

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 7, 1963.

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

QUESTIONS.**AIR SERVICES.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to permit Trans-Australia Airlines to operate a service to and from Kangaroo Island, and other intrastate services that may be required later?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On two previous occasions the topic of other air services in South Australia has arisen. In the first instance, the Commonwealth Government asked the South Australian Government whether it was prepared to allow T.A.A. to operate on a route from Leigh Creek to Queensland, and the Government said there was no objection to that; in fact, it welcomed it. That route is already operated by T.A.A. On another occasion I told the Minister for Air that South Australia would be prepared to allow T.A.A. to operate air routes in South Australia if the Commonwealth Government would permit it. The South Australian Government does not object to T.A.A. being allowed to operate here: in fact, as has already been mentioned in the Commonwealth Parliament, there is some merit in having competing services on some occasions. The passing of a Bill, however, as outlined by the Leader of the Opposition, unless it had the consent of the Commonwealth Government, would not mean in itself that T.A.A. services would apply in South Australia, as the Commonwealth Government has the over-riding control of licensing of air services, including T.A.A., at present.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Is the Premier prepared to take up this matter with the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall be happy to put the request to the Minister for Air, and to inform him that the South Australian Government would concur in the request.

COCKBURN POWER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Last year I asked the Premier whether he would take up with the Electricity Trust the question of a power supply for Cockburn, in the north-east of this State, from Broken Hill. I thank the Premier for the

action he took in that matter. The television station that is contemplated for the Broken Hill area is, I understand, in the initial stages of construction in the Thackaringa Ranges, and as a result power will be supplied to the television station in these ranges by the Broken Hill City Council. Will the Premier further investigate this matter to see whether it is still feasible to take power from the television station to Cockburn so that the New South Wales Railways Department's property at Burns and also the Cockburn people can be supplied with electricity from that source?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I shall be happy to see whether the proposals mentioned by the honourable member are practicable. As a general comment on the topic the honourable member has raised, I have foreseen the time when all the Broken Hill power probably would be supplied from the South Australian grid lines. I believe there would be much advantage both to Broken Hill itself and to the South Australian supply if that were achieved. One problem concerning the Broken Hill supply, as the honourable member would probably know, has been that two different authorities have been involved: the mining authority has one supply and I think the town people have another. I will have the honourable member's suggestion examined to see if anything can be usefully done.

TOWN PLANNING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday I asked the Premier, on notice, a question concerning town planning, and in his reply the Premier very properly pointed out that the development report must remain on the table of the House for 28 sitting days and that it would not be proper for the Government to take any steps to introduce legislation on this matter during that time. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce or sponsor any resolution in the House regarding the town plan during that period of 28 sitting days, or whether we can assume that the Government is satisfied with the plan as contained in the Town Planning Committee's Report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have seen no recommendation to Cabinet from the Minister in charge of this matter suggesting that a resolution should be carried in this House sponsoring the plan. I personally believe that the plan overall is extremely good, but if the honourable member were to ask me whether I agreed with every detail in it I would have to confess that I opposed some of the details. As far as I know, the Minister does not intend

to recommend to Cabinet that any motion be moved during the period of 28 days that must elapse, but I think that Cabinet intends to introduce legislation dealing with the recommendations requiring immediate attention. I believe that that legislation would in turn be supplemented by other legislation at the appropriate time as it becomes necessary.

SEPTIC TANKS.

Mr. BYWATERS: On June 14 this year I received complaints from residents in the Tailem Bend railway cottages about the disposal of effluent from septic tanks. I investigated and found that the effluent was putrid. I took up the matter with the Railways Commissioner and eventually received a letter stating that the work was now approaching completion and that it was unfortunate that seasonal conditions were abnormal. I informed the people concerned that the work was nearing completion, but yesterday I received a letter from one whose house I had inspected. The letter states:

Thank you very much for taking up the cudgels on our behalf, protesting about the delay in connecting up the bores for drainage in the south-east of Tailem Bend. I have made further inquiries to see if there was any justification for the Commissioner to say that the work was nearing completion. The clerk in the Works Foreman's Branch showed me the progress report on July 27, 1963, and it has been the same since January last. Of 69 houses to be connected up, six have been completed. I have repeatedly complained to the Works Foreman about the stench in my yard, and he informs me that the work will resume again, when our only mason finishes the job he is on (in three or four months). Once more I stress that one mason for an area of the size of this division is absolutely ridiculous.

As this work is urgent, will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Railways, whether it can be expedited?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: Complaints have been made to me of more trouble with septic tanks in the newer Housing Trust area in Gawler South, near the Evanston racecourse. Will the Premier obtain a report from the Housing Trust on this matter to see whether the trouble can be alleviated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I am not sure, but I believe that ultimately that area will come within the greater scheme that is being prepared for deep drainage for the whole of the northern suburbs. In the meantime, I will see whether action is necessary to alleviate any present chronic condition.

DECIMAL CURRENCY.

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the announcement that the Commonwealth Government is to introduce decimal currency into Australia soon, can the Premier say whether a committee has been formed to investigate the conversion, within Government departments, of office accounting machines such as computers and punch card systems? If a committee has not been formed, is one likely to be formed to make recommendations on this matter? Will State Government departments qualify the same as private companies for compensation from the Commonwealth Government for expenditure on machines that have to be converted, if it is done within the time limit stipulated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The answer is "Yes" to the first part of the question. The Government is considering the steps necessary for the conversion of the machines. I believe the answer to the second part is "Yes" also, but that matter has yet to be determined. I believe Government departments do qualify to the extent that if the machines to be converted are modern machines, they come within the qualifications required.

DRUGS.

Mr. TAPPING: An article in *Truth* last week, under the heading "Doctors Warn on Drugs", stated:

Drugs which, according to Adelaide doctors, are habit-forming and can result in nervous disorders are being sold freely in chemist shops. At least three women whose condition has been aggravated by these drugs are at present in Northfield Mental Hospital. Anybody from a child of six can buy these drugs. They are sold without prescription.

Some people in my district became alarmed on reading this article, as it does not indicate the name of the harmful drug. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether the press report is accurate, and, if it is, whether steps will be taken to rectify the position?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that but I point out that stringent regulations, which from time to time have been supplemented by additional regulations, cover drugs that may be regarded as harmful. Last week I had to get drugs on a prescription, which I did not have in my possession, and found that the chemist refused to supply what I believed to be a normal drug, because I did not have my prescription with me. I have seen the operation

of these regulations firsthand, and I believe the statement in the press is somewhat far-fetched. Some drugs, which when taken in moderation are harmless, become harmful when taken in excess. I will get a report for the honourable member.

WHYALLA AERODROME.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about the survey of the old aerodrome site at Whyalla?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The survey of the old aerodrome site is being treated as an urgent job. The actual field work has been completed, and the examination of the diagrams of survey for acceptance by the Surveyor-General is being carried out as quickly as is practicable, so that the land can be made available with as little delay as possible.

SITTINGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand that the Parliament in one Australian State adjourns for one week at the end of every fourth week of sitting during the long session of Parliament. This adjournment of one week in five permits a proper liaison between the members and their constituents during a prolonged session. This applies particularly to country members. Has the Premier considered introducing this practice here?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall be happy to consider the practice, but it would be impracticable to introduce it this session because this session has been designed on rather different lines, and with the amount of legislation to be introduced (particularly financial Bills, which are urgent) it would be impracticable to give immediate effect to it. However, I will have the suggestion examined.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.

Mr. McKEE: In today's *News* it is reported that the Off-Course Totalizator Committee will agree to an inquiry into off-course betting if a judge of the Supreme Court is appointed chairman of the inquiry. Would such an appointment meet with the Premier's approval?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Such an appointment is completely impracticable at present. In fact, I believe that the Chief Justices of all States take the view that judges should not be appointed to Royal Commissions, particularly if judicial questions may ultimately be put before them. In all States there are objections to the frequent appointment of judges away from court work to inquiries. At present one South Australian judge

is already serving as chairman of the committee examining electoral boundaries and another is indisposed and unable to perform his duties. Consequently there is considerable congestion in civil cases before our courts. Cabinet has been examining whether it is not time to appoint another judge to clear the lists and to keep up with the civil cases. The answer to the question is that it would be impracticable to comply with the Off-Course Totalizator Committee's request. It has been suggested that if we cannot obtain the services of a South Australian judge we may get a judge from another State, but I do not believe that we have to import people to conduct our judicial inquiries: South Australians are sufficiently fair-minded to be able to undertake them. I do not think any other State would volunteer to supply a judge and, in any case, I would oppose the appointment of a judge from another State to conduct such an inquiry.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand that the Government has directed the Betting Control Board to inquire into the T.A.B. system. Will the Premier say what powers the board has and how long its inquiry will take compared with that which a Royal Commission, if such were appointed, would take?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Betting Control Board has the full powers of a standing Royal Commission in South Australia to deal with off-course betting, which T.A.B. betting is. The board is a Royal Commission constituted by Act of Parliament, and it has the full powers of a Royal Commission in South Australia, but it does not have these powers in relation to evidence to be taken in other States. However, no Royal Commission that South Australia could appoint would have the powers of a Royal Commission in other States. The Betting Control Board has the full powers of a Royal Commission in South Australia to conduct this inquiry, and it has as much power in other States as any other commission that this Government or Parliament could appoint would have. The Government has asked the board to make a prompt investigation, and I hope that its report will be available to Parliament in, perhaps, a month. That is only an estimate but, as it is a factual investigation, it is expected that it should not take 18 months or two years, which could easily be the case with a protracted Royal Commission.

FORBES PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Last week, in replying to my question about portable classrooms, the Minister of Education intimated

that if a suitable area could be found near the Forbes Primary School he would see whether another school could be built thereon. An aerial photograph of the area indicates that no 10-acre site is available near the Forbes school. I understand that the policy is not to construct a school within a one-mile radius of an existing school. The only land that might be suitable has previously been investigated and rejected. It is in Raglan Avenue near the Edwardstown Oval, and so is close to a recreation area on which competitive sport is conducted. Some years ago I referred this matter to the late Mr. Rudall, who was then Minister of Education. He was impressed with the site, but thought it too narrow. I believe that vacant land adjoins this site, but I do not know who are the owners. The Railways Commissioner owns this narrow section of land in Raglan Avenue and information I received last week from the Minister of Railways indicates that it will be offered for sale at public auction within the next 18 months. In view of that, will the Minister of Education inquire further to determine whether this land could not be used for school purposes? I admit that it is not a 10-acre site, but it could help solve some of the Minister's problems.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to make further investigations. As the Leader knows, we have conducted investigations over a period of years. The possibility of securing land as a site for an additional school has been investigated by the department, and by me, and in conjunction with the Leader after he said that there was vacant land in Raglan Avenue near the Woodlands Park railway station that might be suitable as a site for a primary school to reduce the enrolment at Forbes. I referred that request to my colleague, the Minister of Railways, who, in due course, received a report from the Railways Commissioner that the site was not available and that he was not prepared to release it. I was not surprised to receive that reply because I have never yet received a reply that the Railways Commissioner was prepared to make any land available. However, he may have good reasons for that attitude.

Mr. Frank Walsh: When do you think that the Government will be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader cannot ask two questions at the one time.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Apparently the Leader has later information, so I shall be pleased to take the matter up with the Minister of Railways. In addition

to investigations street by street, we have had an aerial survey made of the district. No available site can be found. It may be due to lack of planning in the past that land was not secured when it should have been, but none is available now, and we are faced with the problem of having the large Forbes Primary School with a present enrolment of about 1,710. That enrolment will continue to increase unless something is done about it. I have stated repeatedly to the Director of Education, the Deputy Director of Education and the Superintendent of Primary Schools that we must rid ourselves of this problem. I am only too pleased to endeavour to have erected as soon as possible a large solid-construction additional building at Forbes. I think the school is entitled to it, but that will not cure the position of having an abnormally large school. Large schools become huge institutions and the headmasters do not get to know their staffs properly, let alone the pupils. If the Leader can make any further suggestion as to how we can bring about a better state of affairs, I shall be only too pleased to consult with him. In the meantime, dealing with this specific request, I will have urgent inquiries made to see whether this land can be made available.

FOSTER CLARK (S.A.) LTD.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked yesterday about Foster Clark (S.A.) Ltd.?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Under Treasurer states that he has been informed that certain tenders and other proposals in more general terms have been received. They are being examined by the receiver and will no doubt be discussed by him with the State Bank, which is the secured creditor that appointed the receiver. Until that examination is complete, it would not be proper to make any comment or announcement in relation to the tenders.

TEACHER'S SALARY REFUND.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the last few months I have had correspondence with the Minister of Education over a request for a refund of salary paid to a teacher. This teacher, a married woman, had the misfortune to suffer a miscarriage late in the third term. The department paid her until the end of December and then realized that, under the present regulations or policy, that should not have been done. In his letter to me of July 16 the Minister said, *inter alia*:

I have given lengthy and sympathetic consideration to this matter but feel bound by a decision of Cabinet, made several years ago and still existing, that paid leave cannot be granted to cover absence from duty caused by miscarriage.

I passed on that information to the person concerned and received a reply asking me to request the Minister in turn to take up the matter with Cabinet to see whether or not that policy could be reversed. Will the Minister of Education do this?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be only too pleased to do so, but I point out that this does not apply only to teachers: it is Government policy in relation to all public servants, and it is no more my responsibility than that of any other Minister. As this is a problem concerning which I have been dealing with the honourable member, I shall be only too pleased to refer his request to Cabinet.

REID MURRAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: It came to my notice that one of the Reid Murray subsidiaries encouraged employees to place part of their wages in the firm's savings account. I understand that the employees are now denied access to these savings. Will the Minister of Education inquire of his colleague, the Attorney-General, whether the priority of these employees can be ascertained and whether their earnings rank as secured or unsecured debts?

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

CITY FLATS.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier the information I sought yesterday regarding the construction of flats in North Adelaide?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The Building Act provides generally that when flats are built to the height of three or more storeys not more than 35 per cent of the site is to be built upon. Incidental to the actual flats, other buildings such as garages, laundries, and outbuildings are necessary, and all these must be built on 35 per cent of the site, leaving 65 per cent not built on. However, within that part of the City of Adelaide bounded by North, South, East and West Terraces, the requirements are much less restrictive. In general, there must be at least 1,320 sq. ft. of open space and suitable access for use by the domestic services of the flat building, but the limitation that 65 per cent of the site must be left not built on does not apply. It thus follows that, in the area within the four terraces, a

greater flat density to the acre is possible than is the position in North Adelaide, with a consequent reduction in the land cost to each flat.

REGENT DEVELOPMENTS (S.A.) LTD.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yesterday I asked the Premier a question about a firm that has houses for sale at Para Hills on subdivided land. The name of the firm is Regent Developments (S.A.) Ltd., and its registered office is at 73 Pirie Street, Adelaide. I asked whether this company was in any way associated with Reid Murray Developments (S.A.) Ltd., which has an agreement with the Engineering and Water Supply Department concerning water and sewer connections at Para Hills and which has been negotiating for sewer connections at Seaview Downs. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have information about the company, and I believe the arrangement with the Engineering and Water Supply Department for sewer and water connections is that the company has to pay, under an agreement, for the services being sought. The Attorney-General reports:

Regent Developments (S.A.) Ltd. was incorporated on July 22, 1959, and was granted a land agent's licence to operate from April 1, 1962. In Regent Developments (S.A.) Ltd., Reid Murray Development (S.A.) holds three 20 per cent preference shares and Regent Holdings holds 20,001 ordinary shares. In Regent Holdings, Reid Murray Holdings Ltd. hold one ordinary share; Reid Murray Development (S.A.) Ltd. holds 24,999 ordinary shares and three 20 per cent cumulative preference shares.

I hope the honourable member will not ask me what all that means because, frankly, I would not hazard a guess at this stage. I will see whether I can get fuller information in more general terms concerning who owns the company and the conditions under which it is trading.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

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

Duplication of Morgan to Whyalla Pipeline,

Kimba Water Supply,
Herbarium Building, Botanic Garden,
Government Office Block, Victoria Square,
Happy Valley Reservoir, Inlet and Outlet
Tunnels,

Pata Water Supply,
Dental Hospital Additions,
Athelstone Primary School,
Elizabeth Field Primary School,

Hawthordene Primary School,
Parafield Gardens Primary School,
Poeraka Primary School,
Steventon Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 6. Page 333.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore): Last evening I was endeavouring to convince the House of the necessity of appointing a Minister of Housing in this State. I pointed out that in all the other States of the Commonwealth such a portfolio existed. I can only conclude that housing in other States must be regarded as more vital than it is in this State. There is an old adage that an Englishman's home is his castle, and that also applies in this State. From time to time members of Parliament receive a bulletin known as *British Information Service*, and the one I have here, dated June 21 of this year, referring to housing in the Old Country, states:

The White Paper puts forward proposals which are intended to form a radical revision and rationalization of housing policy in Britain. It is a comprehensive document covering a 10-year period. It examines in detail the present housing situation in Britain today, and covers all aspects of accommodation, including local council, owner-occupied and rented houses; the provision of more land for building, slum clearance, house improvement grants and the need for special accommodation for the elderly and others.

I concede that housing difficulties apply all over the world and have done so for some time. This shortage is an aftermath of the war, and, although thousands of people in this State desire houses, many cannot be accommodated. Because of that vital circumstance, this Government should appoint a Minister of Housing specifically to look after matters pertaining to the accommodation of the people of this State.

Some years ago the Premier announced to the House that he would introduce an emergency housing scheme in the metropolitan area to expedite the accommodation of people living under dire circumstances. In my district, at Semaphore South and at Largs North, many people were living in tents and in the sandhills under shocking conditions. Although we feared that temporary houses would eventually be of a substandard nature, these houses were erected and were the means of providing housing for people formerly living under shocking conditions. About 600 of these houses were built

in the Largs North area on LeFevre Peninsula, and unfortunately there was set up a colony of people who did not seem to care and some of whom disregarded law and order. In fact, it was common for the police to visit that area almost every night to quell some disturbance. Today in that area only about 25 of these temporary houses remain. I know that many people have been transferred from these shocking substandard conditions and now enjoy a solid building, and their viewpoint on life has changed overnight. That convinces me that good houses mean the preservation of good health and, above all, good citizenship.

I now wish to bring down some enlightening and alarming figures to show what has occurred in the district of Taperoo. More than a year ago the Housing Trust constructed 120 solid construction houses in the Taperoo area, yet these have not been occupied. Sewerage has been the difficulty. I hasten to say that the Public Works Committee and the Minister of Works did everything possible to have this scheme brought before the committee. The hearing was expedited and a recommendation made, and today the sewerage scheme is being installed. However, I do not think it will be completed for another three months. It is interesting to look at the economics of this project; I would call it a financial disaster. In my opinion, these 120 houses would cost not less than £4,000 each, and that would be a moderate assessment when we consider the cost of the land. On my figures, £480,000 has been invested, and, considering the interest involved, that figure would reach at least £500,000. As these houses have been empty for 12 months, the Housing Trust—and therefore the people of this State—have been losing £3 10s. a week in rental for these houses: £21,840 over 12 months. Equally bad is the fact that 120 families are being deprived of decent accommodation.

