

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Thursday, October 10, 1963.

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS.**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills: Amusements Duty (Further Suspension), Brands Act Amendment, Fruit Fly (Compensation), Supply (No. 2), Thevenard to Kevin Railway.

**QUESTIONS.****SITTINGS.**

**Mr. LAUCKE:** Can the Premier inform members of the Government's intention regarding sittings of the House next week?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD:** We are somewhat lagging in our programme with regard to the Estimates and the Government would be pleased if members would consider sitting next week on Tuesday and Wednesday nights until about 9.30.

**OUTER HARBOUR FACILITIES.**

**Mr. TAPPING:** I recently read in the press that the Minister of Marine had gone to Western Australia to observe at first hand harbour improvements, the handling of cargo, etc. I understand that Fremantle is regarded as one of the best harbours in Australia in this connection, and, having in mind the proposals for Outer Harbour, can the Minister say whether he found any modern methods in Western Australia that could be incorporated in Outer Harbour proposals?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON:** In company with members and officers of the Harbors Board I inspected the passenger terminal at Fremantle, which is indeed a fine terminal, and which I think provides adequately for the large number of passenger vessels that call there each year. From our inspection we formulated some general plans for a passenger terminal at Outer Harbour and for associated improvements and amenities there. I have discussed these ideas with the members and officers of the Harbors Board and plans are being developed according to the needs as we see them at present and in the future for an Outer Harbour passenger terminal. The ideas are taking shape and this week Mr. Moyses, Engineer for Development with the Harbors Board, is in Fremantle to go further

into the matter. When he returns our plans will be further considered.

The whole matter is one of deciding what is adequate for the present and future needs at Outer Harbour, as far as we can see them; what incentive such improvements would afford to shipping companies to make increased use of Outer Harbour as a calling point for their vessels; and to relate those needs to the cost of a proposal that would be effective, attractive, and suitable, and at the same time not place an undue burden on the taxpayers of the State. The project is going forward and plans are being submitted. When some firm basis has been arrived at the matter will be submitted to Cabinet and then, I have no doubt, to the Public Works Committee.

**DRIVING LICENCES.**

The Hon. B. H. **TEUSNER:** Can the Premier say whether consideration has been given in this State, in the interests of the motoring public and with the possibility of saving administrative costs, to issuing motor vehicle drivers' licences to be current for periods of one, two or three years? I understand that in Victoria motor vehicle drivers' licences are current for three years, and that in Queensland under certain circumstances they are issued to be current for 10 years, five years or one year.

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD:** This matter has been raised from time to time, and I am not sure that the long periods have proved popular. Licence fees do not come into the Treasury for ordinary revenue purposes, so there is no problem regarding the distortion of Treasury figures. I very much doubt whether the long periods are taken very much into account. However, I will make some inquiries and advise the honourable member.

**QUEEN MOTHER'S VISIT.**

**Mr. HUGHES:** No doubt the Minister of Education has read the many favourable reports of the recent schools' music festival held in the Adelaide Town Hall. One writer has raised the question whether the committee would be willing to arrange a similar concert in honour of the Queen Mother's visit next year. Will the Minister, as patron of the recent music festival, take this matter up with the Director and the committee with a view to approaching the Director of the Royal Tour on the subject this week?

The Hon. Sir **BADEN PATTINSON:** As the honourable member is aware, a very large choir from some of the secondary schools took

part in the last Festival of Arts, and it may be quite an innovation to have the choir from the primary schools. I shall be only too pleased to discuss the matter with the Director of the Royal Tour and also with my colleagues in Cabinet.

#### WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the Watervale water supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief reports that the original bore which was drilled in the centre of the township for the scheme proved a failure for, although a depth of 288ft. was reached, no water supply of any consequence was encountered. Approval was given to drill a second bore on an alternative site about 1½ miles north-west of Watervale, and the drilling of No. 2 bore commenced on October 1. The depth drilled to date is 32ft., and it is expected that drilling will be completed and the bore tested within three or four weeks. I can only express the hope that this bore will be more successful than the first one.

#### PORT PIRIE WEST SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works report on the progress of preparations regarding asphaltting of the schoolgrounds at the Port Pirie West Primary School, the survey work for which, I understand, has been completed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think that earlier I was obliged to inform the honourable member that the winter conditions had prevented the work from going ahead. Now that he has raised the matter again I will look into it and obtain a report for him next week.

#### HOUSING TRUST.

Mr. SHANNON: I was upset by the member for Gouger's attack upon the Housing Trust yesterday when he implied that it was intervening in local government affairs. I do not know whether or not I am correct in my assessment of the honourable member's remarks; although he did not mention any name, I assumed that he was referring to the Chairman (Mr. Cartledge). To my own knowledge, Mr. Cartledge has been called in for advice by people concerned in the area to which the honourable member referred, but I do not think he has ever intervened. That is the information that I have on the matter. I think that in the interests of the trust this matter should be cleared up, because I do

not think any of us is happy to have semi-governmental authorities, if one might put it this way, butting into affairs that are not their affairs. If the member for Gouger was right in his assessment that the trust was butting in, I think his comment was justified, but I do not think the trust was butting in. Will the Premier clear up this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As far as I know, the trust's policy has always been to support local government and, indeed, on many occasions local government has informed me that it has had great assistance in developing different areas through the trust's activities. The trust obviously desires that local government be effective in any area in which it is building houses, because this is important to it as the principal householder in the area. I did not hear the remarks referred to so I hesitate to comment on them; I do not know whether they referred to the agitation that has taken place from time to time in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area for a separation of Elizabeth from Salisbury.

