, and I think that that should be the order of the day. I think every Minister is anxious that we look upon them in that light.

Mr. Jennings: Of course, you have a courteous approach.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I appreciate my colleague's kindly remarks. In my letter to the Minister I said:

I appreciate the difficulty you have in influencing the Public Examinations Board but I think I should bring to your notice the great amount of anxiety suffered by a number of students who did Italian. As there is no chair for this subject in South Australia their papers had to be sent to Victoria to be marked and for some students their results in this subject will decide whether they gain their certificate or not. As the school year has commenced they are placed in the position of not knowing whether they should return to school or whether they are qualified to seek employment. One of my constituents who was concerned about her daughter rang the Public Examinations Board only to be told that if students wished to take a subject where the papers had to be sent interstate to be marked it was just too bad and they would have to put up with the consequences. I feel that this is quite the wrong approach for the board to use in view of the distress now suffered by students due to the foregoing. They could at least show some sympathy rather than adopt the bombastic attitude that is evident.

Mr. Jennings: Has the Workers' Educational Association an Italian course?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I received a letter dated February 8, 1963, from the Minister of Education, which reads:

I refer to your letter of February 6, concerning the results of the Leaving Italian Examination. As you know, the Public Examinations Board is set up pursuant to regulations made under the University of Adelaide Act. This provides that:

"In addition to the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor the board shall consist of twenty-four members, of whom eight shall be professors or lecturers, eight shall be nominated by the Minister of Education, and eight shall be selected to represent schools other than those of the Education Department, viz., four headmasters of boys' schools, two headmistresses of girls' schools, one representative of the S.A. School of Mines, and one representative of commercial schools."

I have no control over the board. In 1961 I received a letter dated November 16, from the then Chairman of the board (Professor E. S. Barnes), which reads as follows:

"On several occasions recently, members of the public have written to you concerning their special difficulties in taking public examinations. These difficulties are usually caused by time table clashes, sickness or injuries. The Public Examinations Board has a set of established rules for dealing with such special cases; although these are not part of the university statutes, they are based on decisions of the board. The Chairman of the board is of course responsible for any action taken, and any rule or any particular decision may always be discussed at a meeting of the board and reported to the University Council. In all cases referred

by you to the board, a decision had been made on this basis, after a careful checking of the facts when this was necessary. Generally, the applicant had been informed of the board's decision before your letter was received. These special cases already occupy a disproportionate amount of the time and attention of the Public Examinations Office, at a time of great pressure in the general organization of the examinations. In the circumstances I am writing to ask whether you might see fit normally to tell members of the public who write to you on such matters either that they are matters on which representations should be made to the Secretary of the board or that you have referred their requests to the board for decision."

On November 22 I replied as follows:

"I received your letter of November 16 concerning approaches which are made to me from time to time by members of the public concerning their special difficulties in taking public examinations, and I have noted your statement that these special cases already occupy a disproportionate amount of the time and attention of the Public Examinations Office. Out of common courtesy and in the interests of public relations, I have endeavoured to reply to all correspondence and inquiries addressed to me personally either as a Member of Parliament or a Minister of the Crown, and to supply any legitimate information either at my disposal or within my power to obtain. Over a period of many years, this practice has absorbed much time I could ill afford to spare. Your letter absolves me from continuing it concerning any inquiries about the Public Examinations Office. I am delighted to adopt your suggestion. Indeed, to persistent correspondents and inquirers I shall take the liberty of quoting your letter in full."

Since then I have ceased to make any direct representations to the board but have referred correspondents and inquirers to the chairman. This puts the members of the Public Examinations Board in a particularly bad light. The letter written to the Minister of Education was a reflection on Her Majesty's Minister and on Her Majesty's Parliament. I believe that anyone who puts himself above Parliament is, to say the least, unappreciative of the democratic system under which we live. The Minister said it was a polite reply: it was a crude and rude reply.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: I said it was either politely offensive or offensively polite.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I think it was insulting and showed disrespect to the people of this State. It is about time this board was put in its place and made to realize that this Parliament represents the people. It represents the people through its members and should be responsible to the Ministers of the Crown. I am not making a claim for the

Ministers of the Crown for any reason other than that they are Ministers. A Minister of the Crown should be treated as such, and should be able to give a satisfactory answer when asked a question. The Minister should not be dictated to by an arrogant lot of educated upstarts. I regret that the Minister was insulted in this way.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They may be educated, but are they upstarts?

Mr. HUTCHENS: There may be educated fools, but there are educated upstarts. The Leader of the Opposition referred to examination fees. They have been well discussed here, and have been reported upon in the press. Following a statement made by the Leader in this debate, the Minister today gave particulars of examination fees. The entrance fees are 25s., plus 10s. for each Intermediate and 15s. for each Leaving subject, making a total for the Intermediate of £4 15s. and for the Leaving of £5. I add my voice to that of the Leader of the Opposition, the President of the School Committees Association and those who are protesting against these increases. The Minister said—and I believe he was sincere—that there was no intention, in increasing fees, of debarring anyone. I do not object, and I am sure no member of the public would object, to an examiner being paid a proper rate for the work he does. The Minister said yesterday that Cabinet should not take action unless there was a good reason for it. I agree with that. I believe that there is now good reason. No-one should be debarred from sitting for examinations. Professor Neal said that the method of financing examinations was clearly a matter for politicians. I am prepared to accept that challenge, but I think it is clearly a matter for the Government, which must give the lead. We want those students with the best brains to have every opportunity of becoming our scientists and technologists. A couple on a low income, with two children—one of Intermediate age and one of Leaving age—cannot possibly afford to feed, clothe and educate the family and meet the £9 15s. examination fees. I remind members that many country people have to pay for accommodation for their children who are being educated in the city. Some parents recognize their inability to meet these costs and send brilliant children into the workshops. Do we want this to happen to our brilliant boys and girls? They have the ability and the desire to develop their knowledge to enable them to serve in higher spheres. Cabinet has every reason to intervene

in this matter. The Government should provide equal opportunities to all, but I submit that many children will be debarred from examinations because of the increased fees.

The Leader of the Opposition stated that during the last 13 years the Opposition has frequently referred to the need for providing more and better accommodation for our Public Service. Some time ago the Premier announced that a 16-storey building was to be erected for the Public Service, and I understand that the project has been referred to the Public Works Committee for a report. However, some people doubt whether the building will be commenced during the lifetime of many present public servants. When will there be some real move to provide necessary accommodation, apart from a submission to the Public Works Committee? The public is greatly inconvenienced in having to travel from department to department. I know a man who purchased a retail business. He had to go to the Land Tax Department (in the old Legislative Council building in North Terrace), to the Lands Titles Office (in Victoria Square) and finally to the Department of Health (in Rundle Street). Apart from the inconvenience to the public, public servants are housed in unsuitable buildings. For instance, the old Legislative Council building is unimpressive from the front and disgraceful from the back. I went through it recently. The interior is ugly, unhealthy, poorly ventilated and has little natural light. The floors were riddled with white ants and were unsafe. The walls were damp. The building is so depressing that one is amazed that employees remain sane. Yet the public expect the employees to be pleasant civil servants!

Mr. Jennings: It is an architectural treasure!

Mr. HUTCHENS: In the eyes of the misguided. An architectural treasure of that type leaves me cold.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It would if you lived in it.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. It is antiquated, unpleasant, unhealthy and occupies a valuable piece of land.