About 50 houses have been built in the last five or six months under what is known as the £50-deposit scheme. With some of my colleagues, I inspected these houses some months ago and I stated to the press that I believed that this type of house was highly commendable and would prove popular with the people who went in for them. My point is that, because there is no Minister of Housing, there is no co-ordination between the departments. Had there been that co-ordination the sewers would have been put down before the houses were built, or at least at the same time. However, because of this lack of co-ordination £480,000 has been

invested and is lying idle because the houses are not inhabited. We all agree that unused houses not only deteriorate but depreciate.

Mr. Hutchens: Many people are waiting for them, too.

Mr. TAPPING: Yes, 120 families are being deprived of a house in Taperoo. In addition, there are those who wish to purchase such a house under the £50-deposit scheme. I think the plea from this side of the House to appoint a Minister of Housing will at least be conceded by the Government. I know of no more important matter than housing. I am not able to give the figures of those waiting for houses, but from what I have heard we can say that there would be at least 4,000 people waiting for a decent type of house.

Mr. Hutchens: The waiting time for a rental house is about four years.

Mr. TAPPING: Yes, sometimes five years. Generally speaking, it is shorter at Elizabeth and Salisbury. While these houses are not occupied they deteriorate and, above all, families wanting houses have no chance to get them.

I listened with interest to the speech of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) a few days ago. The honourable member, referring to the Premier's trip overseas, said that the trip was undertaken for two purposes, namely, to gain information on the Torrens Island power station and on afforestation in the South-East. I agree that, because both these departments are administered by a Minister, both Ministers should have the chance of going overseas to make inquiries. If the Labor Party was in power, I should be concerned if our Ministers representing specific departments remained here while the Premier went overseas to do the business. True, the Premier has considerable knowledge of these matters, but the Minister concerned should accompany the Premier overseas in order to obtain knowledge of use in his own department. It could be said, with respect, that we know the Premier has considerable capacity, but our public careers must come to an end, and Ministers should have the opportunity to speak with responsible people overseas and to gain knowledge that would help them. I hope the Premier will, when considering an overseas trip on a special project, take with him the Minister who is responsible for matters that may be discussed.

I was amused by the generosity of the member for Mitcham when he referred to Mr. Cameron of the Australian Labor Party as the "czar of the Labor Party." I assure the

member for Mitcham and other honourable members that Mr. Cameron is a private member, as I am, in the Labor Party, and all our voices speak with his. If the member for Mitcham thinks that Mr. Cameron is regarded as a czar he is entirely wrong.

Mr. Dunstan: He does not believe it: he just said it.

Mr. TAPPING: That may be so. The member for Gouger referred to heavy succession duties. I realize that a few years ago an amendment was passed whereby the primary producer received concessions on succession duties. Some years before, Parliament gave general relief concerning succession duties. The member for Gouger said he thought the people on low incomes—I think I heard him correctly—were at a disadvantage compared with those who had large holdings. It is a question of what one can afford.

Mr. Hall: I think you have the wrong idea there.

Mr. TAPPING: The honourable member made it clear that those on the lower incomes were at a disadvantage compared with those on higher incomes.

Mr. Hall: No. It was only in relation to the Bill that went through and its total effect.

Mr. TAPPING: If I heard the honourable member incorrectly then I apologize, but I understood him to say that those on the bottom rung were at a disadvantage compared with those in the top bracket. Succession duties are entirely wrong. They are too burdensome. A taxpayer pays so much while he is alive that it is wrong for a burden to be imposed on his relatives when he dies. If succession duties have to be imposed, let us be realistic, and reduce them for all people whether on a high or a low income. Isolated cases do not make for good legislation, and from time to time I have had brought to my notice cases where people have been left a house, but have had to pay heavy succession duties. In one case, a person (call her Mrs. X) receiving a pension of £5 5s. a week was left a house by her sister-in-law, and because she was not a blood relation, she was expected to pay a large sum in succession duties. She had occupied a home in Glanville for about 20 years as a tenant. Eventually her sister-in-law died and left the house to her. She was gratified to know that she had received this gift from her relative, but after some time she received a letter from the Public Trustees' Office informing her that she had to pay £231 10s. 7d. in fees. The burdensome part was that she was

also expected to pay £208 6s. 2d. succession duties on a property worth £1,114 11s., although her only income was the pension. The lady is 82 years of age and it worried her, and she asked me for advice. On the first £500 at 10 per cent she had to pay £50, on the next £500 at 15 per cent she had to pay £75, and on the £460 11s. at 20 per cent the duty was £83 6s. 2d., making a total of £208 6s. 2d.

I highly commend the fine services performed by Mr. Fahey (Public Trustee) and Mr. Doyle (Commissioner of Succession Duties). Both are excellent public servants and help all people, including members of Parliament. In reply to this lady's request, I told her that the Public Trustee had the power to make a loan from the Public Trustee Common Fund. Mr. Fahey told me that he would do that in this necessitous case. However, Mrs. X had to give guarantees: first, that she would pay the rates, taxes and insurance; and, secondly, that she would keep the property in good order and maintenance. She also had to pay for the money borrowed from the common fund at 6 per cent until she died, and then it would be taken over by those who received the house in her will. I saw Mrs. X's relatives and we collected the money to pay to the Public Trustee and the Succession Duties offices, and she now has a free title. It is embarrassing for a person like her to have to pay such a large sum. The Public Trustee was most assiduous in trying to help Mrs. X. I appeal to the Government to see whether in this type of case relief cannot be given. There are not many of them, but when they occur they are financially embarrassing to the person concerned.

From time to time members on both sides have expressed concern at the lack of warning devices at railway crossings. Over the years accidents have occurred where no warning devices exist. Last Friday week at Taperoo, at a very busy crossing, a Volkswagen was destroyed. The two people in the car were not killed, thank God, but they were badly injured. Representatives of the Port Adelaide Council and I have waited on the Railways Commissioner to point out the dangers of this crossing. Three schools are adjacent to the crossing: the Taperoo High School, primary school and the Roman Catholic school. Many children cross here two or three times a day from the schools and, unless something is done, a serious fatality will occur at this crossing. Apparently the Railways Commissioner has changed his policy. Once, if an obvious danger existed, he would have provided a warning device, but now he seeks to throw

the complete financial onus onto the local council. Some months ago he told the council that he would give priority to installing a warning device at this particular crossing provided the council paid the entire cost. If the council accedes to this request it will create a dangerous precedent. The railways are owned by the State and controlled by the Commissioner, so it must be the department's obligation to provide warning devices where necessary. Residents of the area are alarmed lest a disaster occur at the crossing, and their alarm is increasing as the area develops. It is estimated that within the next six years about 5,000 houses will be constructed in that area. I hope that the former practice of providing warning devices will be reverted to.

Last week I asked a question about the activities of secondhand car dealers. The Opposition believes that action should be taken to improve the present position. Members frequently receive complaints from constituents who have purchased used cars and have subsequently found that they are not as represented. Engines have been faulty and they have incurred severe financial losses. I have often had complaints of companies adjusting speedometers on motor vehicles. One of my constituents suspected that the mileage on the car he had purchased was faulty. He went to the Motor Vehicles Department and paid 3s. for a search fee to discover the identity of the previous owner. He wrote to the previous owner, who lived at Port Elliot, and received a declaration that the car had travelled almost 20,000 miles more than was recorded on the speedometer. I do not wish to name the company concerned, because sometimes high-pressure salesmen manipulate the mileages.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I know of one vehicle where the mileage on the speedometer was altered from 40,000 miles to 14,000 miles.

Mr. TAPPING: In the case I have just mentioned, the deposit was returned to my constituent. However, in another case, the son of a man named Myers purchased a car, and searches revealed that the speedometer had been turned back 22,000 miles. This matter will come before the courts for determination because the firm involved will not refund the deposit. Legislative action should be taken to control these activities. Genuine dealers would welcome it. Most are honest, but it is the dishonest dealer who causes trouble. If a land agent commits a misdemeanour he is examined by a board. There have been instances where land agents have had their licences revoked.

Something similar should be done with second-hand car dealers. The Government should consider this suggestion. I was perplexed by the Premier's reply to my question last week. He said that the Government would introduce a Bill to amend the Act and that it would provide for a 5s. fee for a search. Mr. Myers told me that he was charged 24s. for searches. Apparently the car had passed through eight owners, so eight searches were necessary.

Mr. Loveday: I got a search made for nothing for one of my constituents.

Mr. TAPPING: The honourable member is favoured. I thank members for their patience in listening to my complaints. I support the motion.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I, too, support the motion. I offer, without mentioning names or going into details, my heartiest congratulations to all those members in this House and in the Legislative Council who have earned them. I also express my regrets at the deaths of old friends from this Parliament. We will miss them. I do not think that in any other walk of life can one get to know his associates and colleagues as well as in this House. We get to know their faults and their virtues.

I have had an experience, during this debate, that I have not had before during my 11 years as a member. A minor illness confined me to hospital for a few days, and through the courtesy of a friend I was able to read the *Hansard* pulls of members' speeches. I was denied the pleasure of hearing them. It was an odd experience because the speeches read better than usual—and I am not trying to be sarcastic. I do not know whether this was due to the very excellent *Hansard* reporting or whether it was because I did not have to have the patience to sit and listen to them. However, it gave me a slightly different slant on the debate.

May I comment briefly on some of the speeches which I did not hear, but which I had the opportunity of reading? When one is not feeling well a speech must be good to interest one. I found the speech of the member for Torrens interesting. I regret that I did not hear the member for Mount Gambier because his was an excellent maiden speech which provided interesting reading. Much has been said about the speech of the member for Mitcham, and possibly I would be doing him a kindness if I did not mention it. It was supposed to be an interesting and exciting speech, but I do not think it was. When I read it, I thought a mistake had been made. It did not seem like one of his speeches.

I wondered whether the speech had been delivered not by him but by one of his slightly less experienced and even younger colleagues. However, when I opened the *News* the next day I was left in no doubt whatever that it had been made by the member for Mitcham, as there was a beautiful photograph of him that proved that it was his effort. The Minister of Education will have to look to his laurels as the most photographed member of the Liberal and Country League from now on.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: It made me very jealous.

Mr. CLARK: I thought it might. It was an odd speech, and I see that some of my colleagues agree with me. I am still trying to make up my mind whether or not it was an anti-Playford speech. If it was, and if there was some sort of design about it to get rid of the Premier, I find it hard to follow. I assure the honourable member that he may be most photogenic, but, when it comes to wile and guile, the Premier leaves him stumbling behind. We have found by long and bitter experience that this is so. If this is the beginning of an idea to get rid of the Premier, it has my entire support. After all, we have been trying to do that very thing for many years, and our experience has been that even when we have got him beaten he just does not know it.

I find it hard to agree with the contention of the member for Mitcham regarding the age of Ministers—not from a personal point of view, because I would come fairly safely within the scope of his average age. I am sure that most members agree that the criterion for judging a Minister is not whether he is young or old but whether he has the ability to do the job. Quite frankly, I would be happy to get rid of all the Ministers opposite, but I am not saying that from any personal point of view; I am saying it because I think it is time they were replaced by a Ministry from this side of the House.

Mr. Ryan: That seems to be the belief of the electors of this State.

Mr. CLARK: I am sure that contention is just.

Mr. Lawn: He said he was not old enough to have the intelligence to become a member of the Legislative Council.

Mr. CLARK: Members are starting to embarrass me by their interjections.

Mr. Shannon: If they were in your Cabinet, how would you get on?

Mr. Lawn: What about today, when King Tom is there?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interruptions. I think the honourable member for Gawler had better be listened to.

Mr. CLARK: In reply to the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), I point out that our members would be able to make themselves heard if we were able to form a Ministry. If the member for Mitcham is dissatisfied with the present Ministry or the way it is elected, he might suggest to his Party (it is not my business, of course) that it adopt Labor's democratic method of election by Caucus. I do not understand what was in his mind when he said:

I believe that the average age of the British Cabinet is now substantially lower than that of the South Australian Cabinet, and lower than it has been for the whole century.

Anyone who reads overseas journals, either Left or Right, will not argue that not only is the average age much lower than for the whole century but that probably its prestige is lower than it has been for the whole century.

Mr. Lawn: Profumo was too active.

Mr. CLARK: I have no personal knowledge of Profumo's activities.

Mr. Lawn: Don't you read the papers?

Mr. CLARK: I can appreciate the difficulties experienced by the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) last night when about 14 members attempted to make his speech for him. Possibly I should not have said so much about the speech made by the member for Mitcham; probably too much has been said about it already. I wish now to deal with a few bread and butter items in my district. First, I refer to the Main North Road between Adelaide and Gawler. This road, particularly the part through my district, has concerned me for many years. All members know that the incidence of accidents at Elizabeth is high indeed. I do not want to dish up old history, but it is necessary for me to refer to one or two occasions on which attention has been given to this matter. On August 15, 1962, I asked the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads in this Chamber, the following question:

In the last few months I have received many complaints from motorists, including members of Parliament on both sides of the House, which, from my own experience, I know to be completely justified, about the lighting of the Main North Road through Elizabeth. It is claimed that many sections of the driving surface are very dark, which greatly increases the possibility of accidents, and I agree. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads to have this section of the road

thoroughly investigated by his department with a view to obviating the difficulties I have mentioned?

The Minister referred the matter to his colleague and on August 30 was good enough to give a reply, part of which was the following report from the Minister of Roads:

The department and the Road Traffic Board are aware of the poor lighting conditions which exist on the Main North Road through Elizabeth. The responsibility for provision of this lighting is primarily that of the local governing authority concerned, namely, the District Council of Salisbury. The Commissioner of Highways' power to finance lighting is controlled by provisions of the Highways Act, and is at present restricted to Anzac Highway and the Port Road, and furthermore, stipulates a maximum amount which can be expended on lighting in any one financial year. Although the degree of hazard, due to the absence of lighting, is most evident at the intersecting streets, it is considered that it would be unwise to provide lighting only at intersections, as this would have the effect of contrasting sharply with the unlighted sections and causing a greater degree of hazard to pedestrians who cross at other than intersections. To summarize, it is considered that the whole length of the road should be lighted to a proper standard, but the Commissioner of Highways cannot provide this facility.

I made a suggestion to the Minister (which I thought might be of some value) of providing reflecting discs. The Minister was good enough to take up this matter with his colleague, and I was glad to see that these reflecting discs were provided. Unfortunately, the lights that the Minister said the Road Traffic Board considered so necessary are still not there. I know that the responsibility for this lighting is the council's, but lighting is costly, and I hope that some way can be found to assist it. I am sure the reflecting discs that we managed to have erected there have been of some assistance to drivers. I have driven there myself and I know that to be so. Possibly they have prevented some accidents; I hope so. But, Sir, there are still far too many accidents in this area. I have noticed for some time that one of the members in another place and others have urged the adoption of a faster speed through Elizabeth. We find now that speed zones are to operate through the 18½ miles stretch from Gepps Cross to Gawler. The *Advertiser* of a few days ago contained the following article:

Road Traffic Board plans to reduce the accident rate on the road through Elizabeth were approved by Executive Council yesterday. The zones and their respective speeds are: Gepps Cross to Pooraka North, 45 m.p.h.; Pooraka North to John Rice Avenue, unrestricted (up to 60 m.p.h. with due care); John

Rice Avenue to Hogarth Road, Elizabeth, 50 m.p.h.; Hogarth Road to Woodforde Road, Elizabeth, 40 m.p.h.; Woodforde Road to Gardiner Terrace, Smithfield North, 45 m.p.h.; Smithfield North to Gawler by-pass, unrestricted; Gawler by-pass to Gawler racecourse, 45 m.p.h.

I think a further extract from the same article is interesting, for it states:

Our Political Roundsman understands that other highways on which speed zones will be created are the Main South Road, Port Road and Anzac Highway and approaches to country towns. A report by the Executive Engineer of the Road Traffic Board (Mr. P. G. Pak-Poy) says the efficiency and safety of the Main North Road has been considerably reduced because it cuts through Elizabeth.

I think that is fairly obvious. The article continues:

The mixing of local and through traffic, the confusion at night between the bright lights of Elizabeth and the darkness of the highway and side activity associated with pedestrians and vehicles crossing the road have had a bad effect on traffic handling.

At present 1,000 pedestrians are crossing the highway daily and 12,000 vehicles are daily entering or crossing the highway at Elizabeth, the report says.

The failure to provide street lights in the section of the highway through Elizabeth must be regarded as one of the major factors contributing to the extraordinary high night accident rate, the report says.

The newspaper also quotes briefly in the same issue a few points regarding the Salisbury District Council's attitude on this matter:

The Salisbury District Council has asked the Road Traffic Board to investigate difficulties which have arisen on the Main North Road at Elizabeth since "give way" signs were erected last month.

In a report to the council, the district engineer (Mr. J. Dumes) said that following the erection of the signs there had been a marked increase in the speed of vehicles using the road, increasing traffic hazards.

That is the opinion of the man on the spot. We find now that there will not only be a marked increase but there will be a legal increase. As I say, I do not know whether these new speed zones will increase or minimize accidents. No doubt the future will provide the answer, but I am desperately afraid that we could have a big increase in accidents, not so much possibly because the speed zones have been instituted but because the lights that are going to be placed at several crossings have not yet been installed, and because the lighting of the road itself is not adequate. I hope that these new traffic zones will not lead to additional accidents, but I am afraid that they may do so. I know that the intersection lights will be installed, and that probably they would

have already been installed but for various mechanical difficulties that arose. Let us look at what the Royal Automobile Association—and I think most members would have a good deal of respect for the opinion of that body on such matters as this—had to say. The *Salisbury and Elizabeth Times*, in an article headed "Traffic Measures Just First Aid", published the following statement by a representative of the Royal Automobile Association regarding this matter:

"Traffic lights, halt signs and overpasses proposed for the Main North Road through Elizabeth were merely expensive 'first aid' to repair a situation which should never have been created," a Royal Automobile Association spokesman said this week. "The Royal Automobile Association has protested vigorously and persistently against the perpetuation of the Main North Road through Elizabeth ever since it was first planned," he said. Originally a by-pass had been planned, and when the association became aware that it would not be proceeded with, it warned that in perpetuating the Main North Road through Elizabeth the authorities were virtually creating an improper and dangerous traffic situation. "The dangers to traffic and pedestrians and the costly, irksome delay caused to through traffic had become more and more obvious during the past few years," the Royal Automobile Association spokesman said. "Now more money may be thrown down the drain, and perhaps more will follow that, when the only real solution is to construct a by-pass, as originally proposed," he asserted.

The article went on to state:

The S.A. Housing Trust had promised that land would be available for a by-pass when it was considered necessary, and it had been necessary right from the beginning. "The R.A.A., the motorists it represents, and the people of Elizabeth must remain unimpressed by the present short-sighted postponement of the by-pass. In fact, the real solution has been so obvious right from the beginning that one might well wonder whether there is not some motive behind the postponement of the by-pass, which no-one is prepared to state publicly."

I must say that I entirely agree with the statement of the R.A.A. I consider that the people who live in Elizabeth and around that area, and indeed many motorists who pass through it, if they are not blinded by the thought of getting through it quickly, would have to agree with that.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: A man who is driving has a great measure of responsibility, you know.