I believe that the trust—I would not discriminate between Mr. Cartledge and the trust, as I think he would have expressed its views—considered at the inception of Elizabeth that advantages were to be gained by Elizabeth's being associated with a council that had some stability. I believe the trust's present view is that Elizabeth has now established itself on a permanent basis and that whether or not it has a separate council is a matter for self-determination. I do not think it has any views about whether it should be separated from Salisbury, as Elizabeth is now an established area capable of running its own council if it considers that its citizens feel they would be better off by doing so. I know it is the trust's policy to support local government, which I am certain that any honourable member who is connected with local government and who has had dealings with the trust would confirm. For instance, the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) is a member of a local authority, and I am certain he would confirm my statement that the trust is always anxious to play along with and support local government.

#### PORT AUGUSTA BRIDGE.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister of Works has some knowledge of the railway bridge at Flinders Terrace, Port Augusta, over which all traffic going to Eyre Peninsula, Western Australia and Woomera has to pass. Experience has shown that it is a dangerous bridge. This week another accident occurred there, and the

medical officer who was called to the scene said this was the sixth time in 18 months he had been called to accidents there. The Port Augusta Corporation has asked the road traffic authority to prepare plans for an island at, or traffic control over, the bridge. The corporation has been waiting for it for over 12 months; I am not quite sure how long but it is a considerable time. I have been asked to seek the good offices of the Minister in an urgent approach to the appropriate department to see when those plans will be ready.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes; I will do that.

#### FLINDERS RANGES.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on October 2 last about the availability of parking facilities on the new road that has been constructed to the television site at The Bluff, near Wirrabara?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was not sure about the ownership of the land in question, but the report I have deals with that and reads:

The area referred to by Mr. Heaslip, M.P. is shown on the accompanying prints and comprises portions of sections 4 and 16 in the hundred of Darling, portion of section 3 in the hundred of Howe and portion of Trigonometrical Reserve known as "The Bluff". The access road proposed to this area is a right of way through sections 4 and D in the hundred of Darling. The above area and right of way are in the process of being acquired by the Commonwealth (Department of the Interior) for television station site and access road (D.L. 5510/61). It is not known where a suitable area for a car park would be located but it is presumed that it would, of necessity, be sited in section 4 where the right of way ends. Section 4 is portion of forest reserve No. 2 under the control of the Woods and Forests Department. Access to the summit from this point could only be obtained through the land to be acquired by the Commonwealth. It is pointed out that the scenic road is a right of way proposed to be acquired by the Commonwealth for its own exclusive use and there is no suggestion that it will become a public road. It is understood that the road as constructed is very narrow and has a grade of approximately one in eight.

#### HAWKER WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Several weeks ago I received a letter from the Minister of Mines informing me that the Mines Department contemplated boring for water near Hawker township. Since then, the boring plant has been operating in that district and, to the best of my knowledge, two holes have been drilled. However, the

salinity of the water is such that it is not fit for human consumption. Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Mines, say whether the department intends to continue boring in this area in the hope of eventually finding good water? The Minister knows, as well as I do, that Hawker is in rather a precarious position: about a week's or a fortnight's water supply is left in the reservoir, and continued pumping will be necessary from the old bore.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member's question is hypothetical as he asks whether the plant will remain until a bore has been drilled that will give a suitable supply, but I am afraid that no-one with the best will in the world can answer that question. I was not aware that the two holes that had been drilled (according to the honourable member) had both produced, in effect, a negative result. I will get a report from the Engineer for Water Supply and inform the honourable member next week. The acute position at Hawker is well known to me and to the department. I do not know of any alternative means of giving the town a supply adequate to meet present and future needs, unless a reliable source of underground water can be discovered. That would be the best solution if it were available, and the department will persevere as long as there is a reasonable hope.

#### NARRUNG WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ascertain when the plan for the proposed water scheme to serve the Narrung district is expected to be completed, and when it will be available for submission to the people concerned for their consideration?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will get a report and inform the honourable member next week.

#### REID MURRAY HOLDINGS.

Mr. CURREN: Many constituents of mine, as well as those of other members, have been affected by the financial breakdown of Reid Murray Holdings. As I have received many inquiries as to the rights of debenture holders in any distribution of funds, can the Premier say what legal rights debenture holders have in this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some companies have debenture holders, and I believe their rights are graded so that they do not

have the same rights. Some debenture holders have a better or more preferential right than others. I cannot inform the honourable member now, but if he lets me have the names of the people for whom he wants the information, I will see whether I can find out what their classification is.