Mr. Jennings: It is insanitary.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes, and it is time something was done about it. We should treat our public servants with respect and provide them with proper accommodation to enable them to do even better work and to provide better facilities. Generally speaking we have a fine body of public servants. Recently I drew attention to the condition of trade schools in

South Australia. They are situated in buildings that were not constructed for the purpose. In reply to a question about the proposed engineering trade school the Minister of Education pointed out that the building, furnishing, electrical and radio trade schools have been housed for some time in suburbs in buildings erected for other purposes. These may have provided schools two years sooner than otherwise, but what did these buildings and their remodelling cost? Was it less than it would have cost for an adequate building? The *Advertiser* of April 17, 1926, is interesting. It refers to the occasion when the building now occupied by the engineering trade school was commenced. The foundation stone was laid on April 16, 1926, and the Minister of Education, in laying the foundation stone—

Mr. Coumbe: Was it Lionel Hill?

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. He said that the engineering trade school was to have a permanent and central home, proper lighting and ventilation would be supplied, and the school building constructed and designed to meet future needs. Professor Chapman said that South Australia was fortunate in having a Minister who had the courage of his convictions. Mr. Duncan, of the Chamber of Manufactures, said that the chamber was delighted. Of course, that was a Labor Government, and no trade school has been constructed by any Government since that day. The buildings now occupied by the trade school have been purchased by the Government from some bankrupt company, and it looks as though the proposed new trade school will be purchased from a bankrupt company and that it will be a building that was not constructed with the idea of its being a trade school. This building will be remodelled. I think it is time that we started to build trade schools with an appreciation of what they were to be used for.

Mr. Jennings: Perhaps buildings will be purchased from Reid Murray for trade schools.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I should not be surprised. The Minister said that students were going on to the fourth and fifth years, so surely some of our advanced technologists will come from trade schools. These men will be serving in some of the most modern factories and will be filling some of the most important positions. The people directly concerned are not happy about this. The South Australian Institute of Teachers is most unhappy about the proposal to buy a building not designed for the purpose for which it will be used. I protest about the continuation of the practice of

buying and using secondhand makeshift buildings for the important work of our trade schools.

I shall deal now with roads, particularly those in the metropolitan area. When I was overseas in 1961 I became concerned about the future of Australian roads and about the costs associated with roadworks. This year I visited Perth and saw the results of putting a town planning programme into effect. I also became most conscious of the cost of remodeling many of our early suburban roads and, mark you, Sir, Western Australia has not the older areas that South Australia has. As I think the Town Planner's proposals will be considered at some other time, I shall make only a passing reference to his report. There is no doubt that something definite and of a substantial nature will have to be done in respect of town planning in the metropolitan area in the very near future. Anybody who has had a brief look at the proposals in the Town Planner's report will be conscious of the great cost that will be involved in the proposals. City and suburban councils have little, if any, chance of finding finance to carry out the road programmes that will be needed in association not only with this plan but with normal development.

Since 1923 the Commonwealth Government has been giving some assistance to the States to develop roads under the provisions of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. In 1923-24, South Australia received £10,000. This allocation was gradually increased, and in 1962-63 it was £6,200,000. When the Leader of the Opposition raised this matter, the Premier said that it did not really arise because the agreement under which we were working was not subject to amendment for another 18 months or two years. That is so, but now is the time to draw attention to it and to endeavour to enlighten those who will represent us at the conference. More than half of the 3,250,000 vehicles registered in Australia are garaged in the metropolitan areas. It is expected that by 1969 this number will reach 5,000,000. In this State in 1961 only 10 per cent of total road funds provided by the Commonwealth and State Governments was spent in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Nankivell: Are you advocating an increase, or taking it away from the country?

Mr. HUTCHENS: That is something I could have missed referring to. I do not want to take anything away from the country. I deeply appreciate the need for developing our country roads. I believe that all the money

that can be spent on them should be spent, but an increase should be made to metropolitan councils to meet their needs. I do not seek to take anything away from the country because it is essential that the most advanced method of communication possible be provided for country areas. I believe that we should work for decentralization of industries and population, and roads will play an important part in that. However, we cannot deny that the bulk of our population and industry is in the metropolitan area, and the delay caused by congestion brought about by inadequate roads must be costly to industry and commerce. I have seen figures relating to the cost to industry of these delays, but I do not intend to quote them. In addition to the cost, figures supplied by statisticians show that an average of one person is killed each 3½ hours, and one person is injured each 9½ minutes. While I admit that many accidents are caused by speed, many are caused by unsatisfactory roads, and roads have not been adjusted or re-sited because local government bodies have not been able to find the necessary finance. That is a cold fact. As the majority of people are crowded into the metropolitan area, some consideration must be given to providing adequate finance for roadworks or we shall be losing many of the established industries, and they will not be going to the country.

Mr. Hall: You have not proved that the condition of the roads causes accidents.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I did not think it would be necessary to waste time proving to intelligent people that the condition of roads was the cause of accidents. However, I shall be pleased to take the honourable member into my district and show him narrow streets, and then to show him police reports about accidents that occur because of the heavy traffic using the narrow streets to go to and from the industries concerned. We must rehabilitate the old areas, and the road programme is important in the rehabilitation of that area. Decay is setting in in certain areas in my district, and some roads will have to be rubbed out and new roads established.

Mr. Nankivell: It is a social readjustment programme rather than a road programme.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes, but the road programme is associated with it; roads are a vital part. We must not forget that our industries are vital to the economy of Australia. We do not consider that the supply of water and power is a matter for local government, and I suggest that roads are just as important

as power and water and that they should therefore be looked upon more as a national programme than limited to local government. Many of the roads in local government areas are used to a great extent by traffic that is passing through.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Do you know how much we can spend on roads in any one year?

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes; I have all the details of the amount that was spent, but I do not wish to weary the House with that. I know that the States are limited in what they can spend, and therefore this matter has to be looked upon as a national programme and additional funds must come from the sources that have the ability to raise the money.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I have been making a quick calculation while you have been speaking, and I think you have spent about £250,000,000 already.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I did have all the facts here, and I think that figure would not be an exaggeration.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I am sure it would not be.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I am sorry: I do not have the figures here now. I make this plea because I know that the request will be made and I hope that it will not fall on deaf ears.

I wish to draw attention to two social matters about which we have heard much in recent months. I refer to the suggested change in the Licensing Act to extend the hours during which liquor may be served, and the suggestion for a Totalizator Agency Board system of betting. I desire for definite reasons to place beyond doubt the fact that members of the Australian Labor Party are free to do as they choose regarding these matters. Speaking personally, I have strong views on these matters. I acknowledge that the liquor trade is closely associated with our tourist trade, but on the other hand I maintain that it is the cause of many of our economic and moral ills. Nevertheless, I feel that the matter of the changing of hours is one that the people should decide by referendum. The hours were determined as a result of such as far back as 1916, and I am convinced that it is almost impossible to gauge correctly the views of the people today in this matter.

I must confess that I am not enthusiastic regarding the extension of facilities for gambling. However, if I were compelled to make a choice between the re-establishment of betting shops, as we knew them in the old

days, and T.A.B. I would decide in favour of T.A.B. However, I shall need much convincing that something that is considered wrong can be remedied by legislating in respect of that wrong.

I trust that the splendid opening to the season that we have received, with the unusually plentiful rains, will continue. I also hope that there will be a continuation of understanding between the nations of the world and that we in this place will agree to differ in a firm yet friendly way, each determined that this State must progress and that justice must be done to all sections, thus establishing a unity that will enable us to stand high in the eyes of the rest of the world. I support the motion.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency opened this second session of the thirty-seventh Parliament. I congratulate the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) both on the manner in which he moved the motion and on the content of his speech. As a man of the land, he spoke with the strength that comes from a personal knowledge of rural matters. I listened most attentively to his references to wheat stabilization, and I thought that he summed up the position very adequately when he said that it was necessary for us to explore and exploit every possible avenue for creating overseas credits through increased production. He then instanced the valuable contribution being made by wheat in achieving satisfactory overseas credits. He referred to the desires of the industry to have increased from 100,000,000 bushels to 150,000,000 bushels the amount of wheat guaranteed for export at home consumption prices, and he indicated the cost to the nation from that increase.