Mr. CLARK: Of course he has, but I think the Minister will agree with me that that responsibility does not always stand the strain, and it is a very good thing if the responsibility can be assisted by all the preventive measures

possible. The population of Elizabeth at present is about 30,000, and it will become much greater; and it is split in halves by fast-moving traffic. I well remember coming back with the Commissioner of Highways from a meeting at Gawler a few years ago; the Commissioner pulled up his car and showed me just where the by-pass road would leave and re-enter the Main North road. I have been wondering for a long while why the by-pass road has never been constructed. I remember that in 1961 the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) asked a question about this matter. I was rather surprised, and I think the member for Barossa was, also, at the reply given at that time. The honourable member asked the Premier whether a decision had been made about the speed limits, and he went on to ask:

Also, when the present highway to Gawler is completed, will the proposed by-pass road along the foothills be proceeded with?

The Premier replied:

I have no proposal for a by-pass road at present. This would mean complete duplication of the road through to Gawler. Much money has been spent in that district, and I should be utterly opposed to a further duplication of the road at present at the expense of others, as the road to Gawler is surely one of the best highways in Australia. I do not favour further expenditure in that area to provide a by-pass when already a limited access road is available.

Later I asked a similar question, and the Premier made it plain that at that stage he was not interested in the by-pass road. I sincerely urge the Government to reconsider its decision. Apparently, loud whispers of dissatisfaction have reached the ears of the Minister of Roads. I read in the *Advertiser* this morning a report that action will be taken soon to consider a by-pass road from Elizabeth, and a suggestion that a conference will be attended by representatives of the Highways Department, the Road Traffic Board, the Housing Trust and the district council. The words "action will be taken soon to consider" do not promise anything. I hope that this matter will be regarded as urgent and immediate action taken to build the by-pass road. It is an essential non-access road for people coming to the city, and wishing to avoid Elizabeth.

Reference has been made in this debate to the Gawler Adult Education Centre. Honourable members no doubt remember that in a speech last session I dealt at some length—too long probably—with the need for this centre. I am happy indeed that it is now to be built. It has been suggested that perhaps too

much money is to be spent and that the building may be too grand. I do not agree with that, and perhaps I could give honourable members some idea of the value of this centre. I read recently that this year the Holland University of Adult Education is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary. The subjects offered to students in this university are similar to those available at adult education centres in this State.

Incidentally, I wholeheartedly support the remarks made yesterday by the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) regarding the need for a centre in his district. Much good work is done there and as the work is extending all the time, there is great need for a centre. While the Holland University of Adult Education is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary, Gawler is celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of adult education. Records quoted in the Gawler *Bungyip* show that a series of lectures was begun on March 18, 1888; regular weekly classes commenced on July 31, 1888, and within two years classes in three subjects had 90 students enrolled. At that time, many foundries existed in Gawler, there was an intense interest in singing and music, as there is today, and cultural activities were at a high level for a country town. I believe they are still at a high level. In the early 1920's classes were established in the Barossa Valley and at Renmark and Jamestown.

Many adults and adolescents have attended the classes over the years since then, and many of the students have made their mark in all walks of life. The education available made it possible for men and women to obtain the jobs they wanted or to achieve promotion. In these days of excellent secondary education many people find that later in life they need additional education and qualifications which may be obtained at adult education centres similar to the one at Gawler. The Gawler centre has achieved spectacular results, particularly in accountancy. Since early 1950 students who have attended classes and obtained diplomas have received, in the main, rapid promotion and increased salaries. I am informed that last November two students topped the State, and one the Commonwealth, in the examinations conducted by the Australian Society of Accountants. In the recent May examinations two students gained first place in South Australia and one second place in the Commonwealth. This forcibly illustrates the type and standard of work being done at this centre.

By the end of this year over 2,600 students are expected to be enrolled and, had fees not

been increased, the enrolment would have been about 3,000. That is one reason why I asked a question yesterday of the Minister of Education. I understand that this increase in fees has had an adverse effect, not only on the Gawler Adult Education Centre, but on adult education generally. In the last five years courses have been made available for wine-makers in the Barossa Valley, and between 60 and 80 men in the wine industry have attended a series of lectures given at Nuriootpa. Some lecturers came from Sydney and Melbourne, and some students from Clare and Morphett Vale. Last week, the member for Burnside listed the subjects being taught at these centres. The Gawler centre has a total enrolment of 2,207: 1,117 students come from Gawler and Elizabeth and 1,090 from country towns extending from Parndana (Kangaroo Island) in the south to Manoora in the north and from Balaklava in the west to Cambrai in the east. Gawler is only a small section of the department's provision of adult education centres, but what I have said indicates the type of work being undertaken. It certainly justifies the building of an adequate centre at Gawler and, I hope, at Murray Bridge and elsewhere. I trust that fees will not be increased too much, because if they are too high a choice must be made. After all, a family has many things on which to spend money.

Mr. Bywaters: Adult education is free in Queensland.

Mr. CLARK: I did not know that until a few days ago. However, I understand that the Queensland system lags behind our system. It is claimed that Gawler has set the example in adult education for 75 years. The building of a new centre will sustain and increase interest. We are all waiting for the building to be erected. I do not wish to reflect on the work performed by the firemen at Elizabeth. They work well. I understand that Elizabeth has three permanent officers and nine auxiliary firemen. However, I suggest that a city of 30,000 people should have a permanent fire brigade staffed with permanent officers who are available at all times to attend to fires. This is particularly necessary when one considers the factories at and near Elizabeth and those planned for the future. Although some factories have fire units and have men trained to assist in combating fires, the men are not always available. This applies to auxiliary firemen who can be working anywhere in Elizabeth. The danger period of a fire is when it first starts. Firemen can only

prevent its spreading to other properties if they are quickly at the scene. We must remember that in modern fire fighting many new methods are used, including the use of fluids and gases to smother and extinguish fires. It has been suggested by people who know more about this than I do that the most suitable persons to use these modern means are permanent fire brigade members.

Concern is often expressed at the quantity of radio-active materials stored in and used at factories. This could create a special hazard for firemen to tackle, and surely permanent officers would be best equipped to do so. Elizabeth is isolated. The nearest fire stations are at Gawler and Prospect, each 10 miles away, and the headquarters station in Adelaide is 14 miles away. Traffic on the Main North Road and Lower North Road is increasing and, during peak hours, it would take a long time for units to reach Elizabeth. Time is valuable when a fire is raging. Auxiliary firemen receive about £120 a year for holding themselves ready to fight fires, but because of their occupation they are not always readily available. I know that the auxiliary system operates successfully in country areas, but a town with a population of 30,000 should be more adequately serviced.

A few weeks ago members of the Australian Government Workers' Association with the Trades and Labor Council took a deputation to the Fire Brigades Board to discuss this question, but the deputation did not get far. I am informed that the deputation was told that a calculated risk was being taken at Elizabeth. I should not like to be a party to taking a calculated risk with the lives of 30,000 people. Those keenly interested in this subject believe that Elizabeth should be supplied with two fire fighting appliances and two permanent officers and six permanent men. The fire stations in Adelaide have been operating for many years without any expansion. The headquarters and other stations are able to back one another up readily. Although the metropolitan area has grown tremendously its fire fighting service has not grown proportionately. If the Prospect brigade were out at a fire, it could not back up those fighting a fire at Elizabeth and it would probably be difficult for the small Gawler brigade to be available at short notice. I urge that further consideration be given to providing more adequate fire protection at Elizabeth. I realize that this could involve increased payments, but the increased safety would more than offset that cost. I should have liked to

speak about other matters. I remind the Minister that we are still anxious to have Gawler sewered. I should have liked to say something about the necessity for Commonwealth aid for education, but probably there is no need for me to do so because, although I have been talking about this for years without receiving any support from members opposite, peculiarly enough some members opposite have now reached the conclusion that it is a good thing, and the Minister of Education has publicly supported it. I should have liked to speak on several of these matters, but at the moment, although the spirit is willing, the flesh, although not weak, is not up to it.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support the motion. Much has been said in this debate about the appointment of additional Ministers. I have listened with great interest to the points made by previous speakers on this matter, and at the outset I assure the House that I strongly favour the appointment of additional Ministers because I believe that, since the last alteration was made to the size of Cabinet in 1953, the work of the Government of this State has increased sufficiently to warrant additional appointments. If additional portfolios are created, surely there is also a need for more members of Parliament. I say this because the appointment of two members to Cabinet would mean that more members would be engaged in the executive side of Government and proportionately fewer would be free to inquire into the activities of the Executive. Further, if the work of the Government has increased sufficiently to warrant the appointment of extra Ministers (and it has), surely there must be a need for more members in this Parliament. This situation would be altered very little even if the electoral redistribution, which is under consideration at the moment, were approved—and this is not likely. That would mean at the outside an increase of only three members in this House. An interesting feature of the constitution of this Parliament is the high proportion of Ministers to members in another place and the high proportion of total Cabinet strength—three out of eight—in that Chamber. This proportion is the highest in Australia, as I have verified by gathering information about the proportion in other States. New South Wales has 14 Ministers in the Legislative Assembly and only two in the Legislative Council; Victoria has 10 in the Legislative Assembly and four in the Legislative Council; Queensland has 11 in the Legislative

Assembly, and, of course, there is no Upper House; Western Australia has eight in the Legislative Assembly and only two in the Legislative Council; and Tasmania has nine in the House of Assembly and none in the Legislative Council. As I understand it, the justification for an Upper House is that it should be basically a House of Review, and be complementary to, and not competitive with, the popularly elected House. But, Sir, it stands to reason that the greater the number of Ministers in another place the greater will be the temptation or tendency to introduce legislation in that Chamber and so make it a House of initiation rather than of review.

Mr. Lawn: Last session, 18 Bills were initiated there.

Mr. CORCORAN: That is an example. The appointment of any additional Minister (which would have to be authorized by an alteration to the Constitution) should therefore be made from members of this House if what I consider to be an undesirable ratio is to be rectified.

Last night the member for Semaphore referred to the need for a Minister of Housing in this Parliament, and I agree wholeheartedly with what he said. It has always concerned me that, although we as members of this House are at liberty to criticize the policy of the South Australian Housing Trust, we can play no part in formulating its policy. Section 14 of the South Australian Housing Trust Act provides:

All real and personal property of the Trust shall be held by the Trust for, and on behalf of, the Crown.

This means, in effect, that the assets of the trust belong to the people of this State. If this is the case, the elected representatives of the people should have some say in the policy of the trust. Also, I think it would be desirable to have a Minister in this House who would be answerable to Parliament on housing and could not evade any issue concerning housing simply because policy was not formulated by the Government.

Much has been said about the achievements of the Housing Trust since its inception in 1938, and I recognize those achievements, but it is still a fact that there is a five-year or six-year wait for rental accommodation in the metropolitan area; although it is much less in the country, there is still a delay. Therefore, much remains to be done before the housing situation in this State is corrected, and I believe the correction of this situation could be expedited by the appointment of a Minister of Housing.

As I indicated previously, the assets of the trust belong, in effect, to the people of this State. Since I have been elected to this House many constituents have come to me with complaints about defects in their rental accommodation. I admit that any case I have taken up with the trust has been attended to, but in one area in Millicent the back verandahs of about 70 houses have collapsed in a matter of two years due to faulty workmanship. The same has happened to about 30 front verandahs, and in the bathrooms of these houses, which have been erected for no more than two years, the surrounds of the baths have collapsed, and, in 20 cases, the baths have sunk.

Another matter that has concerned me is the insulation of ceilings in these houses. From the knowledge I have been able to gain, insulation was provided for in the specifications, but in over 70 cases either the insulation was not placed in the ceiling or it was piled in one corner. This, Sir, must indicate negligence. However, I want to be fair to the person who has been responsible in the main for the inspection of these houses prior to their being taken over from the contractor, and to say that I believe it has been physically impossible for him to give the necessary supervision whilst these houses have been in the course of construction because of the number that have been allocated to him and the fact that the area he has to cover makes it impossible for him to do the inspections effectively.

Nevertheless, this is a serious and undesirable feature, and I hope that as a result of my mentioning this in the House today some steps will be taken to rectify it in future. I am sure that I would be supported in this matter by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), whom I happen to know have had similar experiences in their own towns. I think they would agree with me in the main that the job the inspector has been given to do in these areas is beyond him. I sincerely hope that something can be done or that it will be brought to the notice of the authorities concerned so that this type of thing will not recur.

On Saturday last I happened to read the newspaper *Truth*, and together with the member for Semaphore again I was rather concerned about an article in that newspaper. The member for Semaphore asked a question of the Premier in this House today on the matter. The article to which I refer is headed "Doctors Warn On Drugs." This article concerned me, and whilst the Premier in his reply this afternoon said that he thought this matter

may have been a little far-fetched, I do not altogether agree with him. I was pleased to hear him say that there are stringent regulations in this State regarding the control of drugs. However—and I disagree with the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) in this instance—I advocate uniformity in the control of drugs throughout Australia. I am informed by a chemist friend of mine that there is a great variation in the control of drugs throughout Australia. I have discussed with this friend the article that appeared in *Truth*. A drug or sedative which is common to most of us is the tablet known as a Relaxa Tab, which I believe can be purchased by anyone from a chemist's shop. In fact, a 12-year old boy could enter a chemist's shop and purchase these tablets. I wish to quote from *The Extra Pharmacopoeia*, which I believe is a reputable reference; in fact, it has been accepted throughout the world for 75 years as a valuable source of information on medicinal and pharmaceutical substances, and the one I have here is an entirely new edition; it is the 24th edition, vol. 1, and it has been completely re-written and revised. I am told that a Relaxa Tab contains a drug called Carbromal, and I now wish to quote what this volume has to say on the toxic effects of Carbromal. The quantity of Carbromal contained in a Relaxa Tab, I am led to believe, is three grains, and it is interesting to note that the absolute safety limit for a dose of Carbromal is 15 grains. The book to which I refer states:

Carbromal is a relatively safe hypnotic, but doses greatly in excess of the therapeutic range may cause acute toxic symptoms similar to those described under Chloral Hydrate (p.370), and deaths have been recorded. Continuous use of Carbromal over long periods may give rise to symptoms of chronic toxicity, resembling bromism, including severe mental depression, irritability, slurring of speech, and skin eruptions. Reports of two deaths from 20 tablets (10g.) and 50 tablets (25g.). One patient was comatose for nearly a day after taking nine tablets. Carbromal is quite as dangerous as other stronger hypnotics, and among the cases of acute poisoning admitted to the psychiatric division of the Copenhagen Municipal Hospital in 1943 and 1946 it was the third commonest toxic agent, with a mortality of 6 per cent. Patients who did not die took two to three days to recover and passed through a period of confusion and motor restlessness. Chronic usage of six to 20 tablets a day leads to loss of energy and ability, irritability and depression.

I shall not quote further from this publication because I believe that I have made my point. So far as I can ascertain, Relaxa Tabs can be and are, in fact, a dangerous drug if used

indiscriminately. As I have stated, it is possible for a 12-year old, and probably an even younger child, to go into any chemist's shop in this State and obtain it. The maximum safety dosage is 15 grains, and there are three grains in each tablet. I am concerned generally about the control of dangerous drugs in this State. So far as I know, there is a system whereby chemists are required to record any transaction in drugs, and they keep books for this purpose. I am also led to believe that the Department of Health has inspectors who from time to time should visit these chemists' shops and should in fact check their books to see that everything is in order. However, I do not think that this has occurred in Millicent for some time. If this inspection is to be carried out, and if people are appointed to do this inspection, then I should like to bring it to the notice of the Minister of Health that this has not occurred for some time in Millicent, and I hope that he will do something about it.

I now wish to refer briefly to one problem that I have in my district at present. It concerns the extension of the reticulated water supply from Kingston to Kingston South. Since shortly after being elected to this House I have been dealing with the Minister of Works in this matter without success, and I take this opportunity to make a further appeal on behalf of the residents of Kingston South in order to try to get this most necessary service. The main reason the supply has not been extended is that it will necessitate the laying of 2,800ft. of mains. No doubt it would be a fairly expensive project, and the Minister has pointed out to me that it is not an economical proposition at this stage because development in this area does not warrant it. I remind the Minister, however, that already 30 houses have been built at Kingston South, two houses are being constructed at Wyomi Beach, a shop has been built there and a caravan park established. Although it may not appear that that is sufficient development to warrant this extension, I believe that it should be the policy of this Government to encourage development wherever possible. In addition to the houses that have been built, 26 blocks of land were bought in this area last Christmas. If the necessary services were extended to Kingston South many more people would buy blocks, and those that have bought them would build. In addition to a water supply, an electricity supply should be extended to this area. These utilities would be instrumental in speeding up the development of this area, and the Government would gain

great satisfaction from knowing that its policy had this effect.

Kingston relies to a large extent on the tourist trade. The people who have bought blocks are those who, living inland, come to Kingston in the summer at weekends and for holidays. I appeal to the Minister to reconsider what I believe to be a most important question in the development of Kingston. I intend to deal with other problems concerning my district in later debates.

I extend a hearty welcome to the members for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) and Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon). I congratulate them on their maiden speeches to which I listened with great interest and which I have since read. It is not so long ago since I made my maiden speech and I assure both new members that I had some anxious moments prior to delivering it. This is not the easiest of places in which to speak. I say this because the House includes such a wealth of knowledge and wisdom, with many members willing and ready to criticize constructively—I hope—what is said.

Mr. Millhouse: The criticism is always constructive.

The SPEAKER: You need a Relaxa Tab.

Mr. Frank Walsh: There are certain members I would recommend not to take them.

Mr. CORCORAN: True, but I do not use them. Another reason why it is so difficult to speak in this House is that everything one says is taken down and may be used against one in the future. I congratulate the members for Yorke Peninsula and Mount Gambier on their extremely constructive maiden speeches. I heard the member for Gouger, Mr. Hall, when referring to the member for Mount Gambier's maiden speech, say that if Mount Gambier received everything that the member was asking for, nothing would be left for the remainder of the State. The member for Mount Gambier, however, is well aware of the needs of his district, and I am sure that he does not think he will get everything this year, but he has spoken in this place and brought the matters to the attention of the various Ministers. I join with the member for Mitcham in congratulating the Minister of Lands on his promotion to Cabinet. Since he has been a Minister I have had many dealings with him regarding soldier settlement problems in Zone 5 in the South-East. Although I will not speak of those problems in this debate, I commend the Minister for his action in trying to rectify the anomalies, not only within Zone 5 but in comparison with

adjacent zones. When the committee he has appointed reports its findings to him, I understand that he will approach the Commonwealth Government and do his best for the settlers in the South-East. My thoughts and my best wishes will be with him because I hope that the situation there will be rectified and concessions granted.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I add my brief and modest contribution to this debate, which opening enables me to avoid saying that I support it. Normally I would have had no hesitation in supporting the motion, but it has become increasingly obvious over recent years that the Governor's Speech is degenerating into nothing more than a propaganda vehicle for the Government. That means also that the Governor himself is put into the humiliating position of having to read out purely Playford propaganda. However, before I proceed further, I add my tributes to those of other members to our former colleagues, the late Sir Cecil Hincks, Ron Ralston and Allan Hookings. The loss of friends in Parliament is always saddening because we are very close to each other here. I do not want to be lugubrious, but Sir Cecil Hincks was one of the most lovable members to enter this House, and he enjoyed the friendship of everyone. Mr. Ralston's untimely death was a blow to those on this side of the House, as no doubt it was to members on the other side. A rather tragic aspect of his death was that it happened just when he was entering into the most fruitful period of his career.