**GAWLER RAILWAY SERVICE.**

Mr. CLARK: For some months, while travelling to and from the city, I have been concerned to notice that Kudla, Tambelin and Para sidings on the Adelaide-Gawler line, each have a three-step wooden platform that is much too short for three-car trains. I have also noticed lately—and numerous complaints have been made to me—that passengers, particularly women with children in pushers, have great difficulty joining and alighting from the train. It has been suggested that some people are not using the train because of these difficulties. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Railways to see whether adequate platforms could be constructed at these three places?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

**SEWERS.**

Mr. FRED WALSH: During the debate on the Loan Estimates I referred to the provision of sewers in new housing areas, including Housing Trust areas. Has the Treasurer any information on this subject?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Engineer for Sewerage reports:

Sewers are being extended to serve new housing developments in all parts of the greater Adelaide area that are commanded by the sewerage system. These extensions are carried out under four types of approval:

- (a) Short extensions to serve new houses for individual home builders or owners. These are carried out under the annual financial provision for miscellaneous sewer extensions and extend to all outer suburbs.
- (b) Extensions to serve small group building schemes in individual subdivisions or in portions of large subdivisions are carried out under the financial provision for miscellaneous extensions. These schemes usually comprise sewers to serve up to 30 houses and the builder is required to pay all service fees before the sewer is laid. The prepayment of service fees is required as a measure of the builder's good faith to proceed with his project, and in the event of non-payment the provisional approval lapses after 60 days.
- (c) Sewers are extended to areas where a high degree of development has already taken place and where, in

most cases, development is still proceeding. A typical example of this is the large area of Brahma Lodge, near Salisbury, where some 200 existing houses will be sewered this financial year.

Other areas where private building development has taken place and for which sewers have been or are intended to be provided this financial year are: Mansfield Park, Ayton Estate, Kingston Park, Seaview Downs, Marion, Mitchell Park, Beaumont, Woodforde, Rostrevor, Stradbroke, Newton, Campbelltown, Klemzig, Felixstowe, Holden Hill, Strathmont, Gilles Plains, Beefaces, Highbury, Seacombe Park, and Darlington.

- (d) For the large development companies who require large areas sewered at one time, the department is not in a position to lay sewers following the payment of service fees, and in these cases the companies are required to enter into financial agreements to meet the full cost of both water supply and sewerage for their subdivisions, subject to a repayment of £200 for each house erected on their subdivisions during the five-year period following the laying of the mains. Most schemes carried out under this arrangement are in the Para Hills-Modbury area, where the department is at present proceeding with a large trunk sewer scheme to serve an area which will be developed by private companies and by the South Australian Housing Trust and in the Dernancourt area where a trunk sewer was extended along the northern banks of the River Torrens.

The major development schemes for which agreements have been executed are listed below; in some cases actual work on the site has not yet commenced:

	Allotments.
Reid Murray Development—Para Hills (1) . . . . .	1,047
Reid Murray Development—Para Hills (2) . . . . .	392
Lonora Limited—Para Hills . . . . .	100
Para Hills Estate Syndicate . . . . .	230
Rialto Limited—Para Hills . . . . .	270
Alan Hickinbotham Limited—Parafield . . . . .	80
Southern Securities Limited—Modbury . . . . .	450
A. V. Jennings Constructions Limited—Dernancourt . . . . .	120
Orlit S.A. Limited—Dernancourt . . . . .	120
Ocean Development Limited—Sema-phore . . . . .	120

**CROP PROSPECTS.**

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week concerning crop estimates for the forthcoming harvest?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Senior Agronomist of the Department of Agriculture reports:

Present indications are that a total cereal crop of about 100,000,000 bushels is likely to be reaped in South Australia this year.

Approximate production totals are: 60,000,000 bushels wheat; 30,000,000 bushels barley; and 10,000,000 bushels oats. Weather in the next two or three weeks will be critical—a useful general rain in the next week or so will ensure a yield as above—while continuing dry conditions could cause a reduction of 10% or more.

The Senior Agronomist told me that it was extremely difficult to forecast crop yields at this stage and he stressed the importance of weather conditions over the next few weeks, saying that they could result in a severe variation of actual yields if they were adverse.

#### BUSH FIRE PATROLS.

Mr. RICHES: I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on his statement concerning the bush fire danger during the forthcoming summer, which danger is a source of concern to people from one end of the State to the other. Can the Minister say whether thought has been given to providing a system of patrols in the danger areas and during the danger periods? Every summer the Bureau of Meteorology can forecast, a few days ahead, the heatwave conditions that cause the most concern about the danger of bush fires. I am convinced that most fires are caused by negligence and thoughtlessness and that a patrol could have an excellent effect. Even if it resulted in preventing only one or two fires the overall benefit to the State would be substantial.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I thank the honourable member for his remarks about the publicity. This is the responsibility of the Bush Fires Research Committee which, under the chairmanship of Dr. Melville, has worked effectively in imaginatively stressing the importance of fire precautions even before the danger season arrives. The clean-up work will be made known as widely as possible. At present patrolling is carried out by Emergency Fire Service units in some districts. The Woods and Forests Department mans fire-spotting towers on bad days. This is the quickest and most accurate known means of identifying fires. In addition, I know of areas where organizations and, in some instances, private citizens undertake patrol work. However, this is a subject directly related to the E.F.S. and I shall refer the

question to the Chief Secretary, under whose direction the E.F.S. comes, to obtain a report from the Director of the E.F.S., Mr. Kerr, which I shall let the honourable member have as soon as possible.

#### PARLIAMENTARY VACANCY.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: On September 3, as a result of a personal explanation I made concerning a press article that appeared in the *News*, you, Mr. Speaker, intimated that you would consider asking the Managing Editor of the *News* for a report on the incident. Have you a report?