The honourable member then referred to the increased yield per acre in wheat over recent years, which would bring the divisor up and result in a lower cost of wheat, ensuring that the overall cost to the economy would be no more than has applied up to now. I agree that we should increase our production and increase overseas credits in the way the honourable member indicated, and I warmly endorse what he said. As a sound businessman, too, he referred to the growth in our economy over recent decades, particularly the increase in our secondary industry activities and the complementary character of the two sectors of our economy—the secondary and

the primary—working together, one hand helping the other, and collectively giving us a far more secure background than we had a couple of decades ago.

I compliment the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) who, in his maiden speech in this place, seconded the motion. It was done in a manner and with an ability that augured well for his contributions to future deliberations. I congratulate the honourable member on his election to this place, as I do, too, the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon). This motion embodies an expression of thanks to His Excellency the Governor for the traditional part played by Her Majesty's representative on opening day. It is one of the many duties of Governorship, and it was performed in the exceptionally fine manner we have come to take for granted in respect of whatever this gentleman does. Our thanks are due to him not only for this particular service, but also for the immense amount of good he does from day to day through a very wide range of interest, all tending to promote the welfare of the State. He exemplifies to me the ideal in national character and approach: he is an individualist, one imbued with dynamic drive and energy and prepared to express his opinions forthrightly and constructively. His Excellency is indeed an inspiring force, and I humbly pay my tribute to his work.

Reference is made in His Excellency's Speech to the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. These visits are of supreme importance in maintaining the easy and delightful ties which bind the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. I heartily congratulate Mr. Lou King (Under Secretary and Royal Tour Director) on the magnificent job of organizing which he and his staff did and which was responsible for the smooth running of the visit. It is indeed pleasing to hear that Her Majesty the Queen Mother will visit us next year.

As we push ahead with the development of our primary and secondary industries, the matter of markets looms up as a major challenge. Not only must our traditional outlets be retained and extended in the face of a changing world pattern, but new outlets must also be found. I am pleased to note what is being done in this respect. The citrus industry is passing through a difficult stage, with low prices, and the difficulty of disposing of crops. Last year, however, there was an all-time record in export of citrus from this State, and for the

12 months ended December 31, 1962, there was a total placing of 836,800 bushels. The traditional market of New Zealand accounted for more than half the total, taking 432,500 bushels, but Malaya took 202,000 bushels compared with 147,000 bushels in 1961. Hong Kong increased its purchases from 49,500 bushels in 1961 to 71,800 bushels. Virtually a new export market, the Phillipines, took 21,800 bushels. True, they are not big figures, but the important thing is that new doors are being opened up for trade.

The citrus industry has found new markets, and it is good to see this keenness in getting out and selling, a keenness that is so necessary, not only for the citrus industry, but for so many of our primary and secondary products. There are many commodities for which a vastly increasing market can be found with our northern neighbours, but goodwill among the people of these nations and ourselves is basic and necessary before trade can ensue. We need good relations with our customer countries, and the visit of Their Majesties, the King and Queen of Thailand, last year, engendered much goodwill between our countries—goodwill that must surely lead to increased trade. Visits such as these should be encouraged, and the visitors shown more of our rural and secondary industries in operation. My point is that our Asian neighbours are so near to us, but between us gulfs exist that can only be bridged by personal contact and understanding of mutual problems. In this regard, as a British country in an Asian setting, it is very pleasing to note the introduction into South Australia of teaching of an Asian language—Malay—to a wide group of teachers, trainee teachers and adult pupils numbering in all more than 300. I congratulate the Minister of Education (Sir Baden Pattinson) on this forward and constructive step.

I pay a tribute to the memory of four excellent former members of this Parliament. The late gentlemen, Sir Cecil Hincks, the Hon. Alexander Melrose, Mr. Ron Ralston and the Hon. Allan Hookings have each left honourable marks in the history of South Australian Parliamentary representation. I join in the expressions of sympathy to the members of their families. I congratulate the Hon. P. H. Quirke on his preferment for the important portfolios of Lands, Repatriation and Irrigation. I recall the kindly assistance I received from this gentleman when I entered this place as an extremely raw recruit. The late Mr. George Hambour experienced these same kindnesses, and he and I often spoke of them as

we, in retrospect, discussed our entry here. The preparedness on Mr. Quirke's part to take a kindly interest in the welfare of others, his propensity to call a spade a spade, and his experience as a man from the land and as an ex-serviceman: all these equip him well for the discharge of the duties of his ministries. I wish him well indeed.

I pay a tribute to the memory of one of Barossa's grandest sons—Mr. Oscar Benno Seppelt, who passed away last Friday. The late gentleman was a true pioneer who played an outstanding part in the development of the Barossa, through many years of sound and solid application to the viticultural and wine-making industries. The Seppelt wineries are among the finest monuments to private enterprise conducted by a family that one could wish to see. I pay my humble tribute to a kindly man and a real builder in the highest traditions of private enterprise. History was made in the Australian wine industry in recent weeks when part of a 10,000-gallon export order was loaded for Germany. The wine was Chalambar Burgundy, a dry red vintage wine—one of Seppelts—produced in the Barossa Valley. It will be distributed in Southern Germany and Switzerland under the brand name and label we know so well in South Australia.

Mr. Hall: Isn't that taking coals to Newcastle?

Mr. LAUCKE: Perhaps, but it indicates that we in this country can make the best wine in the world. When our vigneron can place wines in the traditional wine-producing countries of Europe they certainly show the whole world that our quality is equal to the world's best. With this in mind, and also remembering that South Australian vigneron produce 80 per cent of the nation's wines, it is rather an anachronism that in our excellent restaurants a full range of our wines are denied patrons. Whilst our restaurateurs are able to present food to world standard in excellent surroundings and with first-class service, they are forbidden to serve the accepted and expected drinks that naturally go with the foods. I refer to sheries, ports, brandy and liqueurs. Dry wines only are now served. I am most sympathetic to the requests of the South Australian Restaurants Association for permission to serve other than dry wines, and I trust that action will be taken to accede to its requests.

Mr. Nankivell: It is unfair that people can purchase all wines at hotels with their meals during the same time that the restaurants are restricted to the sale of dry wines.

Mr. LAUCKE: It is unfair that where food of a similar standard is served one establishment should be restricted to dry wines whereas the other can serve the full complement of wines. That does not ring fair to me. For a State which produces a wide variety of wines (which in international competition—such as at Ljubljana in Yugoslavia—can gain highest awards) that can be placed commercially in the traditional wine producing countries of the world, it is beyond comprehension that restriction on enjoyment of them in our well-conducted restaurants should exist.

The rate of building is always a good gauge of the condition of the economy. It is good to note in paragraph 27 of the Governor's Speech that whereas a year ago many contractors had to lean heavily on Governmental works, at present many of these works have been progressing somewhat more slowly than was expected, because contractors have been able to spread their activities to meet wider demands being made of them. Two important things are evident from this. First, the ability of the Government to render assistance to the economy in a difficult time. A year ago, when the economy was sluggish, the Government was able to take up the slack through judicious expenditure on its projects. This expenditure was in no small measure made possible through the sound financial policy of the Government, and reflects very creditably on the Government. It had cash which it could put to good purpose at a crucial time. At the same time employment in normal Government departments was fully maintained. Had the Treasury been living hand to mouth this would not have been possible.