Allan Hookings was not a member of this House, but many of us were privileged to know him before he entered Parliament and were greatly impressed by his character. To members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee his death came as a great shock, because on the morning of the day of his death he accompanied them on a tour of inspection and was his usual genial self. The three members I have mentioned went out in harness, and I am sure that that is the way they would have liked it. I congratulate those members who have made their maiden speeches. We have all had to go through this experience, and we realize that one feels immeasurably better when it is over. The member for Yorke Peninsula wisely refrained from entering into controversial matters. He confined himself primarily to domestic affairs. His was a well-delivered speech. It is more pleasing for me to congratulate the member for Mount Gambier on his outstanding maiden speech. He revealed conclusively that

he will be an acquisition to this House in the true hard-hitting yet constructive tradition which, of course, is the general Labor tradition so envied and feared by members opposite.

Little can be said of the Governor's Speech. Only a minute proportion of it was devoted to the Government's legislative intentions. The remainder—about 90 per cent—was taken up, as has been the custom for the last nine or 10 years, with eulogizing the Government for its former actions, both real and imaginary. Of course, this amounts to no more and no less than self-praise, which we have been often told is no recommendation. Paragraph 18 of the Speech refers to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department and states that the work of this department has continued to increase. I certainly would not argue with that. However, I am obliged to say that my experience in taking up cases on behalf of my constituents with this department is that it reminds me more than any other department of the worst features of hard-hearted bureaucracy that we read about in the 19th Century. We can all appreciate that it must be an enormously difficult department to administer. No-one approaches that department in a happy frame of mind. A person must have some grievous sadness, so it must be difficult to administer the department happily. I believe that this is all the more reason why the department should be under the control of a sympathetic Minister of the Crown—and we must presume that they are all sympathetic, whether they are or not—who has sufficient discretion to enable him to deal with cases as human problems and not according to some rigid pre-ordained policy, which seems to be the present position, and which it is difficult to get explained adequately.

I believe that my pleasure in paragraph 20 of the Speech will be shared by the member for Mitcham. It promises an extension of prices legislation and authority to the Prices Commissioner to investigate improper trade practices and to curb undesirable activities connected with the sale of goods.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Are you striking an optimistic note?

Mr. JENNINGS: I have not had any denial.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to join me in opposing an extension of prices legislation?

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member cannot make any bargain with me.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought you might take the place of the Minister of Lands who always supported me before his appointment to Cabinet,

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think the honourable member and the Minister of Lands have been getting on too well lately. I shall have more to say about that later, and I think my comments will vary somewhat from what the member for Millicent said.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the member for Wallaroo?

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are out of order in anticipating debate.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think it can be truthfully said that never in the commercial history of this country have we seen a greater need for such legislation as is proposed in paragraph 20 of the Governor's Speech and never has the need been more obvious. Never before have we seen so many instances—as we have done in the last few years—of ordinary people being robbed of their life savings by unscrupulous racketeers, lying brochures and rigged financial statements. All of these crimes have been committed in the sacred name of private enterprise. Many of the cases we have read about recently were certainly committed by very private private enterprise—private enterprise in the best tradition of some of the most noble practitioners of this art, such as Ned Kelly and Captain Starlight. I am sorry if what I have said is offensive to their memory.

I think every member will agree that it is our obligation to do everything possible in this Parliament to protect innocent investors from the rapacity of big business and swindlers. I confidently expect the encouragement and active support of the member for Mitcham—that great social crusader.

Mr. Millhouse: Go on!

Mr. JENNINGS: Coming now to the member for Mitcham—

Mr. Millhouse: Good, I have been waiting for this.

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member will not have to wait any longer. I congratulate him on an outstanding contribution to this debate. Indeed, I have been astonished, I assure the House, that some Opposition members do not share my views in this regard.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't get stabbed in the back by the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. JENNINGS: I can only assume that my colleagues consider that just because the member for Mitcham has never been any good before, he always and inevitably must be uniformly bad. Surely that is completely illogical, because never in his long and illustrious history in this House has he ever impressed us by his consistency; so why expect him to be uniformly bad? Why can't he occasionally be good?

He certainly was good on this occasion. I particularly applaud him for his criticism of the Government in keeping Parliament out of session for so long—for more than half the year.

Mr. Millhouse: I think I mentioned you in this regard.

Mr. JENNINGS: For many years, as everyone will acknowledge, Opposition members have expressed similar criticisms. This Parliament is silent for more than half a year. Many matters that merit ventilation can pass into the limbo of forgotten things before we ever have a chance to mention them here. Consequently most of the time we have government by the Treasurer for, mostly, the aggrandizement of the Treasurer. In a political situation such as exists in South Australia, where an undemocratically elected Government has for far too long a period occupied the Treasury benches and become completely contemptuous of public opinion or of any opinion contrary to its or his own opinion, it is even more necessary to have Parliament meet more regularly and frequently than under normal circumstances, and by normal circumstances I mean that the Government should be more genuinely answerable to the electorate at large.

Mr. Bywaters: You ought to hear him on Wednesday nights.

Mr. JENNINGS: Exactly. Then we would not be so completely dependent for news about State affairs on the weekly telecast, which is as notable for gross inaccuracies and political stunting as for its insufferable boredom.

Mr. Loveday: We would be better off without the television.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, except that now we have the chance to turn the Premier off. If Parliament met more regularly it would permit sittings conforming more closely to normal working hours. It would enable members to keep up with their Parliamentary duties and provide an opportunity to give proper attention to the many public functions and district affairs that are an inescapable part of the work of a member of Parliament. It would also permit a much more effective study of legislation than is possible now. In the last few months of a session highly complex Bills are introduced, one on top of the other, without there being a real chance of a proper or sufficient scrutiny. Members would also be spared the unedifying spectacle, which we see in the dying hours of the session when the physical strain is so great, of some members even going to sleep.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Some never wake up.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. I hope that for the remainder of this Parliament the House will sit much more frequently and in more sensible hours. However, if this is not to be, it is certain that after the next State election a Labor Government will show much more respect for Parliament in this matter, and I am sure that once again we shall have the active support of the member for Mitcham. I was somewhat disappointed at the marring of a memorable speech by his saying that he was left to make the only constructive criticisms in this Parliament. It should be acknowledged that the constructive criticisms he has made have also come at some time or another from this side of the House, and more pointedly and effectively. We certainly raised more frequently the proposal for an increase in the size of Cabinet. That matter has frequently been advocated by members on this side and I believe that, if the size of the Cabinet were increased by one, that would be a 100 per cent increase! The honourable member for Mitcham forgot to mention that the present Cabinet, insufficient as it is in quantity and quality, has a higher percentage of the total members of Parliament than has any other Australian Cabinet. I was glad to hear the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) mention the matter in his speech. If we increase the size of Cabinet we shall undoubtedly have to increase the size of Parliament.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Did you say that the Parliament must be increased in size?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. An increase in the size of the Cabinet, being a Constitutional matter, would not be agreed to unless the size of the Parliament were also increased.

Mr. Hall: Tell us Labor Party policy?

Mr. JENNINGS: I advocate Labor Party policy effectively. I thought it was wise for the member for Mitcham not to offer nominations for the Cabinet, although implied throughout his speech was the suggestion that the member for Mitcham was eminently suitable. I think the honourable member must have been conscious, after looking around his own benches, of the complete absence of any talent, and so did not nominate anyone, because if he saw anyone worth while he would not have been so modest as to refrain from nominating him. I am confident that the criticism of the Cabinet by the honourable member was wholly bound up with his very ill-concealed resentment, echoed silently

by many members on that side, at the latest addition to Cabinet ranks. It is an open secret that many Liberal and Country League members of long standing, and with excellent opinions about their own ability, were shocked and bitter at being passed over for a member with a rather peculiar political history.

Mr. Millhouse: You can keep me out of that.

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member's remarks showed that we should count him in. We can certainly understand their frustration and jealousy. Surely if they are loyal supporters of the Government they must realize that the appointment of the present Minister of Lands was the price of his support of the present Government, and the means by which the Government retains office. I will not go into the question of the ages of the members of Cabinet which was raised by the honourable member for Mitcham. Ages are always comparative things anyway. I am sorry that I did not take more interest in the matter, for then I might have been able to understand the most peculiar proposal put forward by the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall).

Mr. Millhouse: Do you call it a proposal?

Mr. JENNINGS: It was something posed. I do not know really how to describe it. We have not much hope of getting new Ministers of 18 years of age.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you care to say something about the Labor Convention decision on the retiring ages of members?

The SPEAKER: I do not think members should prompt each other.

Mr. JENNINGS: That matter is completely irrelevant. The decision had nothing to do with the ages of Cabinet Ministers. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) has been consistent over the last few years in his advocacy of the building of large blocks of flats in near-suburban areas. I hope I have been consistent in my support of that advocacy. The housing position is still extremely grave and the erection of multi-storey flats is an excellent and quick way, and considering the presence of roads, sewers and water mains where the flats would be established, a relatively cheap way of housing many people who are suitable for this sort of accommodation and who desire it. We hear from the Premier that a start is to be made on the first of such blocks by the Housing Trust in the city of Adelaide. Apart altogether from the eternal mystery of the Premier's making these

public announcements on behalf of the Housing Trust, it is pleasing news and I sincerely hope that it will not be long before many more such buildings are arranged.

The housing position is still grave. To corroborate this I refer members to the annual report of the Housing Trust for the year ended June 30, 1962, which shows that in the last financial year 56 fewer houses were built than in the previous year; but the year just ended, at June 30, 1963, is even worse: there were 376 fewer houses built then than in the previous year, when 56 fewer houses were built than in the year before that. So our housing rate is declining while our population is increasing tremendously.

Mr. Bywaters: Just wait until next year and see what happens!

Mr. JENNINGS: It appears from these figures that the numbers are progressively declining. Taking these figures into consideration, it is not only a case of a progressive decline over the last few years in the number of houses built: we know that only 174 of the 2,479 temporary houses have been demolished, which means that about 2,200 extra families have been housed over the last two years in permanent houses, thereby depriving an equal number of families of being housed for the first time by the Housing Trust. In case members think I am singling out only the Housing Trust figures, let me immediately disabuse their minds. The summary of South Australian statistics shows clearly that the total number of houses completed in the State has been progressively declining for each of the last three years—up to June 30, 1962. I could not get the figures for the year ended June 30, 1963, but for the three previous years the total number of houses built in South Australia progressively declined.

It is also perturbing to reflect that so many houses completed in recent years have clearly shown a very inferior workmanship, with consequent severe loss to purchasers. I hasten to assure the House that I am not depending for my authority for that statement on that most remarkable file given to honourable members yesterday; I certainly would not depend on that source. On the contrary, only recently at the request of many of my constituents, I inspected their homes purchased from the Housing Trust, and this left not the slightest doubt in my mind (as I have, unfortunately, found many times before, anyway) that the standard of work in Housing Trust construction is not

all that could be desired. This is extremely disappointing when it comes from a semi-government authority. Admittedly, private contractors build all the Housing Trust houses but it is apparent that something is radically lacking in the Housing Trust system of inspection. I know, of course, from experience that, if enough pressure is brought to bear on the Housing Trust in cases like this and the case is a good one, the trust will eventually repair the damage as well as it can. However, in the meantime much inconvenience is caused to purchasers, and we must remember that considerable unnecessary expense has been caused by the trust, which further limits its building capacity.

It certainly does not apply to private speculative builders—it is a different story there. Unsuspecting people buying houses from private speculative builders have little chance of ever having their houses repaired. Only recently in this House we had apparently genuine complaints in this respect from the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who is an apostle of private enterprise, and he would not be running down private builders unless the case was genuine. I have not the slightest doubt that it is. This shows that undoubtedly there is a case for much stricter control of private builders by the Government. How it can be done I do not know—perhaps by registration or some other system that may be devised. However, they certainly need proper and adequate supervision.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: A system of guarantees?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would you nationalize all house building?

Mr. JENNINGS: No; I would not recommend anything quite as drastic as that. I am thankful to be able to report that my electorate is nowadays fairly adequately catered for in its overall school requirements, although some of the schools built in the "wooden box" era we should like to see gradually replaced by more fitting accommodation. Since the session began I have asked questions about the future of the Islington sewage farm and the Gepps Cross hostel. I eagerly expect to receive the promised reports on these two matters at an early date and look forward to an interesting and enlightening session.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I first join with other members in their expressions of sympathy to the relatives of those members who have passed away recently. No-one could have expressed it better

than the member who has just resumed his seat. I endorse his comments in that direction. I particularly congratulate the members for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) and Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon), both of whom made excellent contributions to the debate. As has been said earlier, that sort of speech is difficult to make. I appreciated their speeches and feel we shall have further excellent contributions from them while they are members of this House.

I listened to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) with mixed feelings. Sometimes I felt I was quite with him, and at other times I felt much against his arguments. However, I was in complete accord with him when he described His Excellency's Speech, prepared by Cabinet, as a tepid document remarkable more for what it omitted than for the matters it raised. I agree with him completely in that stricture. In fact, I found the Speech a rather smug and self-complacent document not touching on many things I felt it should have touched on, and particularly matters of great importance concerning this State and the Commonwealth Government. Instead of its being a propaganda recital of the past performances of the Government, it should at least pay some attention to current and difficult problems needing the attention of this House. The member for Mitcham was concerned that His Excellency's Speech contained no reference to the development plan for Adelaide or to fluoridation. He voiced the opinion that some plan is better than none at all. Once again, I was with him. All his remarks about what he thought should have been in His Excellency's Speech were on matters where there had been no planning. We are now seeing the results of lack of attention to matters where there should have been planning over the years. I thought his remarks about fluoridation could have been applied in a different direction. He said he did not know whether the Premier, not having had young children in the house for so long, had forgotten how difficult it was to try to give young children pills. He was referring, of course, to the suggestion that it would be better to give each child a pill than to doctor the water for fluoridation. After listening to the honourable member's criticisms and strictures of the Premier and Cabinet, I thought that possibly the Premier had found it increasingly difficult to give the necessary knock-out pills to his young children on the back benches.

I was disappointed about the analysis of the age of Cabinet made by the member for

Mitcham. We could expect a good analysis from a lawyer, not just a bald statement viewed from what I would describe as the chronological angle, which is only one of many facets of age. I am reminded of the story of the little boy who, when having some school tests on the question of his age, said that it had been found that his psychological age was 11, his moral age was 10, anatomically he was seven, mentally he was nine, and chronologically he was eight. I suggest to the member for Mitcham that when he examines the age of Cabinet again he does it from all those angles.

Mr. Dunstan: In that case, their moral age would be zero.

Mr. LOVEDAY: It would produce some interesting results. He might even find on his premises that the average age of Cabinet was really satisfactory. I am reminded that Bernard Shaw once said, "Youth is a wonderful thing, and it is a crime to waste it on children." I should like to pursue another angle of the speech of the member for Mitcham that I thought was most revealing. He said that during the last few years there had been a fantastic passion amongst our Ministers for uniformity of legislation between the various States. He referred to the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act and the Companies Act, and pointed out that the uniform Business Names Bill was about to be restored to the Notice Paper. He said:

We have had this fantastic desire for uniformity. It is a desire which can never be fulfilled because of the idiosyncrasies and quirks of members of the various State Parliaments involved.

Mr. Jennings: He is bringing him in again!

Mr. LOVEDAY: I was amazed that there were "quirks" in other State Parliaments; I thought ours was unique. However, apparently there are others. Actually, of course, the member for Mitcham is worried by the march of events; he is worried by the fact that the general public desires to get rid of all the inconveniences, loss of time and unnecessary expense that have occurred in the past through the differences in the laws of the different States. He sees that the general public wants uniformity in matters where there should be uniformity, so he is worried that the importance of State Parliaments is disappearing. However, although this Parliament may be losing in this direction, it is gaining in another direction, as it is taking over from local government, either directly or indirectly, many of the powers it has had. When local government wants to do something, it now finds

that the State Government has laid down more than one particular rule about the particular matter, which it has to abide by. This means that local government expenditure is determined in many ways by the State Government.

I do not regret that we are getting more uniformity of legislation. I think it is a good thing and that we should be happy about it; in fact, the presence of so much different legislation in the States has been a source of terrific expense, great inconvenience and great uncertainty. These things should be dealt with.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You probably do not approve of State Parliaments with differences in policy.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Minister should not put words into my mouth. I suppose many things would be better if there were greater uniformity of policy. After all, there is nothing wrong with uniformity of policy where one nation is concerned; surely that is axiomatic. I have yet to hear anyone who can defend the lack of uniformity in these simple things in our lives. During this debate, members have referred to several matters which, if carried into effect, would bring in their train great expenditure. When the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) was speaking, the Minister of Lands said that the things he had mentioned would cost about £250,000,000. Whether that is correct or not, there is not the slightest doubt that during this debate members will bring forward many things which, if carried into effect, will entail great expenditure.

Mr. Hutchens: I looked at this later and found the figure was from the imagination of the Minister rather than fact.

Mr. LOVEDAY: It seemed a fantastic sum that must have been taken out of the air, and nobody on the spur of the moment could say whether it was right or wrong. I have heard nothing extravagant in this debate in what members thought should be done in the State or in their districts. Greatly increased sums have been spent on education, but greatly increased expenditure is needed. On every hand, there has been a demand for increasing Commonwealth assistance. Suggestions have been made this week (in fact, in yesterday's *News*) that in the next Commonwealth Budget one of the main features will be a reduction of income tax to all taxpayers of 1s. in the pound. That, I think, is a most unnecessary cut that should never be made when this country is at such a stage of development that much more should

be done in the States to accomplish things such as those which have been mentioned in this debate.

Mr. Hutchens: Don't you realize that the slogan will be "A bob to vote for Bob"?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I appreciate that. If this cut is made, it will be a special benefit to a select few in the community; it certainly will not help the small people at all. A rebate of five per cent on taxation is now allowed, and that is of benefit mainly to the well-to-do; it is of little benefit to those in the lower income bracket. The suggested cut is in the same category. I was interested to see in the *Financial Review* of Thursday, July 25, a leader under the heading "Of Cabbages and Kings". This leader analysed the situation if the Commonwealth Government extended the existing 5 per cent rebate of tax to 10 per cent, and the analysis was quite revealing. After going through a complete list of all the various groups with their various incomes, the article went on to say:

Now adding up the total of increase in disposable income as a result of our hypothetical example, we find that the total increase would amount to about £33,000,000.

That is £33,000,000 extra in taxpayers' pockets, of course. It continued:

Of this £33,000,000, about £12,000,000, or almost 40 per cent of the total, would accrue to people earning more than £2,000 a year, and who represent less than 8 per cent of all taxpayers. Such rebates are clearly of benefit mainly to the very small fringe of well-to-do people in the community and of little benefit to the great mass of taxpayers.

The same criticism should be offered regarding the suggested cut of one shilling in the pound. This, at a time when so many things are needed not only in this State but throughout the Commonwealth, I regard as quite unnecessary and reprehensible.

I appreciated very much the remarks of the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) on the question of apprenticeship. I could endorse virtually everything he said on that matter. There is not the slightest doubt that here again we have evidence of the Government's failure to plan. Shortages of apprentices exist in the building, metal and electrical trades in particular, and the recruiting of apprentices has remained steady or fallen off in some States during several years past. It may be that it has fallen off in all States, but I have not the available information; it certainly has fallen off here. Many employers have failed to employ the number of apprentices to which they are entitled under award conditions, and some have been quite content

to take the chance of getting tradesmen from the firms that have a proper apprentice training scheme.