The SPEAKER: Yes. I communicated with the Managing Editor of the *News* by letter, in which I set out the question the Leader had asked. I expressed my concern about the statements made in the House to the effect that Parliamentary reports were incorrect. I received a reply from the Managing Editor saying that the press report was based on information obtained outside of Parliament. I replied to that letter stating that the information contained in my original letter was based on happenings inside Parliament. He then rang me on the telephone and asked to have a conference with me, which he did. He informed me that he had every reason to believe that the information was correct, and that it was based on correct information he had received.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I think I can claim, Sir, that the reply you have given is not altogether in the best interests of all concerned. In what circumstances did the Managing Editor of the *News* make the statement to you that his information was obtained from either inside or outside of Parliament? The point with which we are concerned—and I admit this frankly—is to know where leakages are occurring. If leakages are not occurring inside of Parliament then all I can say is that there are some extremely imaginative brains on the newspapers of this State. As you were good enough to inquire into this matter, will you go further and try to ascertain from the Managing Editor the source from which he obtained the information on which he based the press report? I resented the article that appeared in the *News*, and so did my Party. I know that the Government did, too. Will you ascertain whence the Managing Editor obtained his information, or whether it was simply a matter of anticipation?

The SPEAKER: I will again take the matter up with the Managing Editor of the *News*.

## IRRIGATION PUMPING COSTS.

Mr. BURDON: The Electricity Trust operates a low tariff rate for irrigation pumping—a rate of 2.04d. a kilowatt-hour—between 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. Will the Premier take up with the trust the question of extending these hours to the period from 7 p.m. until 7 a.m.?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The low tariff is provided in the night because there is then no great domestic or industrial demand. If the plant were not used then, it would probably be idle. At that time there is a surplus capacity in the plant. It comes down to a question of whether the charges pay for the fuel content of the electricity. Charges can be low in off-peak periods. The additional two hours mentioned by the honourable member are probably peak hours when there is almost the highest demand of the day. However, I will obtain a report from the Chairman of the Electricity Trust who is more conversant with the matter than I am. I will submit the honourable member's question to him.

## RED STRINGY BARK.

Mr. SHANNON: I was particularly interested to hear the Minister of Lands say that a small stand of red stringy bark existed at Penwortham. This is a rare species of tree, which once occurred in the Adelaide Hills, although before my time. I have seen examples of its use for structural purposes. It was obviously durable. Some of the specimens I have seen are reputed to be over 100 years old, yet they are still in perfect condition. If seeds can be gathered from this small plantation at Penwortham this tree might be re-established in parts of the Adelaide Hills that come under the control of the Minister of Lands. Will he investigate this possibility?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: This is an interesting question. I shall be pleased to comply with the request. Present knowledge is that red stringy bark occurs in three places only in Australia. The honourable member said that it probably occurred originally in the Adelaide Hills, but it is now extinct there. It was with the object of preventing its extinction in Clare that a reservation of 15 acres was made under the authority of the commissioners of national park and wild life reserves. As far as is known the tree exists at Clare and in two areas hundreds of miles away in the Eastern States. It is thought that they are relics of flora that covered the whole of the continent from the Flinders Ranges to the

Blue Mountains, hence the urgency for their preservation, because, as in our hills, they could be rapidly depleted. It is thought that they date back to the time when the Leigh Creek coalfields were laid down, or some time after that when the land was a forest reserve. It is interesting to study these things and I thank the honourable member for the suggestion. I will give it to the Botanic Park authorities under Mr. Noel Lothian, the Director, who I am sure will be only too happy to undertake the work the honourable member requests.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have sought this leave because of a report, under a big heading, in this morning's *Advertiser*, relating to Parliamentary salaries and to the commissioners who were appointed to inquire into them. The report suggested that the Parliamentary Labor Party would make an early approach to the Premier on this topic and stated:

The deputation to the Premier, probably to take place next week, is the outcome of examination of the proposed new salary scale by Caucus.

I do not know of any meeting that is planned with the Premier to take place next week or any other week. We did agree to the appointment of a commission to inquire into salaries and other matters associated with the Parliament of South Australia. A report has been submitted to the Government and I have perused it. All I can hope for now is that the Government will give effect to the report, and I will support it.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FREE BUS PLAN.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Last week when asking a question I referred to a report which had appeared in the *Advertiser* and which was really a misreport of a question I had asked of the Minister of Education in that it had been attributed to the Leader of the Opposition. Again, a question I asked yesterday about a free bus service has been attributed

to "the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Walsh)". I am not complaining about the publicity given to the subject matter of the report, but I am concerned about the odium that may attach to one who has not asked a question but is reported as having asked it. As I do not want the Leader of the Opposition placed in that position, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to see that the *Advertiser* reporter takes particular note of those who ask the questions, particularly where the same surname is involved, as in this case.

The SPEAKER: I will ask the Leader of the *Hansard* staff, in co-operation with the press reporters, to look into that.

### THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand total, £103,306,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1003.)

### THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £13,900.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): Yesterday when I obtained leave to continue my remarks I was speaking in support of closer settlement by intense culture along the lower reaches of the River Murray. The matter deserves the Government's attention and I was pleased to have the friendly interjection from the Minister of Lands that the proposal seemed to present no difficulties. I have been advocating it for some time and I feel that shortly the seeds will start to germinate and we shall see the results of the agitation. It is not my brainwave because it has been frequently discussed by people in the lower reaches of the River Murray. We have seen much development on the banks of the river, particularly in relation to orchards, because of the advent of private irrigation schemes. We have seen it a little farther up the river from the district I represent. The most recent have been at Nildottie and Swan Reach, and the schemes are starting to prove their worth. Recently a new area at Mypolonga was developed by private people. It is still in its infancy but it will grow. I am more concerned about the growing of vegetables and other crops that rotate more quickly than orchards, of which we now have a number.