We had the lowest unemployment figures in the Commonwealth at that time. The further fillip given the public works programme following the meeting of the Australian Loan Council in February when S.A. secured a special grant of £691,000, which was applied to speed up several country water increase projects, and an increase in the Loan funds of a similar amount of £691,000 allocated to housing advances, has further assisted over a difficult period. The Commonwealth Government is to be commended for its part in this.

The second thing evident is that we are heading into a brighter and warmer economic climate, as indicated by the current rate of buildings. Speaking of housing brings to my mind the bitter plight of certain migrant and other families at Hope Valley who find that

the houses which were their pride and joy initially, are, after a few years of residence, something akin to whited sepulchres. Their hopes and happiness have been wrecked when they find, as I stated at question time on the first day we reassembled, that obviously inadequate foundations, or foundations laid without consideration of type of soil below, have resulted in recession of this fundamental part of a structure, with subsequent cracking and subsidence of walls, to the extent that fears have been expressed to me as to the safety of occupying some rooms. Windows and door-frames are misshapen to the extent that they cannot be opened or shut, and floors feel like spring boards when one walks over them. I walked over a floor and the whip was about 4in. There was no support under it. Last Sunday I was asked to open a bathroom door, but I could not move it. It was not locked. It would not open or shut, yet I was told that it was opening and closing the day before. This indicates the deterioration that occurred in such a short time.

Mr. Loveday: Do you know that many Housing Trust houses have been similarly affected?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, but I understand that the Housing Trust comes to the rescue of the unfortunate tenants or owners. This has not happened to these house purchasers, and that is why I am so perturbed.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That is striking a balance between the Government and private enterprise.

Mr. LAUCKE: Generally speaking, private enterprise has, with the Housing Trust, wrought magnificently in providing housing in South Australia. Unfortunately, some people engaged in house construction and house sales are apparently not observing the rules of cricket—they have not been fair. I have every respect for the private house builder and for the firms of house builders other than the one to which I am referring now.

Mr. Loveday: Were these houses built by subcontractors?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, under contract to certain builders. Were the Housing Trust, or an honourable building organization, to have been the builders of these particular houses there would surely have been such major action taken by way of underpinning and so forth as to ensure the satisfaction of the purchasers. In this instance the pleadings and representations to their builders (and I must stress that this does not apply to other builders in this area) have been of no avail.

Further, requests for release of part of purchase price obligation or transfer of agreements to other houses have been unavailing.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Have you sought redress other than from the house builders?

Mr. LAUCKE: Strong representations were made to the firm that supplied these houses. I will explain what was done. No action was taken on their behalf until the matter was referred to me. I have endeavoured to do something about it. One house purchaser endeavoured, in despair, to force the issue by ceasing regular payments. The result of this action has been notification of sale of the property by auction, presumably at any old price, with the unfortunate initial purchaser being held liable for the balance between such "knock-down" price and the present financial liability attaching to the house. This is a horrible situation—really iniquitous! One's faith in human nature fades away under conditions such as those to which I refer. It is certainly the case in respect of the affected homeowners, and it is a pitiful thing to observe, as I have.

I am grateful to the Premier, to whose notice I brought these pathetic cases some weeks ago, that he immediately directed the Prices Department to investigate the matter fully, and that he is, further, pursuing the matter of forced sales, which I referred to him last week. I am most anxious to know if there is any legislative protection other than through civil action, which the unfortunate purchasers just cannot afford. Should there be no avenues for protection, then there is a crying need for a system of certification of soundness of houses. With my experience in this matter, and to ensure no recurrence of it, I can see the vital need for some provision whereby, following certification of a given structure by the builder, the onus would fall squarely on him to effect proper repairs or provide compensation in the event of major structural faults becoming evident in a pre-determined time.

I wish now to refer to the Town Planning Committee's report on the metropolitan area of Adelaide. I sometimes think that as we pursue our ways of life with our heads assiduously down (I could be more descriptive) and engrossed with immediate tasks we are, possibly, prone not to see or realize the needs of posterity in certain things. We may be given, through the natural, hard conditions of our State, not to realize that "man cannot live by bread alone". We must pause and consider some things. The most important of these is, as I see it, the report of the Town Planning

Committee, which is a blueprint of immense value. As a practical person, I realize that all of its recommendations cannot be implemented at once, but there are some that cannot brook delay. I refer most especially to those recommendations concerning the provision of adequate open spaces for this generation and, looking forward, for the ultimate needs of our prospective total population.

Before referring to open space needs, I wish to pay tribute to the personnel of the committee for having produced a document invaluable to South Australia as a guide to the orderly development of the metropolitan area. Obviously, the committee in its surveys, investigations and inquiries was most conscious of its unusual and demanding assignment. I congratulate each member of the committee—the Chairman, Mr. S. B. Hart, our Town Planner; Mr. W. C. D. Veale, Deputy Chairman and one of the most competent town clerks our city has ever seen; Mr. J. D. Cheesman, an eminent architect; Mr. J. W. Murrell, a civil engineer of outstanding ability; Mr. H. H. Tyler, one of our most knowledgeable and skilled local government authorities; and Mr. Arnold Taylor, Secretary. Their effort has been superb, and I pay my tribute to them.

Colonel William Light, our first Surveyor-General, showed great foresight when he selected the site of Adelaide in December, 1836, and drew up his plan of the city embracing wide streets, squares and surrounding belts of park lands. Colonel Light obviously recognized the need for the provision of open spaces in his early day, when there was but a handful of population. Today we are going through a new phase of expansion of the metropolitan area, and the basic approaches to this wider development call even more loudly than in Colonel Light's time that orderly development be made according to a master plan (and I stress that we have it in the Town Planner's report), with adequate provision for open space as a vitally important feature. An article in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend in "Mr. Adelaide's Diary" is most relevant to the urgent case for the provision of recreation areas and open spaces generally. The article is headed "What Sports Clubs can you join?" and it refers to the advice often given to the lonely—"belong to something". A quick survey shows that in many of our spheres of sport it is almost impossible to "belong".

This situation will surely be aggravated as our population increases and automation advances, with more leisure time available to

us. We must not allow our youngsters to be onlookers in healthful sport and recreation; we must ensure that they have the facilities to be participants. The Tea Tree Gully District Council is doing a magnificent job in providing recreation areas within its area, but it has definite financial limitations in this matter. I am most concerned about the ability of local governing bodies in rapidly developing areas to satisfy all of the urgent needs and the suggestions set out in the Town Planner's report in respect of retention of selected areas for open spaces and recreation reserves. The report indicates that, of the 29 council areas embraced in the survey, the area controlled by the Tea Tree Gully council is estimated to become the third largest, containing, when fully developed, 26,000 dwellings with a population of 103,000 persons. These estimates are exceeded only by the Salisbury District Council (165,000 persons) and the Noarlunga council (154,000 persons).

Even with the Government's present very generous and constructive policy of subsidizing councils pound-for-pound on land purchases for open spaces and recreation reserves, conditions incidental and peculiar to a rapidly developing area render it monetarily impossible, in the immediate future, for a council such as Tea Tree Gully council to do what it feels it is morally obliged to do in respect of long-range planning.

Mr. Nankivell: By taxing the present to provide for posterity!

Mr. LAUCKE: The present ratepayers are being asked to provide that which will be enjoyed by posterity, but the need is there for immediate action to buy these lands while they are available and before they are subdivided for housing, and so on. I believe consideration should be given to the recommendation of the Town Planning Committee in that a metropolitan parks authority should be established for the purpose of financing purchase of the lands necessary to ensure to posterity particularly the open recreation spaces it will undoubtedly need. As a stop-gap, or until such time as an authority is established, a very great service would be rendered the community if the Government were to purchase the lands *pro tem* and resell to the authority at a later date.

Mr. Shannon: Where would the authority get its finance?