The position in the building trade is particularly bad, and the sub-contracting arrangements entered into through the Housing Trust's building programme are a particularly bad example of this. Under these sub-contracting arrangements I would think that very few apprentices indeed work in the building trade. In fact, the effect is to employ a very large number of unskilled people to do what is supposed to be skilled work. This not only leads to very bad workmanship but of necessity means that sufficient apprentices are not forthcoming in the building trade. Another important aspect of this matter is the lack of proper and sufficiently diversified training for apprentices in many workshops, to which I have referred before. This aspect has been particularly noticeable in the motor repair industry.

The member for Torrens pointed out that South Australia compared very badly with other States in respect of the supply of apprentices. He pointed out that the demand for tradesmen exceeded that in other States; in other words, we are very short indeed. There is not the slightest doubt that this particular matter requires far more attention even than has been given as a result of the recent Commonwealth conference regarding altering the provisions by which certain lads can obtain apprenticeship. We must realize that anything that is done now will necessitate quite a long period before the results can be properly felt in industry. Even with those lads that are able to take advantage of the new arrangements, it will be four years before they can go into industry as tradesmen.

I have heard during this debate the usual references to primary products being our main export, and the suggestion that we should not forget that fact when we are considering wages and hours of tradesmen. However, I point out that the future of primary industry is entirely bound up with the future of secondary industry, particularly in the sale of its products. If we are to get tradesmen from overseas we must give them at least comparable conditions with those that they are able to get in their own countries; in fact, I would say that we have to give them better conditions. No man with an established home, with friends and family and all the associations of his life in, say, Great Britain or anywhere else in Europe, will come out here unless he thinks he will get some advantage. Of course, he may come out purely for the sake of the future of

his children, but that is not the only aspect: he wants to be assured that his wages and conditions will be at least as good. That point must be remembered in considering the effect on primary industry of wages and conditions in secondary industry. Furthermore, the whole development of Australia is bound up in the main with the tremendous development of secondary industry. The number of people that we can employ in primary industry in the future must, of necessity, be quite limited, so the two things are completely interdependent in this respect. The adequate supply of tradesmen is a most vital matter in the future development of this country. As I remarked by interjection when the member for Torrens was speaking, a better supply of apprentices is the only means by which we shall get more technicians and technologists, and these will be needed in increasing numbers in view of technical developments in industry. There should be more scholarships in these fields of education and definite planning at Commonwealth and State levels to ensure the increases required.

I should like to turn now to a few more points on education. One can say that the question of apprenticeship is one of education, but I wish to deal with more specific points. The increase of fees has been referred to, and I consider that this increase can be described only as a very retrograde step. I refer, of course, to the raising of fees for students sitting this year at the public examinations and also to the raising of adult education fees. The increased fees for the public examinations will be a particularly heavy burden on all parents in the lower income brackets whose children have to sit for those examinations. Of the parents in this category, those in the country in many instances are hit most heavily. Only one-sixth of the country children in Australia have the chance that their urban counterparts have of getting to a university, and therefore those increased fees for public examinations constitute an added barrier to the country child in particular getting to the stage of tertiary education.

I point out, too, in this regard that the number of Commonwealth scholarships introduced by the Chifley Government has failed to keep pace with the number of students of sufficient calibre who should be able to benefit from them. The reaction to the rise in fees for adult education classes is most interesting. Other members have referred to this matter in their speeches. The increased fees in Whyalla should have come into operation during the first term

of 1963, but no advice was received at the Whyalla Technical High School and the Minister agreed to waive the increase for the first term. However, in the second and third terms the effect of the increased fees can be seen. In 1963, at Whyalla, the first term enrolments were 348 in classes for which fees were charged; but in the second term they dropped to 174. Figures are not available yet for the third term. In 1962, however, the third term figure was 199, showing that from 1962 to 1963 an increased number of people were interested in adult education. With the increase in fees, the number of enrolments was reduced by about one-half. Other centres experienced the decline in the first term of this year because they were informed earlier. A verbal report regarding Port Augusta indicated a decrease of about 40 per cent on last year's enrolments. As a result of the increased fees in Whyalla, two out of four dressmaking classes were closed as well as the art classes, and the German, French, and Intermediate mathematics classes. These figures do not include English classes for migrants for which no fee is charged. These classes started this year at Whyalla Technical High School and are assisting migrants.

Four classes operate at present and the number will be increased to five, with the prospect of another four starting with the arrival of Transfield Company's employees who are mainly migrants. This company has the contract for the Electricity Trust's powerline between Whyalla and Port Augusta. Prior to this Mrs. K. Bennett, the wife of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's General Manager at Whyalla, and Mr. Durdin, a teacher in the Education Department, both did excellent work in teaching English to migrant classes. It is a sorry state of affairs that fees should have increased in this manner, because education should be a continuing thing, and we should not be at the stage today of increasing fees; rather should we be making education easier to obtain, not only for students of all ages but for adults. Many adults appreciate the opportunity of being able to go to these adult classes.

Mr. Clark: They go because they really want to.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Exactly, and most of the people attending are the ones who have not the financial means to pay the increased fees. I have asked that the building of another technical high school in Whyalla receive urgent attention. I emphasize this because of the tremendous development that has taken place

in Whyalla, the great increase in population over a short time, and the future prospect of similar increases. Obviously another technical high school is urgently required. At present 830 students are in the secondary section and the anticipated enrolment in February, 1964, is 950. Because of the rapid expansion of the school, the grounds are filled with portable huts that are used for the secondary, apprentices and diploma sections. I stress the advantage of this type of school over the purely high school type. Here, boys and girls attend all phases of education, either in the academic, or the technical subjects. They can choose, or in many cases they can be diverted into the subject stream that is most suitable for their abilities. In addition, this school handles adult classes, the apprentices and the diploma section. I am not suggesting that apprentices should be taught at such a school, but I emphasize that this is the type of school that is much superior to that where the high school and technical school are segregated. This desirable combination of the two has produced excellent results at Whyalla.

A remark by the member for Burnside regarding the question of the retiring age for women reminded me of a current feature of the Education Department which, I think is particularly pettifogging. I have noticed that when women teachers reach the age of 60 and the department allows them to continue after that age, they compulsorily have to be absent from school for a period sufficient to break their continuity of service. That means that their accumulated sick leave and other benefits are lost.

Mr. Clark: That is just plain silly.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Nothing could be more pettifogging than this sort of administration, and its effect on the attitude of teachers must far outweigh any financial benefit the department may gain from this ridiculous rule.

Mr. Clark: Many are teachers who have served the department for over 40 years.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Precisely, and they are teachers who, in their efforts to keep the class going, have not absented themselves from school when they should have been at home because of sickness. This is a particularly bad defect in the Education Department's administration that should be rectified. Two or more speakers in this debate have stressed the need for a Minister of Housing and I add my voice to theirs. I am satisfied after watching the operations of the Housing Trust in Whyalla (and they have been the most extensive operations of the Housing Trust outside the

metropolitan area) that a Minister of Housing is most desirable. In anything I say about the Housing Trust, I make it plain that I have had the utmost co-operation and courteous attention from all its officers. None of them could have done more for me in my approaches to them than they have already done, and they have been most helpful. I consider that the policy of the Housing Trust is not all that it could be and that this Parliament, through a Minister, should have more control of the Housing Trust's policy. The Housing Trust's report for the quarter ended July 1, 1963, which has just been issued, states that the trust has recently placed contracts for the erection of 550 houses to be constructed in the metropolitan area under its sales scheme. Concerning designs, the report states:

The new designs range in size from about 11½ to 17½ squares and will give a range of types and sale prices to suit most purchasers. I suggest that that sentence should have concluded with the words "to suit purchasers in the upper middle and higher income brackets". The Housing Trust was constituted to provide houses for needy people. The proposed type of house will be purchased by well-to-do people. We have often suggested that the double unit and single unit houses constructed by the trust could well be improved, but the Premier's answer has been that if they were the trust's finances would be restricted and fewer houses would be constructed. Now, however, we find that 550 houses are to be erected not for people in need but for those who are well-to-do. The design will be greatly different from the design of the houses that we have suggested should have been improved. No-one will suggest that the double units are particularly beautiful. These units served a useful function, but there was much room for improvement. This has been recognized because the trust is abandoning its policy of building double unit houses and is concentrating on single units. Parliament should have control over departures from established policy. If this matter had been brought to Parliament, I am sure it would not have agreed to the erection of these proposed houses in view of the existing shortage of houses for people who most need them.

It was reported in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday, March 14, that the Premier had attended the first South Australian Grocers' Convention in Adelaide. The report states that the Premier said that he had never been one to advocate cut-throat competition, and that whilst this sort of competition might

give some temporary advantage to the buyer it would always eliminate some of the service to the consumer. That happens with the Housing Trust's building operations, which have been conducted along the lines of cut-throat competition between contractors and subcontractors. It is virtually impossible for some well-established builders, who build economically and who employ tradesmen on proper award rates, to compete for the trust's contracts.

Mr. Shannon: Do any of the contractors employ labour at less than award rates?

Mr. LOVEDAY: That is particularly difficult to ascertain. As the law stands, it is virtually impossible to find out whether award rates are being paid, because it cannot be established whether the subcontractors are really employees.

Mr. Shannon: It would not be fair to make charges unless you were sure of your facts.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I have gone fully into this matter. The Department of Labour and Industry finds it almost impossible to police award conditions where a Housing Trust subcontractor is operating. This policy has led to a shortage of apprentices in the building trade. It has had the effect of introducing poor workmanship, and I am informed it has also driven well-established builders from country towns because they have not been able to secure work in the area. It is deplorable that this should be a condition under which the Housing Trust operates. The Premier's statement to the Grocers' Convention indicates that while he says he does not believe in cut-throat competition, such competition for Housing Trust contracts has official approval. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to this topic frequently, but no notice has been taken of his statements. Recently I complained to the trust about its building operations at Whyalla. The General Manager visited Whyalla with his architect and with other officers to make an inspection. In several instances work was certainly within the provisions of the Building Act, but only just within the provisions. When I pointed out several things that the contractor was not doing properly—according to building tradesmen—I was told, "Oh, well, those things will be altered before the house is finished." It should not be necessary to alter those things before a house is finished. This must only lead to increased costs. Obviously some men engaged on the job are not competent. In Whyalla four houses were so badly cracked that the trust cancelled the contracts to purchase. The intending purchasers were given the option of

occupying other houses or of continuing in these houses as tenants at the full economic rent of £5 a week. The General Manager was not prepared to agree, because of the condition of these houses, to a rent reduction. These people are still subjected to great inconvenience because of the bad cracks and because some of the doors will not shut. The trust has agreed to completely refurbish and to redecorate other badly cracked houses after they have settled. It has been argued that this has happened in many places and that the soil has caused the trouble. The trust has a soil testing section, so I find it difficult to understand why the foundations in the poor soil appear to be the same as the foundations in good soil. In view of what I have said, I believe that the appointment of a Minister of Housing is warranted. I have had courtesy and helpful attention from the trust in all matters, and I have nothing against the trust's officers, but this House should have some control over the trust's policy.

I have previously said that I regard the Western Australian Housing Commission as having obtained best results from house building. Last year I suggested that our Housing Trust might adopt the Western Australian procedures, but arguments were advanced for its not doing so. If we wanted to adopt those procedures, we could. I see no real barrier to doing some of the things that I suggested should be done. I point out that in Western Australia no double units are built. They build only single unit houses, which can be rented or purchased. The price is lower than for a comparable house in South Australia. The finish is excellent in all respects. The variety of design is excellent, and so is the siting of the houses. In fact, it is a splendid job. There is no reason why we should not do the same here. I will not have the propaganda that our methods cannot be improved. Recently I wrote to the State Housing Commission in Western Australia about its methods of supervision, and there is one point I want to raise because it is important. In the reply I was told:

It is the commission's policy to appoint to its supervision staff only those who are registered builders under the Western Australian Builders Registration Act.

I understand that we have no such Act here.

Mr. Frank Walsh: That is correct.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The letter continued:

... and they gain this registration either as a result of years of experience or alternatively by examinations set by the Perth Technical College. You will appreciate, therefore,

that a building supervisor, grade 1, has a level of knowledge and experience at least equal to that of the building contractor or the managers of the construction firms. Therefore, the number of homes that he will be expected to supervise will depend upon the proximity of the houses, the degree of efficiency and co-operation of the construction firms or the individual contractors, and the type of construction being undertaken.

That is something we could copy in South Australia. As to the comparative costs of houses, the Housing Commission supplied a schedule showing the costs, rents and repayments of houses under construction. The costs do not include the cost of the land, which the commission says ranges in the metropolitan area from £300 to £450 per allotment, fully cleared and developed, with roads, power, water, and sewerage, where that is available. In country areas the range is from about £60 per developed block with roads, power, water and sewerage, to £400 per allotment in the larger country centres, such as Bunbury.

Mr. Nankivell: How do they acquire the land in Western Australia?

Mr. LOVEDAY: By purchase. There may be some deviation from that, but I am not aware of it. I was told that in the metropolitan area the total cost, including fees, of a three-bedroom brick veneer house was £2,665 minimum and £2,935 maximum. The economic rent charged ranged from £4 to £4 6s. The deposit was from £100 to £185 and the weekly repayments were from £3 11s. 6d. to £3 16s. The cost, including fees, of a three-bedroom timber-frame house in a country area was £2,560 minimum and £3,100 maximum. The economic rent charged was from £3 18s. to £4 7s., and the minimum deposit from £100 to £350. The weekly repayments were from £3 8s. 1d. to £3 13s. 9d. The purchase loans are repaid by monthly instalments over 45 years. I suggest that there is still room for improvement in this direction in South Australia and that, if we had a Minister of Housing, Parliament would have some say in what was done about this important matter.

I want to make a passing reference to the suggestion that there be another attempt at the land speed record by the Bluebird. Earlier this session I asked the Premier a question on this matter, and he assured me that it was not intended to spend more money on such an attempt. I hope this will be remembered if another attempt is made in South Australia. The sum of £14,000 was spent on the project, but I think it could have been far better spent on outback roads in my electorate, for

example, by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I pointed out that the roads in the area where the attempt by the Bluebird was to be made seldom had other than a grader over them more than once in two years. Previously the Premier said the roads received only normal grading through the assistance to the project. Actually the graders in the area, and outback areas generally, seldom go over the tracks. Possibly it is only once in two years. The department has said that in recent years it has had less money for the grading of these outback tracks than previously, despite the fact that the tracks are used more than ever before. Why should this sort of project be assisted by the State? The sponsors are firms with tremendous wealth, running into many millions of pounds. An expenditure of £14,000 would be of little consequence to them, whereas to the State an expenditure of £14,000 would be a valuable amount, if spent in areas of this sort. It is questionable whether any information of real value to motorists or the general public can be obtained from such a speed attempt. Most of the motor vehicles on the roads have more power than can be used with safety. These projects are advertisements for oil and tyre companies, and I see no reason why the taxpayers should be called upon to assist in advertising the companies. I hope that no more money will be spent in that way.

A few days ago the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) asked a question about the Eyre Peninsula water supply. He wanted to know whether, in view of the additional supplies of water available at Polda, certain areas needing supplies could receive attention. The Pildappa supply has been mentioned in this House since 1956 when I first came here, but prior to that it was a matter discussed by the Government and the settlers. Actually, there have been a number of suggestions about improving the supply. One was that a 500,000-gallon tank be set up in the area. Another was that a 20,000-gallon concrete tank should be erected adjacent to the Tod trunk main, with the water being pumped by windmill through a small-diameter pipe to Pildappa. Another was that a 1½-in.-diameter pipe connecting the Tod main be used only when the Pildappa tank became empty. It was pointed out that the distance of the pipeline to the Pildappa tank would be about four miles. I should like the Minister to have another look at the matter, because of the additional supplies at Polda. He said they had not been proved, but if they are proved to be sufficient I

suggest further attention be given to the proposal. I hope it will receive the attention it deserves.

The Whyalla City Commission has noticed that there is a need at Whyalla for a home help service. Upon inquiry it was found that in Victoria there was an excellent home help service. The Victorian Department of Health states:

The Home Help Service provides for help to expectant or nursing mothers or to families where there are young children and the mother is temporarily incapacitated from attending to household duties owing to illness. It also provides help to the aged and infirm whose requirements are not so much medical as supervision and help, and to assist other necessitous cases requiring help in the home.

The statement continues later:

Any municipality which establishes, maintains, or financially assists a Home Help Service shall be paid a subsidy on the basis of four-fifths of the net cost of the service to the municipality to the wage ceilings as set out hereunder (excluding administration). In addition, a subsidy at the rate of £50 per annum shall be paid towards administrative costs.

The statement further on reads:

The administration subsidy of £50 per annum is intended to cover a clerk's time in preparation of salaries and administration of the service and items such as stamps, stationery, etc.

Further to that statement, the City of Preston was good enough to give its experience in running this kind of service. I think it is of particular interest to people in South Australia where this service does not exist.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh yes it does; it is run by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department.

Mr. LOVEDAY: But not along these lines.

Mr. Millhouse: Exactly along these lines.

Mr. LOVEDAY: With a four-fifths Government help to the body concerned?

Mr. Millhouse: What do you mean by that?

Mr. LOVEDAY: It is a four-fifths Government financial help to local government bodies.

Mr. Millhouse: It is not to local government.

Mr. LOVEDAY: This is a totally different sort of service.

Mr. Millhouse: It gives exactly the same sort of service.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Perhaps the honourable member did not catch what I said earlier.

Mr. Millhouse: What did you say earlier?

The SPEAKER: This is not a private conversation between the two honourable members. The honourable member for Whyalla!

Mr. LOVEDAY: The sort of service I am referring to is one in which the State Government pays four-fifths of the net cost of the service to a municipality, and in the municipality of Whyalla, as far as I am aware, no such service can be obtained.

Mr. Millhouse: But that service is obtainable in country areas and country towns.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I stand to be corrected and shall be pleased to know of it.

The SPEAKER: A question on notice should be directed on this.

Mr. Millhouse: Miss McKinlay of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department runs it.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I thank the member for Mitcham for correcting me on this.

Mr. Millhouse: What I have said is correct.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Inquiries had led the City Commission to think that there was no such service in South Australia, and that is why it made these inquiries.

Mr. Millhouse: I can tell the honourable member that I have had the benefit of it.

Mr. LOVEDAY: For example, the City of Preston for the year ended September 30, 1962, received £16,900 from the Victorian Government as a subsidy, and £4,812 was paid by the people receiving the service, leaving a net cost to the council of £4,767. I shall be delighted if we discover that a similar service can be supplied to the City of Whyalla.

Mr. Millhouse: I am sure the honourable member will find that it can.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I will not pursue that question in view of the honourable member's remarks. I hope to have some good news as a result of my question, which will undoubtedly come.

Mr. Millhouse: I can vouch for the excellence of the service, too. It is really outstanding.