The population of South Australia is expected to double by 1990 and the people will need food. It is expected that Melbourne will become a larger city than Sydney and,

of course, Sydney will grow, so the people in those cities will have to be fed. With modern methods it is expected that food will be prepared much more easily than previously. Because of the way potatoes are handled, and the existence of diced and quick-frozen vegetables, it is much easier for the housewife to have supplies on hand. The area I have mentioned will become the food bowl of the metropolitan area and the Eastern States because of its geography, and the fact that the River Murray runs through it. It is a matter that cannot be stressed too often. Today we are looking for food to be better prepared to enable housewives to have more freedom in the afternoons to attend meetings and visit friends. Concentrated vegetables will become increasingly the order of the day. We have a cannery at Murray Bridge which has been processing fruit. This year it has been kept in production mainly because of our apple crop, and the failure of the Tasmanian apple crop. It has been instrumental in bringing about £1,000 a week in wages to Murray Bridge. The money has been spent in the area, with consequent prosperity.

The fruitgrowing areas in the lower reaches of the River Murray are not so extensive as in the upper reaches; nevertheless, there is a need for a processing plant there. It is hoped that the activities of the cannery will grow, with the assistance of a Government loan, to which matter I shall refer later. The operations of the cannery should continue for the full year. Some canneries operate for only a short period and then close, but their production is so great that they can carry the overhead charges. This is not so with the factory I have mentioned. It must process throughout the year. This year there would have been an excellent opportunity for it to process peas. In southern districts, particularly O'Halloran Hill and nearby country, there has been extensive pea growing. Because of the failure of the Foster Clark company and the growers losing much money last year, growing in the area ceased this season. There was an opportunity for the peas to have been processed at Murray Bridge. Representations were made to the Treasurer but circumstances were such that nothing could be done. A glorious opportunity was missed because pea growing in South Australia could be a useful industry, particularly as we import from other States most of our peas, canned and deep frozen. It is a pity that we do not have pea growing in the area, because it could be a profitable industry. It will be necessary for such a

cannery to go in for deep freezing and canning of vegetables, as well as the preparation of diced and other forms of concentrated vegetables, which are so handy for the housewife. The support of the Government will be necessary to put the scheme into operation, and with additional financial help it can be done.

The member for Whyalla referred to the matter of rents of Government-owned cottages. This was the subject of a debate earlier this session, and it was a matter which we as an Opposition considered was successfully debated. Members on this side contributed in such a manner to this debate that it surely must have convinced the Government that there was merit in our case. That effort, together with the representations of the Trades and Labor Council, to some extent accounted for the full increase being reduced to one-third, and the Treasurer has now stated that this will be reconsidered each year. However, I still maintain that these rents are excessive and an unjust burden on the wage earner, particularly as this rent increase absorbs almost all of the marginal increase for all railway employees, although only one-third of railway employees live in Government-owned houses.

The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) drew attention to the average cost and capital value of the houses. These present something of a contrast, and the figures as the honourable member has balanced them out seem to be extraordinary. We find that the average value quoted for Harbors Board houses is £2,744. I know that some of these houses which the employees occupy are not of a high standard, and therefore it must mean that some houses are quite elaborate, judging by the average valuation. In fact, to obtain an average of nearly £3,000 it must mean that some houses are valued at more than £5,000. The average figure is even greater for Highways Department houses—£3,790. We know that that department has built houses recently, but even the cost of those houses could not be very much more than that quoted average. Most of the houses are timber frame, and I do not think I would be far wrong if I said they were worth about £3,000 or £3,250. The average valuation of £3,790 seems to me to be very high.

The figure for rates and maintenance on Harbors Board houses is quoted at £203, and for interest and depreciation £138, giving a total figure of more than £6 a week. When one compares this type of house with a Housing Trust house (the valuation of the latter would be a little higher) it seems difficult to

believe that the figure for rates, maintenance, interest and depreciation would be £6 a week; in fact, I cannot believe that it is true, and I consider that they are figures merely plucked out of the air, as it were, and suggested to the Auditor-General for inclusion in his report. That figure of £6 a week seems to me to be ridiculous. The figure for the Engineering and Water Supply Department is quoted at an average of £4 a week; the Lands Department, £3 a week; the Railways Department, £3 a week; the Woods and Forests Department, £3 a week; and for the Highways Department, £5 a week. These figures are all far in excess of what one would expect for rates, maintenance, interest and depreciation. If these figures are correct, anyone thinking about letting houses as an investment would be well advised to keep right out of it. Those figures seem to be ridiculous. At the same time, we know that the Housing Trust, although it is charging only a little over £3 a week, is showing a profit. To me, these figures seem quite unrealistic. The argument advanced that the Government is showing a loss on the houses it owns seems rather absurd.

The interesting thing is that the average value of the houses owned by the Lands Department and the Railways Department is rather low: £1,500 in the case of the Lands Department and £1,453 in the case of the Railways Department. This is not surprising, of course, when we look at some of the houses the employees are expected to occupy in country areas. It appears that some of the better type houses are valued down to a particularly low figure, because on present-day values one would find it rather difficult to build a decent-sized shed on a block of land for £1,000. No doubt some of these departments' houses would be valued at less than that figure because of their disrepair, and these are the conditions under which employees are being forced to live. At the same time, the increases in rents were mostly applied to this type of house, and, in effect, the increased rental on this poorer type of house was more than 100 per cent in some instances. Some of the Railways Department houses at Tallem Bend were built of poured concrete in the early days of the depression (in 1932 and 1933) and were originally valued at £400. Surely in the 30 years since then these houses have been amortized over and over again, yet they are still being included in the overall figures as presented in the Auditor-General's Report. I still maintain that the Government was most unwise in increasing those rents when it did.