Mr. LAUCKE: It might have taxing powers over a wide range of councils, which are collectively interested in retaining certain areas as recreation reserves. These people and their

children would ultimately make a great use of such land.

We have a newly developing area at Tea Tree Gully, with a handful of population providing not only for themselves in the area—

Mr. Shannon: I do not think the Town Planning Committee has the answer to your problem.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: What is the answer?

Mr. Shannon: I cannot see any other way to do it than by borrowing.

Mr. LAUCKE: The Government could buy and temporarily hold certain lands and sell them to a council when revenue increased. Revenue rises continuously in a developing area. Tea Tree Gully, Salisbury and Noarlunga have special problems. Whilst noting the wonderful work being done by the councils at present, one realizes that so much more is required to be done, for if it is not done right now certain lands that could be retained as open areas for recreational purposes will be lost forever.

I should like to instance just what has been done in the Tea Tree Gully council area, with the assistance of a pound-for-pound subsidy. The council has been able to purchase a 30-acre block which it is developing and which includes two ovals. The master plan for ultimate development of the area includes the two ovals, tennis courts, basketball courts, a general area for baseball and similar sports, an Olympic-size swimming pool and a general picnic area. A further 168 acres at Highercombe has been purchased with Government assistance, and this will be developed as a municipal public golf links, oval, tennis and basketball courts, a picnic area and generally open space. The council currently has an option for the purchase of a further 37 acres, ideally situated at Modbury and forming part of the strategically located areas on the master plan.

The council has had its own plan for open lands that it desires to retain, and when a plan of subdivision comes up and it includes these earmarked lands the council endeavours to buy the land in question. So far it has been able to do so. Invariably the subdivider says, "I wish to subdivide; if you do not buy from me I will subdivide it." Despite its best intentions, the council finds that it cannot continue to do this: it reaches a saturation point beyond which there is no further ability to find the money. It is a difficult situation, yet the council is seized with the importance of retaining these delightfully situated areas for

what will undoubtedly be most valuable playing areas, possibly in only a few years from now.

I recall that only a few short years ago there was a great hue and cry by some of us, myself included, for the need to have some open country reserved near Adelaide. The Government at that time very wisely purchased 1,500 acres of land from Mr. Rasheed, and that land has now become the Para Wirra reserve. At that time I thought that this land would remain in its natural state for generations ahead, but today we find that it is being called upon to provide space for recreation purposes, and it appears that it will not be long before it will be a national reserve of the same standing as the National Park at Belair. This has happened in a few short years, and that is why I am so concerned about this question. People have thought that at Modbury, Highbury, Tea Tree Gully and Golden Grove we could defer certain things, but we have found that we cannot do so because if we do we will lose the land. With the coming of automation and more leisure time, this land will be required quickly, and these open spaces will be needed.

I regard the Government's policy so far as being extremely good and helpful, but in my opinion the Government must provide money for certain land so that it can be held, if necessary, until the local councils can play their part. We cannot allow councils to be denied certain lands merely because of the financial position of the moment. It so happens that at Tea Tree Gully at present there is one ideally situated piece of land, adjoining another area that is to be a recreation area, but it is just beyond the council's means to purchase it. It was said that this land would be there in its present state for many years, and that there was no hurry to buy it because the land would not be used for subdivision. The council thought differently; it went into the matter of purchase but found the project beyond its financial ability, and now there is before that council a firm application for subdivision for housing. Because the money is not there, that area of 25 acres, unless there is a last minute reprieve, will go forever out of the list of lands set aside for recreation areas, and that will be a pity.

I wish to refer now to two other matters of real importance to areas such as Tea Tree Gully. The first one concerns the Town Planning Act and its provision that before a subdivider sells his blocks he must provide sealed roads of a good width and depth. In my

opinion, this is a ridiculous requirement, because many roads are constructed, subdivisions made, and the blocks not sold for two or three years. As a result, the roads deteriorate beyond recognition. The time comes when a few houses are erected on these blocks, and at that stage in come the heavy trucks carrying ready-mixed concrete and bricks over those weakened roads, which then break up. The Engineering and Water Supply Department also comes in and plays its part and those roads, which initially looked beautiful, are finally not worth a cracker. The councils are then called on to reinstate them. Is the Town Planning Act in this respect acting as a medium to assist subdividers to sell their blocks at higher prices, or is the intention to help councils provide roads in subdivisions? I am sure that the real intention is to help councils provide roads.

Mr. Shannon: We all know that the cost of the road goes on the cost of the block.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. I suggest that, when subdivisions are being laid out, the subdivider should not be required to put down a road immediately, but should either put down a bond with the local council that he will do a certain thing by a certain time or give an appropriate sum to the local council. Let the council hold it, and when houses are built and water, sewerage, gas and other utilities are connected, it can then make the roads. As it is now, the incoming owner of a property finds that he is charged later for roads, although he has paid for them initially as part of the purchase price of the land paid to the subdivider.

Mr. Frank Walsh: He can be charged 10s. a foot for kerbing.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, that is the moiety. Present conditions should be varied so that roads are built after all the utilities have been provided. Then there would be no chance of a deterioration in the road, either through lack of use or misuse in the installation of mains.

Mr. Frank Walsh: I could not agree more, because many people in my district cannot get in or out.

Mr. LAUCKE: Roads put down in some subdivisions three or four years ago are now almost worthless. The provision of sewerage is a problem at present in areas such as Tea Tree Gully that are far from major trunk mains. Major difficulties and delays arise in having trunk mains taken to distant places. I appreciate that the Public Works Committee has made recommendations in respect of certain districts for the future, but meanwhile the areas are

isolated and they must be sewered in some way. Residual water that has been in gutters in Tea Tree Gully for months and months has turned green and is unhealthy. It is the effluent from septic tanks and that cannot be removed except through a sewerage system. I have in mind that, in England and in parts of the Continent, numerous small sewerage systems serve particular communities. At present, to meet the conditions to which I refer, councils are putting in their own systems linking up entire subdivisions.

Mr. Nankivell: Are septic tanks compulsory?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. The effluent is taken to a plant or biological tank, similar to a squat-ter's tank, filled with crushed stone.

Mr. Shannon: A biological filter?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. The effluent is thrown into the air, percolates through the filter and finally gets away down creek beds. In the Tea Tree Gully area natural waterways are present to get rid of fine or purified effluent. The council is entitled to £5 a householder annually for that service, whereas the rate for an orthodox sewerage system would be about £15. The Government should consider a scheme to help these councils provide small sewerage systems which, although ultimately linked with a major system, would help the householder in the meantime. Councils cannot afford to do these things at present because of the lack of capital. I make an urgent plea for the Government to make available moneys to councils, such as Tea Tree Gully, to enable them to meet the urgent demand for sewerage by providing small localized schemes such as I have described.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support the motion, and join with previous speakers in expressing my deep regret at the passing of the late Honourable Sir Cecil Hincks. Whilst every member knew of the failing health of our esteemed Parliamentary colleague, his passing nevertheless came as a great shock to each of us. Every member who knew the late Sir Cecil was well aware that he did not allow his political opinions to affect his personal relationship with honourable members. My deepest sympathy goes to his family in their bereavement. Yesterday's speech by the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) will go down in history as that made by the first member of his Party to buck the Premier.

Mr. Jennings: But the Premier was away!

Mr. HUGHES: I know, and that is why I want to emphasize this, because I should have thought that, if the honourable member had

anything to say about the Premier and Cabinet Ministers, he would have raised this point—and maybe he did—at the right place, that is, within his own Party meeting and not in this House. I consider that the honourable member for Mitcham let himself down somewhat yesterday in attacking the Premier and Cabinet Ministers during the absence of the Premier in Canberra on Government business.