Mr. LOVEDAY: A matter has recently been brought to my attention regarding the question of the registration of fleets of motor vehicles as one fleet. I know that this cannot be done in South Australia. Many owners of fleets of motor vehicles in South Australia are, I am sure, interested in the question of getting their fleets of motor vehicles registered as a fleet. In the case of one approach that was made to the Motor Vehicles Department, the Registrar informed the company concerned that he regretted that it was not practicable to accede to its request. The letter from the Motor Vehicles Department reads, further on:

It would not be practicable at present to alter our procedure to provide for common expiry dates without interruption to the work flow. Furthermore, it would be necessary to provide for odd registration periods to bring registration of new vehicles into line with existing ones. Legislation does not allow for this, and additional work and cost to this department would be involved. The problem would not be severe where only one or two fleet owners were involved, but in view of the large numbers of fleet owners, it would be difficult to arrange common expiry dates to suit everyone without creating difficulties.

Upon inquiry in New South Wales and Victoria, I found that the Victorian Motor Car Act, 1959, permitted the registration, on this basis, of any owner of five or more motor cars, and full provision was made for this to be done. I do not need to elaborate on the details of the applicable section of that Act.

I had a letter also from the Commissioner of the Department of Motor Transport in New South Wales, who informed me as follows:

With reference to your letter of June 11 there are about 1,000 fleet owners in New South Wales whose vehicles are registered on the basis of a common expiry date. Provision for the registration of vehicles for broken periods is contained in the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act . . . The system of registering fleets to a common expiry date has been operative in this State for over 30 years. The department exercises the option of declining to accept the expiry date suggested by the fleet owner and offering an expiry date more suitable to the department as an alternative. The reason for this is that there is always an inclination on the part of the operators to desire registrations to expire at the end of their financial years, and acceptance of their proposals would cause an imbalance in the density of registrations renewable at particularly awkward periods such as June 30, December 31, etc. It suits the department administratively to spread "common expiry date" registrations so that the first and last dates for each month of the year are used for the majority of these.

Obviously, despite the letter from the Motor Vehicles Department in South Australia, this system is operating successfully in New South Wales and Victoria, and in the case of New South Wales it has been operating for over 30 years. A common expiry date for the owner of a large fleet of motor vehicles is obviously a matter of great convenience. When put into operation, after the initial difficulties in the Motor Vehicles Department, it must of necessity also be of great advantage to the department itself, because the whole fleet of one owner would then go through in one batch. I can see no reason whatever why this system should not obtain in this State. I hope that the Minister responsible will give this matter

his closest attention (I can supply the necessary correspondence) with a view to introducing this method as soon as possible.

I will conclude by mentioning something that occurred in the recent Grey by-election: I raise it here because, for reasons that are apparent, it has received no publicity. During the election campaign, a Liberal and Country League pamphlet was distributed in Woomera containing these words:

L.C.L. Government means the further development of Woomera—not its gradual liquidation and consequent weakening of our defence.

This matter is of considerable importance in my district, and the suggestions contained in the pamphlet show considerable irresponsibility. Anyone reading this would think that, if the Commonwealth Liberal Government were defeated, Woomera would go out of existence.

Mr. Millhouse: That would be its likely fate, too.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I thank the honourable member; he agrees with the pamphlet.

Mr. Millhouse: Most people do.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The honourable member is badly informed on this matter. Obviously, Woomera could be closed down only by the Commonwealth Government, and the suggestion that if there was a change of Government it would be liquidated and our defence would be weakened could easily deter skilled people from going there to work. It might also cause skilled people already at Woomera to pack up their traps and go because of the uncertainty of the future. This is why I said this was a most irresponsible statement by the L.C.L.

Mr. Millhouse: My Party's statement was made while the Labor Party was in travail.

Mr. LOVEDAY: In company with Mr. C. Jones (member of the House of Representatives) I visited Woomera during the campaign, and we addressed a public meeting at which we gave a written statement from the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament on this point; however, it received no publicity. The statement made in a letter from the Hon. Arthur Calwell, Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament, is as follows:

The Woomera range was established by the Chifley Labor Government for the purpose of assisting, by mutual co-operation and joint action, the people of Britain and their defence. As its founder, Labor is justifiably proud of the record of achievement of the station. Woomera not only has its great value as a defence establishment but is making a contribution to the solution of the problems of peace by extending man's knowledge of and control over his

environment. The next Labor Government will fully maintain the work of Woomera. We will guarantee that the capital investment placed there and the skills and experience built up will never be lost to the nation.

I hope this will at last reach the press, because it is most important that the people at Woomera should not be under the impression that, if there is a change in the Commonwealth Government, their employment will be jeopardized, and that any person with skill who intends to go to Woomera should not be deterred by suggestions of this nature. This, of course, is just the sort of thing we always experience in a campaign; it is a thinly veiled smear on the Labor Party in relation to its defence policy that has no justification in fact or in any other way. I am pleased to have an opportunity to raise the matter, which I hope will receive the publicity it deserves. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

[Sitting suspended from 5.55 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply I wish emphatically to deny the rumour that circulated around the House during the adjournment that the member for Port Adelaide was suffering from a severe bout of laryngitis. That is not true. It has always been said that a member is elected to represent constituents in Parliament so that he can be heard, and I think I would be a good example of the true representation of a district, for no-one can claim that I cannot be heard on any occasion, whether inside the House or outside.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: But you are not supposed to speak to your constituents from Parliament House!

Mr. RYAN: That is true. On some occasions, of course, some constituents say they would dearly love to hear their members speak, and they could be referring to a number of members in this House. I maintain that if a person is provided with certain natural attributes he should use them. As a matter of fact, I use mine on Saturdays.

Regarding the Governor's Speech, I entirely agree with the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) on this occasion that the Speech clearly exposed the Government for what it had not done in the past or promised to do in the future. I would say that 90 per cent of it refers to what the Government may have done in the past, and none of that is nation-rocking. It is not until we get to paragraph 30 that we find the statement that the Government

intends to introduce legislation dealing with brands, explosives, opticians, pharmacy, phylloxera, veterinary surgeons and such things. The whole thing is nation-rocking! If that is the type of legislation the Government intends to introduce we can surely see the reason why this Parliament has not been called together for about eight months. We do not find that the Government has any intention of introducing such essential measures for the people of this State as excessive rents legislation or amendments to the hire-purchase legislation, in which there are enough gaps for a person to drive a horse and cart through. The Government is silent on these matters. Why is it silent? It is true what the Opposition says, namely, that this Government represents the vested interests and therefore does not desire to alter the present legislation. Whenever there are flaws in legislation, the amendments are always suggested by the Opposition and never by this Government.

Last year we were told that one of the most important pieces of legislation that the Government intended to introduce concerned an amendment to the Local Government Act. The people interested in local government waited anxiously during last session for the amendments that were promised by this Government, but the same thing happened with that promise as has happened with many other promises of this Government: they were put up in Annie's room; someone locked the door and the key has been lost, and until those important matters are resurrected nothing will happen. The Address in Reply debate certainly gives the Opposition an opportunity to voice opinions about legislation that is necessary for the majority of the people of this State.

During this debate I think we have heard one of the most savage attacks for some time from the Government Party. It reminds me of an article in a newspaper that I read recently. I have read in the press of moves by the Country Party to form a branch in South Australia, and if that Party formed a branch here it must oppose only the Liberal Party. It is quite easy to see that the split in the ranks and the dissension in the Liberal Party in South Australia today already exists in other parts of Australia. The article states:

The Country Party in Victoria has served notice on the Liberal State Government that it will fight every country seat at the next Victorian election, and this means that for the first time the Country Party will run a candidate against the Premier (Mr. Bolte). Meanwhile, internal fighting is breaking out in the Liberal Party.

Is that not a repetition of what is happening in South Australia? If a fight is going on in the Victorian Parliament, at least that Parliament has a right to air its opinions inside its own Chamber, which is something absolutely foreign in this State. This Parliament adjourned on November 1 last year and, except for the two days when we were called together in June of this year to deal with Supplementary Estimates, we did not meet again until towards the end of July, a period of nearly nine months. The Government itself has said it believes that Parliament is the Government of this State and the body to govern and legislate on behalf of the people. The Government claims that it disagrees with bureaucracy, yet we are without Parliamentary government for nearly nine months. During that time the State is governed by the Liberal and Country League, the Adelaide Club and the Cabinet: that is, really the true Government of this State. When this matter is raised by Opposition members, as has been done ever since I have been a member of this House, it falls on deaf ears; no-one in the Government thinks it is important, for it is only a complaint by the Opposition. However, when any similar comment comes from the Government side it is headlines, and something that is necessary and absolutely essential. The press—the people who are the main supporters of the Government today—are the very people that say, "What nation-rocking statements emanating from the House of Assembly! Is it not time these matters were aired; is it not time the people of South Australia had a voice through their representatives in Parliament?" I consider it is time this Government realized that there is a Parliament in South Australia.

Mr. McKee: It has a television Parliament.

Mr. RYAN: That is true; one night something is mentioned and the next week it is forgotten because something else is dragged in. This Government has the cheek to say that the trade union movement drags red herrings across the trail, but I would say that South Australia has the greatest expert in the world today at dragging red herrings across the trail. I refer to the five-minute session during which the Premier appears and speaks on television. The only thing I liked about it on the one occasion I saw it was the black and white magpie that opened the session. That is all I agree with, but of course he sacrificed the magpie. Members must realize that there is always a top dog, but eventually he is toppled. It happens in football where the top dog for years is

suddenly toppled by the under dog. I promise that the same thing that has happened on the football field will happen to the Liberal Government in the future. It has been top dog for many years because of misrepresentation and a minority representation, but the under dog will take over soon.

Mr. Shannon: Turn your microphone on!

Mr. RYAN: It seems remarkable to me, but I believe I am the guest speaker at the South Australian Hotel this evening: but I do not have to go there because I can be heard from here. Apropos of the fact that the Parliament is not governing the State as it should, today we heard one of the younger members on the Government side ask the Premier—of course, that is the Government—whether he would consider an alteration to our system of Parliamentary sittings to that which operates in the other States. I think it was mentioned that it operated in New South Wales—I can be corrected if I am wrong—and that, if Parliament met for four weeks and then had one week off, the members could meet their constituents and advise them of what was happening in Parliament.

Mr. Freebairn: I did not mention the State.

Mr. RYAN: I am sorry, but I said I could be corrected. The honourable member asked the Premier to consider a system?

Mr. Freebairn: Yes.

Mr. RYAN: I believe this is the system that operates in the Commonwealth Parliament, which meets for so many weeks and then has a week off so that members can keep their constituents informed. Would that system operate in this State? Look what happened last year when the Opposition had 19 members and the Government 18, prior to the most outstanding defection that has taken place in Parliamentary history in this State for the last 20 years. A member defected from the east to the west and no-one can deny that. In the next Parliament he will probably defect to this side of the House, but he will be coming back with the herd, as that will be driven over too.

Mr. Lawn: He may miss pre-selection.

Mr. RYAN: It is interesting that someone has mentioned that.

Mr. Lawn: Perhaps you would not have mentioned it otherwise!

Mr. RYAN: I hold a fishing licence, and why hold it if I do not go out with some bait to catch something, which I can catch any day in the week.

Mr. Shannon: Is that a Dorothy Dixey?

Mr. RYAN: No, it is not. Last year I said before it happened that the member for Burra would be a member of the L.C.L. at the next election, and on that occasion he heard me all right, because he said that I was a liar.

Mr. Fred Walsh: That is unparliamentary language.

Mr. RYAN: It is recorded in *Hansard* that I was a liar. Who turned out to be truthful? Was it the member for Burra or the member for Port Adelaide? I made the statement before the event happened; I stood behind it, and truth has prevailed. What do we see today? We made statements that assurances were given that provided he defected from east to west he would receive his just reward. And isn't that the very reason why there is dissatisfaction and disunity in the Government ranks today?

Mr. Lawn: There are big rumbles against King Tom today.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Mitcham made wild statements, but what did he imply? He did not have the insides to say what he thought. Were his remarks a reflection of what went on in the Government ranks last year when that defection took place, and to cover it up did he make innuendoes about what was going on in the Liberal Party? Wasn't he saying that he hoped our dear Minister of Lands would not change his stand again in future?

Mr. Lawn: They are not too confident, are they?

Mr. RYAN: They are not confident at all, and how can anyone be confident? But that is what is behind all this. The mention of an age limit for Cabinet was only the dress rehearsal for something that will take place on North Terrace during Show week, when certain matters of Liberal policy will be discussed at the convention. The member for Mitcham asked a Labor member today whether he supported his Party's policy regarding the retiring age for members of his Party. He asked if we believed in our own policy. I inform the member for Mitcham, in his absence, and other Government members, that this same motion was submitted to the L.C.L. annual convention in September last and was narrowly defeated. It was submitted to the supreme policy-making body of the Australian Labor Party, and it was narrowly carried. Why cast reflections on our Party, when something that the honourable member wants carried in his own Party is carried by the Opposition Party? As the member for Mitcham knows, this was

debated at the last annual convention of the L.C.L. and was narrowly defeated. If it had been carried, according to some people it would have been the greatest step forward the Liberals have made. Because the Labor Party does it, it is bad, it is sinister; there is something terrible behind it!

The attack on the Premier was a subterfuge because members opposite were not game to bring into the open what they had in their minds. Isn't it true that the Minister of Lands was appointed on a Tuesday and the Government supporters were called together on the Wednesday and told what had happened, after the event? Isn't that true? Of course it's true! Many Government supporters admitted that the first they knew about it (and this applied to the Opposition too) was when they read of it in the press on the Wednesday after the Minister had been appointed. Government members were called together and told what was going to happen. Liberal members would like a system or policy where they could meet and, as rank and file members, select their Cabinet.

Mr. Lawn: That is democracy.

Mr. RYAN: The Liberal Party will not get that sort of thing because it has a so-called policy-making body next to the Adelaide Club, and when a suggestion reaches the Premier he says, "I will say what is going to be the policy of this State; you can take it or leave it." Isn't that what happens? Do members opposite have a vote on their Party's policy and on its legislative programme? Yes, after it is decided! They have the audacity to criticize a Party that democratically determines and implements its policy. Members opposite would dearly love to have a similar set-up, but they haven't the insides to buck the person who says that they will not have it. It was suggested that members of the Cabinet are old and decrepit and that they should retire to their wheel chairs. Let me refer to that. I regret that the *News* reporters are not present otherwise there could be headlines tomorrow.

Mr. Lawn: You might be photographed, too.

Mr. RYAN: If I were, I would not be coming up the steps of Parliament House with my little umbrella. That was all pre-arranged: it was no spur-of-the-moment incident. That photograph was taken within a couple of hours of his speaking here. The old and decrepit Cabinet members have my sympathy, because apparently they cannot last much longer. If I were associated with the insurance company that holds policies on their

lives, I would be scared stiff that I would have to pay out. Their average age was given as 58. I hope that I am still fighting fit at 58.

Mr. Lawn: If you weren't a member of Parliament you would have to work on the waterfront at 58.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. I will refer to that later, and to some of the lowest creatures that ever existed.

Mr. Lawn: Are you referring to the Government, the member for Mitcham, or whom?

Mr. Shannon: He is probably referring to the member for Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: No, he is doing a good job. The member for Mitcham is a member of one of the highest professions. It is the ambition of any man who is called to the Bar as a barrister and solicitor ultimately to be appointed to the Supreme Court bench.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Mitcham wants to follow his father.

Mr. RYAN: I am glad the honourable member mentioned that. I do not like to get personal, but the member for Mitcham's father was appointed to the Supreme Court bench at 59: yet the member for Mitcham criticized the average age of our Cabinet, which is 58 and a year younger than the age at which Mr. Justice Millhouse was appointed. It is interesting to note that the average age of our six judges is 66. The member for Mitcham criticized the Labor Party for introducing a retiring age for its members, but the Government considered it necessary a couple of years ago to prescribe a compulsory retiring age of 70 for Supreme Court judges. Why was that necessary?

Mr. Lawn: The member for Mitcham's father was concerned in that.

Mr. RYAN: If the retiring age were 70 when he was appointed, he could have only expected to sit as a judge for a maximum of 11 years. According to the member for Mitcham a man at 58 is too old to control the reins of Government. I agree that the Cabinet Ministers should get out and let others govern this State. The sooner they do the better off the State will be. Even though the average age of our Supreme Court judges is 66, one judge is only 53, so he reduced the average age considerably. When the member for Mitcham made his statements about the age of our Cabinet Ministers and the need for a longer session, the *Advertiser* and the *News* carried the biggest headlines I have ever seen accorded a private member. The Opposition has often advocated longer sittings, but the press has not deemed it worth mentioning. However,

because the statement came from a Government member, who was speaking only because he was dissatisfied with something that had happened over which he had had no control, it was headline news. There was nothing to prevent Mr. Millhouse from raising these matters in his Party room at one of the meetings they hold every six weeks.

Mr. Lawn: Are they allowed to raise matters?

Mr. RYAN: No, they are given a report, thanked for their attendance, and bade goodbye.

Mr. Shannon: The keyhole listener!

Mr. RYAN: That's really good! The *Advertiser*, a subsidiary of the Liberal and Country League—because if the Liberal and Country League goes bankrupt the *Advertiser* goes too—published a report, which commenced as follows:

The Liberal and Country League delegates at their annual meeting, which is held behind closed doors . . .

Obviously they plug the keyhole. I do not know whether the member for Onkaparinga is the tyler of the Liberal and Country League meetings. This great Liberal and Country League Party meets behind closed doors so that its policy can be considered in secret. If what it intended to do leaked out, the public would not hold it in high regard. Compare it with the Australian Labor Party. The press is invited to the annual conventions of the Labor Party and is invited to comment on the discussions that ensue at that policy-making meeting. That happens every year.

Mr. Shannon: It happened in Perth the other day, didn't it?

Mr. Lawn: The press walked out there.

Mr. Shannon: I understand for a reason.

Mr. RYAN: As far as I am aware, press representatives were invited to attend the Federal A.L.P. conference in Perth, but because the credentials of one man were not acceptable the other press representatives went on strike. If journalists walk out or boycott an ordinary meeting it is proper, but if they walk out of a trade union meeting it is a strike, and that is the only name given to it. Let us hear some more about the keyhole man. The L.C.L. holds its annual convention behind locked doors, yet it criticizes a Party that holds its convention with open doors and invites members of the press, which gives the names and remarks of men who speak for or against policy matters. We cannot say the same about the L.C.L. This is what was said last year after the L.C.L. conference,

and I refer to it because we have had thrown at us what our people do. If this were not so important it would be laughable and the joke of the century. They decided at the 1962 conference—

Mr. Shannon: Behind closed doors we did it.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and what came out must be distorted or what they thought the public should know. It was handed out to the press. Imagine the position of the poorly paid reporter on the *Advertiser* staff if he did not print what was given to him by the masters of his newspaper at the annual convention. He would be drawing social service payments if he did not publish what was handed to him. Just imagine Sir Lloyd Dumas lining him up—

Mr. Jennings: What about Sir Arthur Rymill?

Mr. RYAN: Is he a member? The L.C.L. platform adopted in 1962 referred to "responsible Parliamentary government", but if that is not a misnomer I do not know what is.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Mitcham could not qualify for that.

Mr. RYAN: No. It is irresponsible and indefinable. The platform also says "The federal system of government is the platform defined by the Liberal and Country League in 1962." When there is a Commonwealth by-election it does not want to be associated with it, but if there is any mud-slinging it joins the band wagon. We saw it in the Grey by-election. There we saw the friend of the Liberals, the friend of the people, the most respected Liberal representative in Canberra, the venerable Dr. Forbes! Members opposite all love him absolutely! He led the band wagon, and didn't the member for Mitcham go out with him? He was in the front row. Didn't he stay under a verandah in Ellen Street where he conducted a meeting under the directorship of the magnificent and great L.C.L. man, our old friend Dr. Forbes?