The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) referred to the lime deposits in his district. When I was in that district during the by-election campaign I noticed that the country there was similar to much of the country in my district. I saw much of the same low mallee and limestone country as we have around Murray Bridge, even though the rainfall on Yorke Peninsula is much better than it is in my district. Lime deposits and the exploration of those deposits seem to be in the news today, and limestone has become quite a useful industry. Agricultural lime is being processed successfully in the Murray Bridge district. Many people in the South-East need lime to neutralize the soil when they are sowing their pastures, and those people have found it of great benefit. The firm that has established this agricultural lime plant in Murray Bridge has been very successful because of the abundance of lime deposits in the area.

We have heard from the Government of the wonderful help given to country dwellers as a result of the reduction of electricity charges. The Treasurer has stated more than once that those charges are within 10 per cent of the city charges, and the Auditor-General's Report also deals with that topic. Last year, and the year before, the Opposition sought an equalization of country and city tariffs, and it was pointed out at that time that such a reduction in country tariffs would cost about £500,000. Opposition members then pointed out that that amount was very close to the profit made by the Electricity Trust in the previous year. When our request was rejected we were told that, if tariffs had been reduced, we would not have had the extensions in the country that we were enjoying. Extensions in country areas are financed mainly from Loan moneys, which are reimbursed to some extent by standing charges applied to consumers, who are, in effect, helping to purchase the mains, which they are happy to do so that extensions will be made. I give full credit to the trust for its fine efforts in taking power to the country, but the country tariff should be the same as that in the city.

It was said that the Government introduced a line on the Estimates to bring country charges down to within 10 per cent of city charges, but that was not so. During the Grey by-election campaign I was told by several people that they were paying well in excess of the 10 per cent. The man in charge of the electricity supply for Kimba told me that the current charges there were

1s. 7d. a unit for lighting, and for power, 1s. a unit for the first 300 units and 9d. a unit thereafter. The Government has provided a subsidy of 20 per cent; this amounts to £508 of the total cost of £2,541. The subsidy reduces the lighting tariff to 1s. 3.2d. and the power tariff to 9.6d. a unit for the first 300 units and 7.2d. thereafter. The city rate for single-unit tariff is 6d. a unit, which covers power and lighting, compared with 1s. 3.2d. This is for the first 40 units, and the rate then is reduced to either 4d. or 3d. a unit for the next 90 units, after which it is 2d. a unit. I do not know how it can be said from these figures that country tariffs are within 10 per cent of city tariffs, and my arithmetic agrees with this man's calculations. People are being misled by the statement that tariffs in country areas are within 10 per cent of city tariffs. Although Murray Bridge is much nearer Adelaide than is Kimba, the difference in tariffs at Murray Bridge is greater than 10 per cent, although not much greater. The statement about the 10 per cent difference is not true.

This year the Commonwealth Government introduced legislation to provide that pensioner patients in Government hospitals could have free treatment. Before this legislation was introduced they had to pay £3 a day and were subject to a means test in Government hospitals. This matter was discussed at a conference of subsidized hospital representatives, and it was agreed by all but two to make no charges for pensioners. The two hospitals that held out did so because they thought they could not afford to fall into line. The Mannum Hospital, which is in my district, was one of the hospitals that held out. I received a letter from the board of the hospital stating that it did not object to providing free treatment but that it considered it could not afford it. However, the other hospitals thought that the Government would help to pay for the treatment, which was a reasonable thought; they thought the subsidy would be increased so that any losses they incurred by providing free hospitalization to pensioners would be made up. However, I have perused the line relating to this matter in the Estimates and have read the Treasurer's statement made in moving the adoption of the first line, but I cannot find any sum on the Estimates as assistance to subsidized hospitals to provide for the extra expenditure that will be incurred in providing free treatment for pensioners. When the lines are being debated,

I shall ask the Treasurer a question on this matter, and I hope that he will have a reply.

In last year's Estimates £5,000 was provided for recreation areas and £10,000 was spent, but I am surprised to note this year that nothing is provided. I am not complaining that last year's expenditure by the Tourist Bureau exceeded the estimate, as recreation areas are an important necessity at the moment. However, when we are discussing the lines I should like the Treasurer to explain why this line has been deleted. There may be a good reason, but the deletion is confusing to me at the moment. I think the new Minister of Lands should be given credit for his efforts in acquiring land for recreation areas and open spaces. No doubt the Town Planning Committee's report and the efforts of the Junior Chamber of Commerce and other interested bodies, such as the National Fitness Council, have all played some part in bringing before the Government the need for more recreation areas and open spaces. It is pleasing to know that £62,000 is placed on the Estimates this year for this purpose. Extra land has been purchased already, and I commend the Minister for his interest in this matter and for conserving our flora and fauna. We have a heritage that we should preserve, and, with our rapidly developing country, we must develop more land. It is appreciated that the Minister has acted in this matter.