Mr. Millhouse: May I make two quick points? First, there was no attack.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member yesterday made a few points that left no doubt in our minds on whom the attack was made.

Mr. Millhouse: There was no attack at all.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member must feel deeply conscious of this matter, because he has already tried to correct what he said in the House yesterday, by making a statement in today's *News*. He said that he had not implied by his Speech yesterday that he thought the Premier should retire; he wanted to make it clear that the Premier had undiminished vigour, but one could expect anything to happen to a man of 67.

Mr. Millhouse: If you read the *Hansard* pull you will see what I did say.

Mr. HUGHES: I am aware of that. I do not have to read the pull because I was sitting in this House and heard the remarks the honourable member made when referring to the Premier and to other members of the Cabinet, and they left no doubt in my mind and in the minds of honourable members on this side of the House (and perhaps in the minds of members on the opposite side) about whom the honourable member was speaking.

Mr. Millhouse: That's right, but I was not attacking him.

Mr. HUGHES: I shall not be side-tracked by what the honourable member is trying to say now. If he had anything else to say, he had his opportunity yesterday. He should not try to say it while I am trying to relate my impressions of what he meant yesterday.

Mr. Frank Walsh: He can have another go later.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and no doubt he will have a few goes in trying to defend the statements he made here yesterday. The honourable member knows that, otherwise he would not have rushed to the *News* today to try to smooth over some of his comments.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Did you see page 25 of the *News*?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. It seems rather strange that, apart from the member for

Mitcham, the Party he has supported so often took the liberty, while the Premier was out of the State, to add items to the agenda of a meeting, knowing full well that they were against the Premier's principles. Why they wait until he is absent from the State I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. Millhouse: When I put my name down, I did not know that the Premier would be out of the State.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member did not know!

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation.

Mr. HUGHES: No doubt the honourable member is really rattled.

Mr. Coumbe: Who is rattling now?

Mr. HUGHES: I am talking about his being rattled. Quite apart from his press statements, the way he is springing to his defence now indicates that he has already been on the mat.

Mr. Millhouse: I was ready—

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member had his say yesterday, let me have mine now. He occupies a safe seat and he can be used by his Party to bring matters before the public notice. He can afford to go out seeking publicity. It probably does him good, in view of his occupation, to present himself to the public as a young outspoken member.

Mr. Ryan: Nancy Buttfield thought she was safe!

Mr. HUGHES: I think we can agree that yesterday the member for Mitcham was only amplifying the echo that has been going around the State for some time.

Mr. Millhouse: Then what are you complaining about?

Mr. HUGHES: No doubt the honourable member's duties, apart from his Parliamentary work, have taken him into country areas. He has probably addressed gatherings of L.C.L. groups. He would have heard the echoes he amplified yesterday. It all shows that the L.C.L. is writhing at the decision it knows it will have to make—how to get rid of the Premier.

Mr. Jenkins: Would you like him on your side?

Mr. HUGHES: That is not the point. We like to play fair. If I had anything to say about my Leader I would say it while he was in the House and not wait until he was away on business in another State.

Mr. Fred Walsh: We would say it in our Party room.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. The member for Mitcham said yesterday that everything that happens in his Party is confidential. It was suggested earlier that perhaps he had brought something up in his Party room and had been directed to bring it up here, but I hardly think that that was the situation on this occasion. The point I am trying to ram home to some of his colleagues is that he had to drag in every member of the Cabinet in an endeavour to level against the Premier the suggestion that the time was fast approaching when a change would be sought. I was surprised that he stooped to attack the Premier during the Premier's absence.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Look at page 25 of the *News*!

Mr. HUGHES: I do not need to look at that. I mentioned the statement in the *News* because the honourable member jumped to his own defence this afternoon. I had no need to refer to the *News*, because I was here yesterday and heard his remarks levelled against the Premier. I think I can leave it at that. I do not think the Ministers will want me to go further and speak about them.

Mr. Fred Walsh: No, we have a certain amount of decency on this side.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. I was disappointed in the attack the member made on the Premier during his absence on Government business.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: You must admire the photograph in the *News*, though.

Mr. Fred Walsh: He did not know it was being taken. It was taken by surprise.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not want to go into that, because I do not want to become personal. I was outside the House this morning, but I shall say no more about it. I congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. I have had frequent brushes with the mover over agricultural matters, but we gave him a good hearing. In all sincerity I congratulate him, because he kept himself to matters that he rightly understands as a primary producer. My commendation is justified after reading the *Hansard* report of his speech. He presented some solid and truthful material to members, but I do not suppose that will stop us from having brushes in the future. I have said that Opposition members are fair-minded. When I first came here I said that if I thought a member merited praise for something presented to the House I would give it, but that I would criticize if I thought criticism was necessary. Perhaps I shall do some of that before I end my remarks today. I congratulate the mover of the motion for the splendid

material he presented to the House. I commend the seconder of the motion. I have known the new member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) for many years. He is well known on the peninsula, having carried on farming pursuits there.

Mr. Jennings: Have you carried wheat together?

Mr. HUGHES: I would not say that. Perhaps the member for Yorke Peninsula has had experience of only three-bushel bags, but I will say no more about that. The honourable member has taken a prominent part in local government affairs as a member of the Clinton District Council. Immediately following his election to this place he was laid aside with illness, and it is good to know that he has recovered and has been able to take his place here. He and I have a number of things in common and I am confident that when certain social legislation comes before members, as it will do from time to time, we shall think and, I hope, vote alike. I welcome him to the Chamber and trust that he has many good things to put before us and that the spirit of harmony that existed between his predecessor and members generally will continue.

I also welcome to the Chamber the new member for Mount Gambier. During the by-election campaign last year it was my pleasure to meet him for the first time. After being in his presence for about half an hour, and discussing local government matters with him (at the time he was a member of the Mount Gambier council) I formed the opinion that he was a man with a keen desire for what is highest and best. I thought he was a man with a desire to contribute his full capacity towards the expansion of South Australia in general, and the district of Mount Gambier in particular. In our discussions it soon became evident to me that he was well-equipped to represent the district. He exhibited an ability to appreciate and analyse the subjects coming before Parliament. The wise decision of my Party in selecting him as a candidate was further substantiated in my interviews with various people during the campaign. It soon became obvious to me that he would be elected. I know that he will uphold the high reputation set by his predecessors. During the all too short sitting of this Parliament in June last I asked the Premier how long Parliament had been in recess and suggested that he consider having two sessions in the one year to enable the voice of the people to be heard more often.

Mr. Nankivell: You have something in common with the member for Mitcham.

Mr. HUGHES: I have nothing in common with what the honourable member said yesterday. This House is well aware that I introduced the subject of two sessions when the House met in June, and I am now following it up. Within an hour of my asking the question a copy of the *News* was handed to me and on reading it I was agreeably surprised to find that it contained a leading article under the heading "Why Not Sit Twice?" The article stated:

The Government outlined a solid legislative programme when Parliament was opened yesterday. Why, then, can't it get on with it, instead of dispersing again after a two-day session? It will come back in July and sit until late in the year in one, long, overloaded business session that inevitably ends in night sittings, rushed Bills, and overtired members. As it is now, the main machinery of our democratic system, our elected Parliament, sits for only about five months of the year, and that in one session, with a gap of seven months in between. Possibly the legislative business of the State can be done in only five months. This is even questionable. But it is certainly not desirable that members who are the elected spokesmen of the voters should have to wait for a period of seven months without any chance to voice their views in Parliament. This can only encourage the stifling of any real expression of public opinion in its proper place for too long a time, and the tendency to government by bureaucracy.