Mr. Jenkins: He is a young man.

Mr. RYAN: If there were the chance tomorrow the Party would not nominate him. He said to one Port Pirie elector, "Call me Jim," but the man replied, "If they called you at 10 o'clock in the morning it would be two hours too early." The only thing that saved them in Grey when they arrived in the bus was Dr. Forbes leading the band with a drum and everybody lined up behind him. They do not believe in regimentation, yet they marched along with Dr. Forbes in front and the rest following like an army.

Mr. Loveday: They called it the task force.

Mr. RYAN: That is true. As one man pointed out, the only thing that should have happened to the task force was to torpedo it on the way up. This L.C.L. platform is clear and precise. A child going to kindergarten can understand it because it is so clear. The reference to the federal system of government is clear to understand. Then there is a reference to "the Legislative Council and the principles of its franchise". If any L.C.L. member thinks this is a pantomime and I am making all this up, I point out that it was published in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday, September 12, 1962. There is no pantomime as far as I am concerned. If there is any, it is the pantomime government the public is receiving.

Mr. Shannon: You had better correct that.

Mr. RYAN: When a member offers constructive criticism it is hard to take, and the only way not to take it is to walk out, as the honourable member is now doing.

Mr. Lawn: I think you have torpedoed the member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. RYAN: The public of South Australia will torpedo the honourable member at the next election. Then the average age will probably drop because the L.C.L. will not get such a dear old gentleman in again. I am saying this because it was thrown up at us in the most nation-rocking speech that I have heard in this House by the member for Mitcham. It was said by the *Advertiser* and the *News*. Another reference in the L.C.L. platform is "minimum use of Government control, consistent with the needs of the people". That is one of the most brilliant planks in the platform. I am not going to harp on how they are to govern, but if it is to be government without any concern for the wishes of the people they should scrub it from their policy. When railway gauge standardization was being debated and the unanimous decision of this House was sent to the Liberal members in Canberra, they said, "Why should we be told by the people of South Australia what to do? We will support Menzies & Co. and, so far as South Australia is concerned, they can look after themselves." One of our Commonwealth members who was forceful in her remarks has suffered the consequences of banging her head against the Premier of South Australia. She will never make the grade at the next election.

Mr. Lawn: Do you think that could happen to the member for Mitcham?

Mr. RYAN: At one stage she said that the Premier of South Australia was responsible

for that motion, but later she said that he had nothing to do with it. Wouldn't it be lovely to see her go up on to the platform where the Premier was sitting at the next Commonwealth election and hear her say, "I was dumped because the Premier did not want me to be outspoken where Canberra was concerned"? The Premier was up on the platform in Port Pirie with Sir Robert Menzies, with his Order of the Thistle. He was up there soliciting support for the Liberal and Country League saying, "We in South Australia ask you to support the Liberals in your Commonwealth representation", yet every time the Commonwealth body is mentioned here we are told it is divorced from the Liberal Party in South Australia.

Mr. Lawn: They are going to change their name to the "Liberal and Country Party" in South Australia now.

Mr. RYAN: This is their platform—"The objectives of the Liberal Party of Australia as applicable to South Australia." They say, "Let's divorce ourselves from Federal politics. The people in Canberra might do something distasteful to us and it might have the effect of defeating us." It does not matter what the will of the people of South Australia is—they will carry on. That is the policy as enunciated or criticized by the member for Mitcham.

The *Advertiser*, a subsidiary of the Liberal Party, made these remarks (and I hope the *Advertiser* reporters will listen to this) about the average age of the Cabinet. The average age of the members of the board of the *Advertiser* is 61 years. Sir Lloyd Dumas is 72 years of age, Sir Kenneth Wills is 67, and John C. A. Waters is 63 years.

Mr. Lawn: You will get on the front page now!

Mr. RYAN: Sir Arthur Rymill, in one of the many directorships that he holds, is 55 years of age, John Langdon Bonython is 58, Donald George McFarling is 58, and John N. McEwin is 56. The average age of the directors of the Adelaide *Advertiser* is thus 61.

Now let me come to the *News*, because I want to link both papers. The average age of the six members of the board of directors of the *News* is 60, but included in them is a silver-spoon merchant who is only 32. If you take the silver spoon out of it, the average age is considerably higher. Sir John Stanley Murray is 79 years of age, R. B. Wiltshire is 70, Sir Edgar Bean is 69, Sir Ewen Waterman is 61, R. R. Boland is 51, and K. R. Murdoch 32, making an average age of 60 years.

Why am I giving these figures? When the nation-rocking statement of the member for Mitcham appeared, it was headlined in the *Advertiser* and there was an editorial on it. The *News* quoted it as one of the greatest statements ever made in the House of Assembly and supported it. But my point is that, whilst they quoted the average age of the Cabinet in South Australia as 58, their own executive (and no-one can deny that the executive of South Australia is the Cabinet of South Australia, with executive power over a far bigger company than the directors of the *Advertiser* and the *News* have to look after) has an average age, in the case of the *Advertiser*, of 61, three years greater than the average age of the South Australian Cabinet. Yet they say that the members of the Cabinet are too old and decrepit—"Get rid of them; we don't want these old fellows any longer."

The *News* also headlined what the member for Mitcham said. It took a photograph of him on the steps of Parliament House with all the paint and necessary stuff to make him photogenic, and he looked like Churchill going to a war lords' meeting. The average age of the board of the *News* is 60.

Mr. LAWN: Their eldest member is 79.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and the eldest member of the board of the *Advertiser* is 72 years of age.

Mr. LAWN: You didn't give the individual ages of the judges.

Mr. RYAN: I am coming to them later. In effect, the *Advertiser* is saying, "The South Australian Cabinet is too old at 58 but we are not too old at 61." They further say, "We are elected for life." They do not have to worry about what happens in politics, whether they will be elected every three years. It appears that an age that is too old in North Terrace is not too old in King William Street.

Mr. LOVEDAY: They always have a different set of standards for private enterprise compared with Parliament.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, that is true—different ethics and different principles. It is a case of, "Don't do as I do but do as I tell you." These people are not sincere or genuine in the remarks they are trying to force upon the public of South Australia. If they were sincere in their statements in support of the member for Mitcham's assertion that the average age of 58 was too high, why should not the boards of the *Advertiser* and the *News* be honest about their average ages? Where is the sincerity? There isn't any.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Mitcham says he will table a motion in the House to retire all judges over 70 years of age.

Mr. RYAN: I have quoted the ages of the directors of the *Advertiser* and the *News*. By the way, I believe that the Adelaide *Truth* is run by the Adelaide *News*. They even have the cheek and audacity to come out this week with a leading article—"Are the skids under Sir Thomas? Has he been there too long? Has he become divorced from the opinions of South Australia?"

Mr. LAWN: Yes, he has.

Mr. RYAN: I agree wholeheartedly but, if anybody has the skids under him, let us be honest about it.

Mr. LAWN: If you take a Gallup poll you get the truth.

Mr. RYAN: If there is to be any sincerity, if there are any skids under anybody in South Australia, they are under the member for Mitcham, and doesn't the Government side know it! Members opposite know when "H.M.V." speaks. *Truth*, a subsidiary of the *News*, said that the skids were under Sir Thomas, but it knows the skids are under the member for Mitcham.

Mr. LAWN: Before your voice goes, will you tell us the ages of the judges?

Mr. RYAN: Yes. Don't be impatient; don't try to force the issue. The Chief Justice, Sir Mellis Napier, is 80, and Sir Herbert Mayo is 78.

Mr. LAWN: That is 158 for the two.

Mr. RYAN: They are outside the ambit of the legislation that provides for a retiring age. Mr. Justice Travers is 63, Mr. Justice Chamberlain is 62, and Mr. Justice Millhouse (not Robin Redbreast)—I think he is related) is 61. I do not say this derogatorily, but Mr. Justice Millhouse was appointed at the age of 59, which is one year older than the average age that the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said was too old for the Cabinet.

Mr. LAWN: In effect, he "rubbished" his own father.

Mr. RYAN: That is so.

The SPEAKER: Order! I can allow only one speech at a time. The honourable member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: I thought I was making the speech. Mr. Justice Hogarth is 53.

Mr. LAWN: He is only an infant!

Mr. RYAN: Yes. He reduces the average age of the six, as he is comparatively young. However, the average age is 66. The pinnacle

of success for a member of the legal profession is to obtain appointment as a judge of the Supreme Court, but I ask members to consider the average age, which is 66, yet the member for Mitcham considers an average age of 58 too high for the Cabinet. How can any member opposite support appointments to the Supreme Court, to any Government position, or to the boards of the *Advertiser* or the *News* if he supports the member for Mitcham in his statement about 58 being too old for a Minister? Members of the Labor Party are covered by the Party's policy, which provides that they must retire, but not at 58. Many men are then in the prime of life. I hope that in another 18 years, when I am 58, I shall be in the prime of life and still fighting fit.

Mr. Lawn: Are you still warming up? You have not started your main speech, have you?

Mr. RYAN: Oh, yes.

Mr. Lawn: I thought it was a preliminary gallop.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: I am speaking to the Address in Reply, Mr. Speaker. I have referred to that great defection that took place from east to west. At the annual convention of the Liberal and Country Party, that supreme body on North Terrace, Sir Thomas said, "You make the policy and I will see if I agree with it. If I don't, I will say what is to go on." He said at the conference in 1962 that the Liberal and Country Party's meagre margin had been cut at the 1962 election, but the former Independent had since joined the Party. When I said he was going to join the Party, it was said that I was a terrific teller of lies. The Premier then said there could be no suggestion that the stability of the Government was in danger. That is what he said when he had to give a pep talk about what would happen in the future. It was mentioned in this Chamber that a prominent gentleman said that he agreed that there should be a system and principle in this State, or in Australia generally, that there should always be a pool of unemployed persons. Compare that statement with the policy of the Australian Labor Party that was put into effect when it was the Government. We believe in full employment.

Mr. Laucke: So do we.

Mr. RYAN: You are certainly not carrying it out. For three years your Party has been introducing one horror Budget after another—

and don't say you are divorced from the Commonwealth Parliament. This has been done to accentuate the unemployment position, which has been fluctuating between 80,000 and 100,000 for three years.

Mr. McKee: The people were told that they had to get used to it, too.

Mr. RYAN: That is so, yet the member for Barossa says his Party does not believe in that policy. If it does not, it should do something to implement a policy, if it has one—but I do not think it has. At the 1962 conference of the Liberal and Country League the President (Mr. Gerard) said that it would be disastrous for South Australia if the Playford Government were defeated. Mr. Gerard is the person who said that Australia and Australians would have to get used to a certain percentage of unemployment.

Mr. Loveday: About 80,000!

Mr. RYAN: Yes; it has fluctuated between 80,000 and 100,000 in the last three years. We have had horror Budgets and supplementary Budgets, and we are to have an election Budget soon. It is to be hoped for the sake of members of that Party that the Budget will contain enough inducement for the people to re-elect them. Any time that the Liberal and Country League wants an election in either the Commonwealth or State sphere, it can just name the date. That is no idle challenge. If that Party thinks it has the stability that it is supposed by its policy to have, let it go to the public, which will say whether there is stability in Australia in general or in this State in particular. The Labor Party offers the challenge; all it wants is to have the Government accept it. One minute Mr. Gerard is the L.C.L. President and the next he is the Chairman of the Chamber of Manufactures or some other body, and he says that people have to take it or leave it. That is what we have to put up with, and those are the sort of statements made behind closed doors by supporters of this Government.

One of the most important matters that has been referred to members not only of this Parliament but of every State Parliament as well as the Commonwealth Parliament is the matter of education. With all due respect to the Minister of Education, in my opinion it is just idle chatter when members of the Government say that the time has arrived when we must receive Commonwealth aid for education. We all agree that it is time this happen, but I maintain that it is idle chatter for members of the Government to say that they believe

something should be done when they know it cannot be done and when they will do nothing to see that it is done. Those Government members have the right to instruct their Commonwealth representatives, and if a direct instruction were given to Commonwealth members, how could they refuse to take the necessary action? The answer is that they could not refuse.

Mr. McKee: Not at the moment, anyhow.

Mr. RYAN: We saw what happened to a certain senator who said "No": her political days are over, and members of the Government know that. Could the Commonwealth representatives, on receiving instructions to press on behalf of this State for Commonwealth aid, say, "We are not interested in South Australia"? Let us look at the Governments of the various States. Western Australia is under Liberal Country Party control; South Australia is under a minority L.C.P. control; Victoria is under a coalition control; and Queensland is under L.C.P. control. If those States issued instructions to their Commonwealth representatives to support Commonwealth aid to the States for education, they could do something because they have a majority in the House of Representatives. Are those representatives divorced from the State once they are elected to the Commonwealth Parliament? Can they go to Canberra and adopt the attitude that irrespective of what the States want they will do as they please?

I have mentioned these things to prove that the statement being made by Liberal members that it is necessary to have Commonwealth aid for education is idle chatter. This policy can be implemented. If the Labor Party were in power in the Commonwealth sphere the Liberals in the various States would be demanding immediate action for Commonwealth aid for education. It would not be necessary to put pressure on the State's representatives in the Commonwealth Parliament under those circumstances, because the Commonwealth members would then say they were bound by the decisions of the States they represented, and they would be instructed to implement the principle of further Commonwealth aid for education. I therefore say it is all eyewash when members of this Government say they agree that this Commonwealth aid is essential but at the same time they know they are not going to do a thing to see that it is implemented. Not long ago it was said that the standardization of railways was not necessary. The Commonwealth representatives would not

take instructions, but suddenly the South Australian representation was able to force the issue with the Commonwealth Treasurer, and now we have the promise that standardization will be proceeded with. The same principle can be implemented with Commonwealth aid for education.

Mr. Loveday: Something would be done if another by-election were coming up.

Mr. RYAN: Yes; the Commonwealth Treasurer would find the necessary aid for education if there was to be another by-election in South Australia or any other part of Australia in the next few weeks. I referred a short time ago to the very great friend of the Liberals, Dr. Forbes—"Call me Jim"—who in the House of Representatives on May 2 this year, in a by-election campaign statement, made one of the greatest attacks ever on the waterside workers of Australia. He accused those workers of being some of the lowest types of workers that Australia had ever had.

Mr. McKee: He told electors in Port Pirie that those people were associated with Communism.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, he accused every member of that organization of being a "Commo", a supporter of Communism, or somebody that was prepared to tag along with Communism. I am a member of that organization, and "Call me Jim" is not going to get away with linking me with Communism. I have probably fought Communism far more than any Liberal member could possibly do, and I do not have to run to some other organization to fight my battles.

Mr. Bywaters: They think a Communist is a Liberal man with a hook in his hand or something; they would not know.

Mr. RYAN: When any organization goes to the court and asks for an improvement in conditions, its members are called Communists. That was the statement by the Commonwealth member for Barker. At about the time of the Grey by-election innuendoes were made about certain people being Communists. It was said at that time, "Well, while you might support the selected Labor candidate in this by-election you know that if you do you are voting for a Communist". Yet that man was putting himself up as the endorsed Labor candidate in that by-election. Certain attempts were made in the court at that time to create industrial unrest, but we know that it was done with the ulterior motive of trying to swing the electors against a candidate in that by-election.

Recently, conferences have been held on a national level between the Commonwealth Government (through the Minister for Labour and

National Service) the employers' federation and employees' organizations. In a recent publication the committee that was formed recommended a suspension, for 12 months, of the penal clauses of section 52 (a) of the Stevedoring Act. This recommendation was made in a letter from Dr. Cook, chairman of the committee considering these matters, as representing the Minister for Labour and National Service. On that committee were several national shipping employers. It is an amazing thing that, around election time, some people think that the waterside worker is the lowest type of worker in Australia, but the shipowners' representatives themselves believe that the penal clauses imposed are so severe that they should be suspended for 12 months, and that after a further period the Commonwealth Government should consider a recommendation that they be deleted from the Act.

These are the people fighting for their rights. These are the people that the venerable gentleman, Dr. Forbes—"Call me Jim"—said are all Communists, and would not support the farmers and help them to dispose of their primary produce. If the Commonwealth Government, through the leadership of the Minister for Labour and National Service, is prepared to suspend penal clauses under any arbitration or conciliation Act, and ultimately to dispense with them, I think that that is positive proof that some statements being made by irresponsible statesmen are absolutely without foundation.

The form of dictatorial rule that exists in the administration of the South Australian Railways has been mentioned on a number of occasions. All members agree that the stage has been reached where the control of the Railways Department has been completely taken out of the hands of the Minister of Railways and that the department is administered by the Commissioner. He has powers that no other departmental head has in this State. It is amazing that one departmental head can be vested with dictatorial powers that are not conferred on any other departmental head. If it is good enough for such powers to be conferred on the Railways Commissioner, they should be conferred on the Director of Education and on every other departmental head.

Mr. McKee: Why not the Minister?

Mr. RYAN: That is my point, and that is what we demand should happen. We believe that a Government department should be

under the control of the Minister in charge of that department.

Mr. McKee: The Minister and Directors do not have the control.

Mr. RYAN: The Railways Commissioner is not answerable to the Minister of Railways. He is a law unto himself under an Act of Parliament passed many years ago. The Minister is only a rubber stamp for the Commissioner. What efforts are being made to attract people to a public transport system, the railways? We should assist and encourage people to travel on the railway services. Anyone that uses the railway services will agree that the time tables are not drawn up for the convenience of the traveller. I found, after investigation, that many former train travellers are now using other means of transport because the railways are not providing a service for their convenience. Recently on a public holiday, when the Railways Department should be looking for business, a time table, for the most used section of the South Australian railways—the Port Adelaide, Outer Harbour, Semaphore line—showed trains running every hour. This was on a public holiday! Obviously if a person missed a train he would walk another 200 or 300 yards and use the bus system, which is also operated by the Government, but which runs a 12 or 20 minutes service.

I suggest to the Government that a survey of the requirements of the people living in areas served by the railways should be made to increase the patronage. Surely a survey of this type would be of benefit to the Government and an advantage to rail travellers. We all know that the parking problem in Adelaide is becoming serious. Many people use public transport today owing to the lack of parking space. If the railway system suited the requirements of the travelling public I believe that some of the parking problems would disappear. It is no good offering that suggestion to the Minister of Railways because he is only a rubber stamp, but the Government should instruct the Railways Commissioner to implement a survey of this nature to improve the railways system in this State. I have punished members of the House long enough, so I will conclude now by saying that I support the motion.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): After the storm comes the calm, but I do join with other speakers and express regret at the sad passing of the former members of this House, Sir Cecil Hincks and Ron Ralston, and of Allan

Hookings, a former member of another place. The new members for Mount Gambier and Yorke Peninsula have already shown their prowess in this House, and they will hold their own with each and every member. I well remember my first experience in this House.

Early this year the State was favoured by a short visit from Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh, and I pay a tribute to the Police Force and another group, the St. John Ambulance Brigade, which is always willing to make its services available. I remember their excellent work at the Victoria Park racecourse on the day the children were able to see Their Royal Highnesses.