I notice, too, in the Auditor-General's Report and in the Estimates that money is being spent by the Agriculture Department this year on various forms of research at Northfield. I am particularly interested in the dairying industry. As I have said before, I believe the reclaimed swamps of the River Murray area are unique in Australia. They are proving most productive. In fact, I think that would be where the most successful dairying is being conducted at the moment in South Australia. Conditions there are somewhat different from those in other parts of the State. We know of the dairy research facilities to be set up at Northfield, but I believe there is a need for a research station somewhere along the River Murray in the reclaimed swamp areas. It would be a comparatively simple matter because an existing farm could be purchased and departmental officers could carry that on, even at a profit, which could greatly benefit the people operating in that area. There are about 20,000 head of milking cattle along the reclaimed swamp area which, in itself, provides a large industry and affects a number of other industries related to it.

One-third of the milk consumed in the metropolitan area is produced there. So there is a need for a farm to be set up along the reclaimed swamps—I do not care whether it is in my district or in the district of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). Wherever it is, we want something like that to provide for extra knowledge and research. It is needed in association with the conditions prevailing in that locality. I do not think it is too late to suggest this even though work is going on at Northfield. The time will come, whether I say it or whether others here say it, when just by natural resources it will have to come into being, but I think now is a good time for the Government to start thinking about this to see whether it is practicable.

I should like to add a word to what the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon by way of personal explanation of statements that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* relating to salaries for members of Parliament. The report included the following:

The deputation to the Premier, probably to take place next week, is the outcome of examination of the proposed new salary scale by Caucus.

It suggests that Caucus discussed this report yesterday at its meeting. I was present, as were other members of this Party, and there was no discussion of this whatsoever. As the Leader said, out of something that could have been thought, the figment of someone's imagination has run riot. I point that out in support of what our Leader said in his personal explanation. I support the first line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, too, support the adoption of the first line of the Estimates but, before I say anything more about that, I take this the first opportunity I have had since his death of saying in this place how very much I regret the passing of the late member for Stirling, Mr. W. W. Jenkins. I say that with very great sincerity. When I first came into Parliament in 1955, I sat next to Bill Jenkins and right up until the day of his death he was a true friend to me. That does not mean, of course, that he did not take me to task when he felt it was necessary—indeed, he did that in his last speech—but he always did it with such kindness and courtesy that nobody could possibly take any offence. I am deeply sorry that he is no longer with us.

I would, as a corollary to that like to congratulate the new member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) upon his election to Parliament. I am certain from what I know

of him that he will be a worthy successor to the late Mr. Jenkins.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: He had a good win.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I think all members of the Liberal and Country League in this State, whether members of Parliament or not, were delighted at that result. I note with some interest that opinion on the other side of the Committee and on the other side of politics about whether the new member's win was a good one or not has been rather divided because in the *Advertiser* of Monday, September 30, which was the Monday following the election, we read a comment from the Leader of the Opposition as follows:

It is a strong Government seat, but I thought we would do better.

However, the following day Mr. Nicholls, who I understand is the Secretary of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia, was reported in the *Advertiser* in the identical place (the right-hand column, front page) as saying that the A.L.P. was very pleased with the vote recorded by Mr. Stevens. Those are two diametrically opposite views on the election results—one from the Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party and one from—

Mr. Shannon: The campaign director.

Mr. Coumbe: Who was right?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On this occasion I have no doubt that the Leader of the Opposition was right because I know his deputy, the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens), said as much when handing out cards at Victor Harbour on the Saturday, that the Labor Party expected to get about 3,000 votes in that electoral district. I think that their candidate scored only about 2,200. Am I not right in that?

Mr. Jennings: Yes, you are right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I am about right. So on this occasion, if it is any help to the Opposition, I come down unhesitatingly on the side of its Leader. I always consider that the debate on the first line of the Estimates should be a debate on general financial matters, leaving the detailed consideration to the debates on the lines. That is probably the most profitable way of tackling the financial work in this Committee. I point out respectfully that it is only during the debate on the lines that one can even hope to get a reply to the various matters raised, and even then sometimes that hope is vain.

Mr. Clark: We have been hoping and hoping; I think "hope" is the key word.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We shall see how we get on. Working on that principle, I propose to bring forward in this general debate on the first line only two matters. The first of them is, I suggest, one of overwhelming importance to all members of this Committee, to all South Australians and, indeed, to every Australian. Yet, so far as I know, in the present debate it has been mentioned only once: that was by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), and then not much more than incidentally. I refer to the financial relationship between the Commonwealth Government and the six State Governments. Members can have their own opinions on this, although I cannot see how other opinions can differ from mine on this matter, but as every year passes the financial position of the States compared with the Commonwealth grows weaker. The fact is that a federal system of government cannot possibly work unless both Commonwealth and State Governments have a substantial degree of independence, one of the other. I suggest, after due consideration, that this position no longer exists in Australia. After examining the Treasurer's Estimates we find what has been found for many years. The estimated receipts for the current financial year to June 30, 1964, total £102,814,000. Where is the money to come from? Nearly £14,000,000 will come from State taxation; a little over £48,000,000 from public works and services; a little under £1,000,000 from territorial (sale of land, etc.); and from the Commonwealth Government nearly £40,000,000. In other words, substantially over one-third of the State's income in the current financial year, and indeed in all years since I have been here, comes directly from the Commonwealth Government. That figure is, of all figures in the Budget, the most significant, because it shows—

Mr. Riches: It is really only taxation collected on our behalf.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but disbursed to us by an outside body. This Government does not collect that taxation (and it may well regard that as an advantage), but neither does it have control over its own purse. Without this financial assistance from the Commonwealth the administration of this and every other State in the Commonwealth would be crippled. In spite of the disbelief on the face of the member for Enfield, which is always there when I am speaking, I know that he and all members on the other side of the Committee

must agree with me. I am sure that this position will become more and more accentuated as years go by unless something is done about it, until only the form, only a facade or husk, of a federal system remains in Australia. We will find that greater and greater power is concentrated in Canberra: unification, in other words. That process has been masked in this State in the last few years for two reasons. The first is the personality of the Treasurer. I do not quite know what the proper participle is—

Mr. Clark: We could tell you over here.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What I am going to say would be more accurate.