A couple of sessions ago the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, apparently recognised the wisdom of a two-session Parliamentary year and instituted at least a short second session. But now the pattern seems to have slipped back to the token opening, then the long main session, with a big gap in between. This is not in the best interests of the State or of members themselves. A better balanced program is an obvious need. We value our Parliamentary system, and its efficient operation is important to all. As one practical and easy aid to efficiency, morning sessions, beginning at 10 a.m., when members are fresh, might be better than midnight sessions when important legislation is considered by tired men.

The matters mentioned in the article have been referred to many times by members of this Chamber and the people of the State. I congratulate the writer of the article on forcibly bringing the question to the Government's notice. Apparently the Premier was hedging when he replied to my question. It indicated to me that he had heard that the people were dissatisfied. He endeavoured in his usual form to blame members on this side by saying that a number of representations had been made to him by members of the Opposition who had said, according to the Premier, that they

preferred to have one session of Parliament to two sessions, as they felt having one session enabled them to settle down to do the work. However, when challenged by interjection, he said he did not want to go into that at the moment. I have made inquiries among my colleagues and have been assured by each one that, in his opinion, one long session with rushed Bills and overtired members is not in the best interests of the State. Because of this, and because of representations made to me by my constituents, I protest against the length of time Parliament is in recess.

This Parliament went into recess on November 1, 1962, and was not summoned to meet again until June 12, 1963. For 7½ months the people were stopped from voicing any real expression of opinion. It is claimed from time to time that this State is making considerable progress. If that is so, this State could make greater and more rapid progress if this Parliament met more often so as to give more members, should they so desire, the opportunity to bring publicly before the Government suggestions, and perhaps constructive criticism, which could be of great importance to the State's economy and social life.

Only last year the Premier said that Parliament imposed a much heavier volume of work on Cabinet Ministers when the House was in session, not only because normal administration must be carried out but because many matters had to be prepared for submission to Parliament and many subjects had to be studied before Bills were introduced. I entirely agree with that statement, but it only strengthens my claim that Parliament is in recess far too long. We all know that Cabinet Ministers do not apply themselves to the introduction of legislation just to have it on the Statute Book; they apply themselves to a proper consideration of legislation that is necessary and in the best interests of the community. That being the case, I would think that spreading the sittings of Parliament over a longer period and reducing night sittings would spread the volume of work for Cabinet Ministers and relieve them of any rush period. Sometimes I wonder whether the state of this House has caused Parliament to remain in recess for long periods. I know that some will say that this is the normal routine of Parliament. Perhaps it is, but one does not run a growing State by doing the same things year after year. We on this side of the House are not afraid at any time to face our constituents on any matter brought before this Parliament. The Government's action suggests to me that that

does not apply within the ranks of its own members; otherwise, this Parliament would not be in recess for 7½ months.

The majority of people in this State have grown tired of not being allowed to have a voice in the affairs of their State for such a long period. The late Michael O'Halloran, our highly respected Leader, was always drawing the Premier's attention to the fact that Parliament should be called together more often and not be in recess for long periods. He always maintained that unless Parliament was kept close to the people it reacted against the progress of the State. Just because various industries have been set up in this State, mainly in and around the metropolitan area, the Government and its supporters want to boast about the Government's achievements. They talk about what they have done in the community. I do not object to their seeking publicity in this way, but it would do them good to remember that a State's standard of living and its creative achievements, hence its morality and values, are always directly proportionate to its level of leadership, and, because of that, the people of this State have the right to expect the main machinery of our democratic system to meet more regularly.

I know there is still plenty of room for new industries and fields of development. When one looks around at members opposite one realizes that some of them are new here—not that I am old to this House, of course. Some members opposite accept Parliament's being out of session for 7½ months as part of the ordinary business of being a member of this House. Until now they have taken their instructions from one man. The people of South Australia thought that those members to whom I have referred controlled this Government by their votes, but how wrong they were. I have been a member of this House for six years and during that time I have seen the Leader of the Government dominate his Party colleagues in a way that has made anything done by them appear insignificant. Until yesterday, he had unrivalled power and controlled what members of his Party did and said.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You are not suggesting that he has been dethroned now, are you?

Mr. HUGHES: No, but judging from the remarks made by one who I think was set up deliberately to make them in the absence of the Premier—

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: We must correct that.

Mr. HUGHES: I stand to be corrected; I withdraw that statement. I am pleased to hear that; I have been waiting for it for a long time. It took the Minister a long time to advise me, though.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You had only just said it. It took me only a minute.

Mr. HUGHES: It did not. I threw out several baits in the early part of my speech, but apparently the Minister was not taking them seriously. However, I will not take that further now although I feel that, even if the honourable member was not set up yesterday, there is more behind it than we can see. Some very great outside influence must have prompted the honourable member (I did not want to come back to this but I do so in fairness to the interjection made just now that "he is not dethroned yet") to get up as courageously as he did and attack the Premier in this House. He fell down on it a little, even though he was courageous enough to do it, because he had to attack all members of the Cabinet to do it. The Premier has not been dethroned yet, but if the attack launched yesterday is continued, as I expect it will be after hearing speeches made in the absence of the Premier, it will not be much longer before he receives his marching orders. I still maintain, as I did in the earlier part of my speech, that this was not the place in which to air such views. If members opposite have any differences within their own Party, they should air them within their own Party room and not make them public in this House.

To revert to what I was saying, can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, any member opposite, apart from those on the front bench (I will not bring them into it), until yesterday standing up to the Premier? Until yesterday I did not think that could happen, but the Premier was missing so there was a golden opportunity to do so. Until yesterday, if the Premier had been present honourable members opposite would have shivered in their shoes as though facing a roaring lion.

I was pleased to read in the *News* the remarks of various members on both sides of the House after I asked the question of the Premier relating to more frequent sittings of Parliament. I was pleased also yesterday to hear what the member for Mitcham said.

Mr. Millhouse: You are contradicting yourself!

Mr. HUGHES: I am not contradicting myself. If the honourable member wants me to strike up again on his remarks about the

Premier, it will not take much to start me. I happened to notice that, while the Premier was sitting over there just now at the end of the Chamber, he was really enjoying listening to me talking about the member for Mitcham. That conveyed to me that he had had a victory over the honourable member this morning and he had better look out in future. I was pleased to hear the member for Mitcham—

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member coming back to the Address in Reply?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I am glad of that direction because I feel that we have the Speaker on our side on this matter.

Mr. Fred Walsh: That's a turn-up!

Mr. HUGHES: That is really giving me encouragement. I was pleased yesterday at what the member for Mitcham said in this House about our being out of session for such a long time. I look forward to hearing similar remarks from members opposite who have been murmuring about the same thing. They have said in my presence (I do not mention any names) that this Parliament has been out of session too long. I hope they will voice their disapproval, in support of the claim made yesterday by the member for Mitcham, when they rise to speak in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, do not think I am trying to emphasize a point this afternoon that is not important. I make these comments with real regret but this matter is important. If the Premier thinks he is interpreting the wishes of the people correctly by keeping Parliament out of session for seven and a half months, he is mistaken. Therefore, I trust he will carefully consider this request in planning future sittings of the House.