As this is my first full year in this House, I appreciate the help given to me by all members and the staff, and the assistance received from the various Government departments. In the district of Unley there are six Government schools—four primary and two technical high (one for boys and one for girls). It is an old area and the Black Forest school is the only school in this large area with an oval. As a boy I knew the playing areas of all the schools except the Goodwood technical school. Today the playing areas are becoming smaller, and are far below the requirements of the schools. Prefabricated classrooms are prevalent, and a portion of the Unley infants school has been taken over by the primary section. Naturally education plays an important part in everyone's life, but recreation is also needed. Land is not readily available, but I appeal to the Minister of Education to obtain a suitable centrally situated area on which to provide an oval to enable these schools to participate in competitive sport. It may be that portion of our park lands could be grassed and used by the public schools. This has been done for private schools. The cost of transporting children to a central oval should be borne by the department. Sport is not in the curriculum of some schools because they have no sporting facilities, and they are unable to compete against other schools.

The Parkside Primary School toilets urgently need repairing. They are the original toilets provided when the school was built, and should be attended to as soon as possible. The Goodwood Boys Technical High School urgently needs an assembly room. A room that is used infrequently by a section of the Electrical Trades School could be converted for this purpose. I agree with the member for Gawler that the State should press for a higher Commonwealth grant for education. In these

days of higher education, and with a school leaving age of 15, public examinations should be free. This would ease the financial burden on parents. I do not, however, oppose increasing the remuneration paid to examiners. Theirs is a specialized job.

I have frequently expressed concern about the Victoria Street railway crossing at Goodwood. Many trains pass over this crossing during the night and it is distressing to nearby residents who are unable to sleep because of the noise from the warning bells. As yet no satisfactory solution has been found to the problem. Warning devices at railway crossings are essential, but I can see no reason why the bells should not be stopped at night. One set of bells at this crossing is almost at the front window of a nearby house. Several houses in the area have been sold recently, and the owners have suffered financial loss. Many aged people have suffered sickness through the constant noise interrupting their sleep. The nearby residents are entitled to some rest.

Mr. Ramsay, the General Manager of the Housing Trust, recently announced that flats would be erected in the Parkside area. These will be most welcome. Some years ago the Unley City Council purchased the land on which the flats will be constructed. Portion of the area will be devoted to roads. I commend the efforts of Mr. Perry (the Town Clerk), Mr. Page (the then Mayor), and Councillor Dunnage, who were the prime movers in obtaining this land.

During the last decade the Electricity Trust has made rapid progress. Electricity is used extensively by most people, but few realize its dangers. One cannot see electricity, but if there is a fault one can be seriously injured. Sometimes a person may feel a tickle, but at other times a shock.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't it too late when you feel electricity?

Mr. LANGLEY: Not if it is only a tickle.

Mr. Lawn: It is all right if you can feel a tickle. If you can't feel anything, it's time to worry.

Mr. LANGLEY: My point is that people are not aware of the dangers of electricity. During the Parliamentary recess a deputation from the Electrical Trades Union and from the Electrical Contractors Association waited on the Minister of Industry. This must have been one of the few occasions when unions and employers combined in the interests of public safety. If electricians were adequately trained the accident rate would be minimized.

South Australia is suffering from a dearth of skilled workers and it would be a progressive step if the Government subsidized the employment of apprentices. After all, apprentices are our future skilled tradesmen. In some ways apprentices are not profitable to a business, but they are essential, and something must be done to remedy the present position. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) is a former apprentice and he would be only too pleased to receive Government aid to enable him to employ more apprentices. We need good tradesmen, particularly in the electrical trade. At present the customer is completely in the hands of the electrician who makes repairs or installations for him. Under the present system people with a limited knowledge can pose as electricians. They are a menace to public safety in houses and factories. In addition, I know of instances where people have had to pay heavily to have the mistakes of these incompetent electricians remedied. If electrical contractors and electricians had to be licensed this problem would be overcome. South Australia is the only State that does not provide for the licensing of electricians. Such a licensing system is long overdue.

Mr. Freebairn: What licensing qualifications would you recommend?

Mr. LANGLEY: After an apprentice has been three years at school and two years with an employer he should be a highly trained tradesman, and could be given a certificate. In the early stages there may be difficulties in knowing what to do with electricians of about 65 years of age. Perhaps they could be automatically licensed. They would be under the jurisdiction of a board and if they did not do the right thing they could be suspended. The Electricity Trust inspects new electrical work, but anyone is permitted to put in a power plug without inspection of the work, and often it is not done properly. The man who has been an electrician all his life could be given a licence and it would be up to him to justify his having been given it. I support the motion.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the motion and join with previous speakers in paying tribute to our two late members, Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Ron Balston. On every occasion that I approached the late Sir Cecil in his capacity as Minister of Lands I found him to be most courteous and always willing to be of assistance in helping to solve any problem I placed before him on behalf of my constituents. Mr. Balston was untiring in his

efforts on behalf of the residents of his district. While not with us in this Chamber on many sitting days during the last session, all reports indicate that he had, by his work in Parliament and in his district, gained the respect and admiration of all who knew him. I express my sincerest sympathy to the widow and family of each of the late gentlemen. Their successors in this place will have a difficult task in maintaining the standard they set. However, both Mr. Burdon and Mr. Ferguson have already shown their capabilities, and I join with other members in congratulating them on their first speeches in this House.

I now turn to some of the affairs affecting the Chaffey district, which I have the honour to represent. As members are no doubt aware, the fruit industry in the river districts is going through a rather troubled period. The main worry is a lack of markets to absorb all products at a price that will return to growers a just and fair return for their labours. Strenuous efforts have been made by the leaders of the dried fruit growers, through their own grower-controlled organization, the Australian Dried Fruits Association, to negotiate with the Commonwealth Government a stabilization plan for dried vine fruits. These negotiations have taken place over a number of years, but to no avail. Unfortunately, our leaders have not been able to get the Commonwealth Government to agree to a plan that would stabilize returns to growers at or above the cost of production figure established by the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics. How any Government can insist on a stabilization plan that will not guarantee cost of production is beyond my comprehension. Having been a delegate to the federal conference of the Australian Dried Fruits Association for several years I have an intimate knowledge of the untiring efforts of the executive members in negotiating a stabilization plan that could be accepted by growers, and of their efforts to improve sales of dried fruits in Australia and overseas.

It would appear that the best we can hope for now is a stabilization plan with several unsatisfactory features that will have to be removed by future negotiation when proved unworkable. During the past two seasons citrus prices have been at a disastrously low level. A plan to stabilize prices at an economic level is an urgent necessity and I understand that steps in this direction are being taken by the industry's own grower organization.

Our fruit juice company, Berri Fruit Juices, has recently been re-organized and its operations expanded. The recent trip to the United States of America and Canada by the manager of this company to seek new markets and to investigate the latest production trends and techniques should be of great benefit to citrus growers in the river districts.

Another section of the fruit industry in a troubled state at present is wine-grape growing. Much resentment has been expressed recently by growers at the prices obtained from proprietary wineries for the grapes delivered during the last vintage. The annual battle between growers' representatives and winemakers' representatives resulted this year in the price for sultanas being fixed at 10s. a ton below the price recommended by the Prices Commissioner. Some form of contract between growers and winemakers will have to be introduced to overcome the present situation. I agree with much of what has been said in the past in this Chamber and outside regarding the benefits by way of price increases and stability in the industry that have resulted from the Prices Commissioner's making recommendations each year on what he considers to be a fair price for wine grapes. I want to make this point. The benefits have been gained as a direct result of the petition presented to this House in 1959 and so vigorously supported by my colleague, the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters), who undoubtedly forced action by the Government.

The fruit canning industry is also in a state of flux. Each year an increased tonnage of fruit is available for processing as a result of an increase in the plantings of clingstone peaches. Riverland Fruit Products, the local co-operative cannery, did a remarkably good job in handling the increased tonnage, including much of the fruit that would normally have gone to Foster Clark. Much resentment is felt by growers regarding the operations of this firm. It arrived on the scene amidst a great blaze of publicity, with the intention, expressed by its chief executive officer, of breaking the Fruit Industry Sugar Concession Committee's price-fixing structure. The price-fixing functions of the F.I.S.C.C. have been, and still are, the main stabilizing factor in the fruit canning industry, and to destroy it would be a retrograde step.

In the four sections of the fruit industry that I have dealt with the greatest single need is for individual growers to strengthen their own organization, to give full support to their elected leaders, and, above all, to have faith

in their industry and districts. We have been through sticky periods in the past and I am sure the present difficulties will be overcome. As the result of low prices received and effects on capital values, there has been a great reduction in employment. At present there are more unemployed people in the river districts than at any time since the last war. This has had the effect of reducing business turnover in towns.

I want now to refer to the bridges that are strongly advocated for crossing the upper parts of the Murray River. At present a committee is preparing a case on the need for bridges to be presented to the Public Works Committee. Various theories are being advanced as to where the bridges should be located. We all know that one is required at Kingston and another at Berri. We also realize that they will take a long time to construct. In the meantime the duplication of the ferries at those two crossings is a matter of the greatest urgency.

During the last session and once again in the early part of this session, I suggested that the ferry crossings be duplicated and that the approaches be constructed before the ferries from Blanchetown became available on the completion of the bridge. Another matter brought to my notice from a recent conference in the Upper Murray and which has been raised many times is the need for flashing lights and "stop signals" for the rail crossings on the Sturt Highway—two at Renmark, one at Glossop and one at Barmera, the main one being at Glossop where there is much traffic and a series of accidents has occurred. On our highways, to the best of my knowledge, there are no parking bays for heavy interstate transports. I travel down the Sturt Highway and through Morgan each week and notice that a great traffic hazard is created by these heavy transports parked at the roadside, especially on dark nights when they are a great menace to other traffic. I urge the Government to see whether some parking bays cannot be provided, as they are on the highways in other States.

Turning to education, I am pleased to report that the Leaving Honours class established at Glossop during the early part of this year is functioning very well. The teacher in charge of that class says that it is one of the happiest classes he has ever had, and this assertion supports the strong agitation for the establishment in country high schools of this additional facility of a Leaving Honours class, so

that our children in the country districts can more or less complete their education up to matriculation standard.

Another aspect of establishing Leaving Honours classes is the transportation of the Leaving Honours students from the surrounding towns to the schools. It has been reported to me that that matter has been straightened out and a good service is now being provided. A short while ago I had the pleasure of introducing to the Minister of Education a deputation from the Renmark Primary School Committee to present submissions on the need for the building of a new school in that town. Parts of the old school have been there since about 1890. The school has been added to and sections have been closed down. The old rooms are poorly ventilated and the only one decent classroom there was built in about 1927, since which time a hotchpotch of temporary wood and iron buildings and wooden buildings has been added to the old part of the school. Now it is just a big mess of old and unsatisfactory buildings.

Unfortunately, the Minister of Education stated that the full resources of the department for the building programme were now devoted to the building of new schools in the new areas of population. That was the reply he gave to submissions on this matter last year. How long is this state of affairs going to continue? Are old schools in an unsatisfactory state to be left to deteriorate further, or is there to be a speeding up in the building programme?

The committee of the Renmark Adult Education Centre has recently been expanded to include representatives from the other towns in the Upper Murray—Waikerie, Barmera, Loxton and Berri. Their major need at present is a home at Renmark for the centre itself. I have a report from the chairman of that committee, which states that the increase in fees charged has had a very serious effect on attendances at the classes conducted by the adult education centre. I quote from this report just what facilities are available in the town of Renmark for adult education:

The Renmark Primary School is ideally situated for night classes but the seating accommodation, designed for small children, is quite unsuitable for adults. The A.E.C. has been forced to use these premises for several classes. The vacant land opposite the Renmark Primary School is in an ideal position for an A.E.C. and the provision of facilities there would serve a double purpose—primary school children would be able to use the premises for woodwork, metalwork, art and needlework classes during normal school hours. At present

Renmark Primary School children are denied instruction in woodwork, as no facilities are available.

No facilities exist for apprentice training in Renmark. The provision of adult education buildings would enable apprentices to receive first-hand instruction in their trades and thus overcome one of the many disadvantages experienced by country apprentices.

This adult education centre for the Upper Murray holds branch classes at Loxton. Although it is not in my district, I will read to the House some of the conditions under which they are at present operating:

The adult education centre conducts welding classes in rented quarters consisting of a converted fowlhouse. Despite the cramped and draughty conditions there is a lively demand for instruction, and four classes are held weekly. One of these classes is attended by Aborigines from the Gerard Reserve, who travel from the reserve each week.

That gives some idea of the conditions under which these classes are being held in some of the Upper Murray towns.

The recently announced increased examination fees to be charged for the public examinations at the end of this year are also greatly worrying residents in the Upper Murray towns. They are rather at a loss to understand the need for them. In my opinion it is just another imposition on the parent under the so-called "free education" we are supposed to enjoy in South Australia.

Some time ago a matter was brought to my notice regarding the fishing reach of a man aged 82, a Boer War veteran. I took up the matter with the Minister, but unfortunately he could not see any justice in the case put forward, and rather arbitrarily deprived the man of his fishing reach. The first indication this man had that he would lose the reach was a letter from the Director of Fisheries and Game (Mr. Bogg) to this effect: "Sorry to hear you are ill. Your fishing reach has been transferred to someone else." I consider that that is an unfair and unreasonable way to go about things. I took up this matter with the Minister and with Mr. Bogg, who said that a firm rumour was current to the effect that this man wanted to surrender his fishing reach. I found that hard to believe. The old man is 82 and is practically deaf and blind.

Mr. Ryan: Was the lease cancelled on hearsay evidence?

Mr. CURREN: That is apparently what happened: somebody, who apparently had a personal interest in seeing that the old man had his fishing reach cancelled so that it could be allotted to somebody else, telephoned. I protested to the Minister, but to no avail.

Another matter that concerns Upper Murray districts, mainly those on the river, relates to bird sanctuaries. An enthusiastic band of men has recently formed a group called the South Australian Field Sportsmen's Association. The main objective of this body is the establishment of game reserves instead of the present system of bird sanctuaries. I have obtained a mass of material from the Fisheries and Wildlife Department of Victoria about the operation of this system there, and I am sure that when I have shown it to the Minister he will change his views on its value. The members of this association applied for an area to be allocated to them so that they could put into practice their ideas for improving the breeding and general conditions of game birds in the Upper Murray. The evaporation basin at Berri is about to be allocated as a bird sanctuary or, we hope, as a game reserve. Some indication of what is taking place in Victoria can be gained from the fact that over the last three or four years an area of 50,100 acres has been dedicated to the establishment of wild life reserves.

Mr. Ryan: Is shooting allowed in a sanctuary?

Mr. CURREN: No shooting is permitted at any time of the year in South Australian sanctuaries. However, grazing licences are issued, so there is no hope that the natural flora will regenerate after a flood. Cattle grazes, and the young trees have no chance to grow.

Mr. Shannon: I do not know what the change in policy will be. We have areas where shooting is not permitted, and that seems to be the only way to protect birds.

Mr. CURREN: Is grazing permitted in the sanctuaries?

Mr. Shannon: They are given fairly free range, so the birds have every chance of survival.

Mr. CURREN: A report on the need for securing areas issued by the Victorian Fisheries and Wildlife Department, states:

It is essential to secure the areas and save the existing habitat before it is finally destroyed. Once the areas are safe, then the slower work of rehabilitation and development can proceed. Nature cannot be hurried; time is needed for regrowth, and the full plans will only unfold with the future. One aspect of this early work is important—that of the acceptance of these areas in their new function by the public. Interest has been marked, and in some cases the general public has given much assistance, particularly in replanting and helping in essential water control. The interest shown and co-operation given by the local field and game associations

has been exceptionally good. The working bees for fencing, ploughing, and planting food crops, and many other jobs arranged by the members, have been the main factor in the success of this work.

The systems operating in Victoria are game reserves, where duck-shooting is permitted during the normal open season; State sanctuaries, where shooting is prohibited at all times; and particular species reserves, for koalas, penguins, etc. On other public lands, if wild life is an important product but is of secondary consideration, a co-operative wild life management project is worked out between the controlling authority and the department. If any member would like to study the papers I have, I shall make them freely available.

Recently, iniquitous rent increases have been announced for Government employees living in departmental houses. I have done quite a deal of research into this matter in the last couple of months, and I have found that in my district many Lands Department employees have had this increase thrust upon them. One little known fact is that the occupants of Lands Department houses must sign an annual tenancy licence. This licence is renewed every year, and the fee for this little piece of paper is 2s. 6d. for the first £50 of annual rent and 5s. for the first £100. However, as most of the houses carry a rental of more than £2 a week, which would bring the annual rental over the £100, the cost of the licence is 5s. per £50 or part thereof, so in addition to the rent increase these employees are saddled with this annual fee of 15s., just for signing a tenancy agreement with their masters. I regard that as an iniquitous additional charge.

Additional charges are also made to the occupants of these houses for certain additional facilities that they may require. For example, the extra charge for a bath heater and bath is 1s. a week. A wash-house, including a copper and trough, also adds 1s. a week. Until June 30 of this year a garage cost only 1s. 6d. a week extra, but since that date it has cost 2s. a week extra.

Mr. Ryan: That is for all time.

Mr. CURREN: Yes. Getting down to the real necessities around the house, sanitation dissolvinators, previously supplied for an additional charge of 6d. a week, will now cost 1s. 6d. a week. Septic tanks were previously 1s. a week extra, but now they will be 3s. a week extra. In the metropolitan area, if a person wants the toilet facilities connected to the sewer, he will have to pay 5s. a week extra.

Prior to June 30 of this year the extra charge was 2s. a week.

Mr. Ryan: Wouldn't that become a compulsory obligation on the landlord?

Mr. CURREN: I should have thought so.

Mr. Ryan: In other words, it is making the tenant pay the capital cost over a period.

Mr. CURREN: Yes, it would appear so. The Housing Trust, in its fixation of rents, always allows for all these amenities in the amount of the weekly rental, and I should be greatly surprised, if the fixations on these Government-owned houses were made by the Housing Trust, to learn that those facilities were not taken into account in the rent fixation.

We have heard on numerous occasions just how cheaply the Electricity Trust can supply power. In fact, we have always been led to believe that South Australia provided the cheapest power in Australia. I have had supplied to me by the engineer in charge of the District Council of Berri a set of figures from the account rendered to the council, which reticulates electricity purchased in bulk from the Electricity Trust. The council's account for March this year was £6,312 3s. 4d., calculated on 702,700 kilowatt hours at a rate of 1.6d., and a maximum demand charge of

17s. 6d. a kilowatt hour. The maximum demand was 1,860 kilowatts. For that same month, had the council been paying the charges that operate in New South Wales it would have paid only £5,226 1s. 6d., at a rate of .755d. per unit and a maximum demand charge of £1 13s. 6d. It can be seen, therefore, that the difference in favour of the New South Wales charges is £1,086 1s. 10d. This contradicts entirely the claims made by Government members and their supporters in other places that South Australia provides the cheapest electricity in Australia. I also have a set of figures for the month of June, worked out on the same basis, and in that month the difference would have been £1,183 17s. 11d.

I have dealt with many matters affecting the Chaffey district, and I know that other speakers are just dying to get on their feet to entertain members on both sides of the House. I will therefore conclude by supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.39 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 8, at 2 p.m.