Early this year I was concerned to read in the *Advertiser* that the President of the Australian Metal Industries Association, while in Melbourne, made a statement that Australians would have to get used to the idea that there would always be 70,000 to 80,000 unemployed. He went on to differ from the then recent figure of 101,000 unemployed, released by the Minister for Labour. I quote what he said on that occasion because I understand that this president has close relationships with members of the Commonwealth Government. I can be corrected on this if I am wrong but I think this is the man who sat on the platform with the Prime Minister and the Premier on the night the Grey by-election campaign was opened. I was somewhat surprised that this man (if he is the man, and I think he is) after making such a statement had the audacity to go along and sit on

the platform in a town like Port Pirie where there are so many working people. His newspaper statement, which concerned a number of persons unemployed at that time in Port Pirie, reads:

Employer's warning. Melbourne, February 10. Australians would "have to get used to the idea that there will always be about 70,000 to 80,000 people out of work", the president of the Australian Metal Industries Association said today. He said that if applications for employment hovered around two per cent of the work force, about 86,000, Australia would be doing well by world standards. "We believe that much damage is being done to our country, both at home and abroad, to talk loosely of 100,000 people as all unemployed", he said. The Australian Metal Industries Association was concerned with the confusion in public discussion of the employment situation. In overseas countries exaggerated reports of unemployment in Australia were checking the inflow of skilled migrants and capital investment.

Even though the Minister himself had quoted those unemployment figures—the Minister who by virtue of their associations he would support—that man had the audacity to continue on this line.

Mr. McKee: What is his name?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not wish to disclose his name at this stage, but if the honourable member likes to look it up in the newspaper he will find out. Members opposite certainly know about whom I am speaking. This article goes on:

In January the Minister for Labour (Mr. McMahon) had announced that 101,000 people were registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service, and it was expected that the February figure might be even higher. This did not mean that 101,000 people were out of work at that date, as few of the applicants notified the C.E.S. when they took a job. Furthermore, it did not mean that there were no jobs available.

We all realize that, and that was instanced only last Thursday, I think, by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) in his very good speech. But, Mr. Speaker, according to the article this man was doubting the word of the Minister that 101,000 people were unemployed. I think we have to be honest on this question. We certainly know that a Minister of any Government is not going to leave any loopholes anywhere when he quotes unemployment figures; he would be selling his own Government if he did that. I am prepared to say that what the Minister said was quite correct, and that there must have been 101,000 unemployed at the time about which this man was talking.

Mr. Loveday: At the least, too.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. A Minister would certainly be in a position to make certain deductions and know just how many people were unemployed. It came as a surprise to me to know that this man was trying to dabble with the figures that had been outlined by the Minister. This callous outlook on humanity, this total disregard for the effect of unemployment, and this desire to have a pool of unemployed thrust upon us are very disturbing things, but to say that we have to get used to the idea that it is here to stay is, in my opinion, the lowest form of disregard for the workers of this country that I have ever heard of. I wonder whether this man has ever experienced the sick feeling in his stomach that many men have from day to day when they return home after fruitless job-hunting. I wonder whether he has had to face a wife and small children with looks of expectancy on their faces when he returns home.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Did this man say he wanted a pool of unemployed people?

Mr. HUGHES: He said that we would have to get used to it. What more does the Minister want? It does not matter what he said: we must infer that that is what he meant.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Surely it is what he said that is important.

Mr. HUGHES: I am sorry; I should not have said that it does not matter what he said. I would have given the Minister credit for having more intelligence than to make such an interjection. This man said that people have to get used to this pool of unemployed of 70,000 or 80,000 people. I am not able to say whether in days gone by this same man was ever subjected to such mental torture as I have described, but I hardly think it could be so. I could not imagine any man, if he had had that experience, going around glibly talking in such terms. He said he believed that much damage was being done to our country, both at home and abroad, by talking loosely about our unemployment figure, but the statement made by this man himself has certainly done damage in our country. Surely as an employer—which I think he is—he does not think that such statements will inspire men and women to greater efforts. Those statements would add to these people's burdens, and they could be excused for saying, "Well, if the leaders of our country say we must get used to the idea of being unemployed, then I suppose we must." This country has not grown to its present proportions through that line of thinking: the growth of this country has

been brought about by the aim and the ideals of the majority of its subjects, namely, work for all.

The record of the workers in this country shows that they do not require as many people on the outside to control those on the inside. The only conclusion I can draw from this man's outbursts is that he is anxious to let the workers in this country know that they had better keep their noses close to the grindstone or else they could be amongst those 80,000. The workers of this country have a record that could be the envy of many other countries. Commissioner J. H. Portus, of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, when addressing the eighth summer school of business administration at the University of Adelaide last November, said:

The country's record of strikes over the past six years showed that there was a loss of one-eighth of a working day a year for every wage and salary employee—better than many countries of the world, although not so good as in either the United Kingdom or New Zealand.

In a country where we have Conciliation and Arbitration Commissioners who are prepared to recognize the fair play of the worker, surely in turn we should aim at providing full employment and not suggest a ruinous outlook for the lifeblood of the country. I now wish to quote from a statement which appeared in the *Advertiser* of February 14 last. This is also from the report of the eighth summer school of business administration at the University of Adelaide, and it reads:

Dr. K. J. Hancock, a lecturer in economics at the university, speaking on unemployment in Australia, said the levels of unemployment in Australia during the past year should not be attributed to unsuitability for employment. Available evidence was consistent with the view that the chief cause of unemployment was a deficiency in the total demand for labour. Commenting on a statement by the president of the Australian Metal Industries Association that Australians must get used to 70,000 or 80,000 persons unemployed, Dr. Hancock said that there was nothing about the labour market which supported that opinion. Dr. Hancock said it was his personal opinion that it would be regrettable for the conscience of the community to become dulled by regarding unemployment of 70,000 to 80,000 persons as normal. How conflicting that statement is with that of the President of the Australian Metal Industries Association. It comes from a man who would be strictly neutral on the subject. I agree with Dr. Hancock that it would be regrettable for the conscience of the community to become dulled by regarding the unemployment of 86,000 people as normal.

It was not reassuring for the women to read the article headed "Employer's Warning" which could mean that, not only 70,000 to 80,000 men, but 70,000 to 80,000 Australian women plus children, would still have to live with the shock of seeing their bread and butter disappear into thin air. This is what the women of one organization in South Australia had to say, and it appeared in the *Advertiser* of February 15, 1963, under the heading "Unemployment Level":

The statement (11/2/63) by Mr. W. G. Gerard, President of the Australian Metal Industries Association that Australians would "have to get used to the idea that there always will be about 70,000 to 80,000 people out of work" and that if applications for employment hover around 2 per cent of the work force (about 86,000) Australia would be doing well by world standards, can bring only disgust and must surely indict the present economy of our country. As a women's organization, we strongly protest at the statement, presenting as it does a dull acceptance of unemployment. All people should have the right to work. This 70,000 to 80,000 unemployed must include many of our husbands, sons and daughters.

That was signed by Mrs. B. Jury on behalf of the management committee of the Union of Australian Women, South Australian Branch.

Mr. Ryan: Mr. Gerard was expressing Liberal and Country League policy.

Mr. HUGHES: We are well aware of that, but I only deal with his statement as it affects the unemployed. Considering the economic, social and personal problems of unemployment, no price would be too great for the community as a whole to pay in order to achieve full

production and reduce unemployment to the lowest possible level. It would be interesting if some of our great minds worked out how much Australia as a whole could benefit if those 80,000 unemployed were in full employment earning profitable income and building up our balance of trade which in turn would bring more spending money into the country. In terms of monetary value it would be a colossal sum. Think of the compensating advantages: social security and the preservation and advancement of living standards. I think it was about 16 to 18 months ago that the Prime Minister promised to master unemployment within 12 months; yet the brutal figures reveal that 82,870 Australians could not be employed in May, 1963. That has been reduced, according to the latest figures given by the member for Torrens; in July it was 81,407.

Mr. Ryan: That is still far too many.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it is. That is the point I emphasize, and I hope the Government is taking notice. I imagine that it also realizes that the figure is too high. I would hate to think that members of the Cabinet or any other members opposite would adopt the attitude that people have to become accustomed to the idea of this number of unemployed. From May until the present, the reduction in the number of unemployed in this State was only 31. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 1, at 2 p.m.