Mr. Clark: Or would be different.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going to say he has bestridden the public life of this State and the Commonwealth like a colossus for the last 25 years, and, on whichever side we may be, we are very proud of him. He has been able to fight effectively for the State's interests, and has been able to get substantially what he wants for South Australia.

Mr. Jennings: Rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: "Rubbish" says the member for Enfield, whistling in the dark, but the Treasurer can do and has done these things. However, we cannot, in the nature of things, expect that position and the Treasurer to continue indefinitely. The time must come when we no longer have him here. That is the first reason why this process has been masked for us South Australians. The second is the fact that the Liberal and Country Party coalition Government in Canberra is more sympathetic to the federal system than a Labor Government would be. When those two factors are removed, I suggest that we as Australians are in for real constitutional trouble. The process by which the importance of the States, both their Parliaments and Governments, is declining is inevitable under our present financial arrangements, and my assessment is that it is something accepted by most people both inside and outside Parliament.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Can you suggest a remedy?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot, but if the Minister bears with me I shall comment on it in due course.

Mr. Riches: Do you think South Australia is more sympathetically dealt with now than when the Chifley Government was in power?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have said what I have to say about the relations between the Commonwealth and the State Governments.

Mr. Coumbe: We get much more money now than we did then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. It seems to me that members are doing their best to help me with my speech.

Mr. Riches: You can do better than that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going on to say, before the member for Stuart butted in, that I raised this matter during the debate on the Budget in 1960, and on that occasion my remarks to the same effect caused hardly a ripple in this Committee. Only one other member even referred to the matter after I had spoken.

Mr. Jennings: Have any of your speeches here caused a ripple?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sometimes I think they may cause an inconsequential one. As I said, only one member referred to the matter, and that was the present Minister of Lands, who was an Independent member sitting on the other side of the Committee. He told me then that I was a Conservative because I had said these things. In those days, we used to hear a good deal of robust common sense from the Minister by way of interjection, and we are glad he is now sitting on this side. That was the only comment I received on my speech, yet it is the financial problem that faces the States. In January last the member for Light and I went to Canberra for the Institute of Political Science's summer school.

Mr. Clark: Were you speakers or listeners?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We did a bit of both.

Mr. Freebairn: My colleague was a most effective speaker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The theme was "Forces in Australian Politics". It was noticeable that everyone, no matter from which State or whether a State or Commonwealth Parliamentarian, or not a politician at all, assumed the primacy of the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. Jennings: Did you cause one of those inconsequential ripples there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Mine was the still, small voice raised in defence of the present federal system. Again, and the member for Light will tell honourable members if he does not agree, it did not evoke one sympathetic reply. That shows the outlook

that we are coming to accept in Australia today. Why have I raised this matter again? I believe that it is a problem that we on this side of the Committee cannot ignore. The Australian Labor Party has a settled policy on this matter, and knows what it is. It is set out in its federal platform: it is to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers, and with the duty and authority to create States possessing delegated constitutional powers. On the other hand, members of the Liberal and Country League believe in the federal system of government. I regret the passing of the federal system and the imbalance that uniform taxation legislation, introduced by Dr. Evatt when he was Attorney-General, has caused to constitutional arrangements. However, we cannot live on regrets; we must accept the facts of life and make the best of them. Members of the L.C.L. must accept the facts as they find them and make up their own minds on what to do about them. Nothing would be worse, more wasteful, or more frustrating for Australians than to go on drifting and trying to use machinery that is totally obsolete and unsuited to today's conditions.

Mr. Riches: What is your solution to section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is a pretty good red herring. If the honourable member cares to pay me a fee and come to my office I shall give him professional advice on the section.

Mr. Jennings: It would not be worth it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My fee would make it worth while.

Mr. Clark: To whom?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: To me. However, I do not wish to be drawn into a discussion on that matter. I say with sincerity to members, especially on this side, that it is time some thought was given to this problem because it must be faced fairly and squarely as time goes on. Although it is of overwhelming importance, members choose to ignore it.

I shall now refer to the report by the Clerk of the House (Mr. G. D. Combe) following his visit overseas. I believe that all members would agree that it would be discourteous if it were not mentioned at some time because it has been laid on the table. Probably all members have read or, at least, looked through the report. Besides describing the procedures at Westminster (where Mr. Combe spent three months) and contrasting them with our procedures, the report makes several recommendations and I believe it contains much information of great value to

members. This is only to be expected when one knows the author of the report. When an officer of an organization is sent overseas it is to be hoped that the visit will be beneficial, not only to the officer, but also to his organization. I am certain that Mr. Combe's experience overseas will be of great benefit to Parliament.

Part XI of the report sets out the recommendations under five headings, the first four dealing with matters that can best be considered by the Standing Orders Committee. At long last this committee is to meet and I am sorry that it has taken the Speaker so long to arrange a meeting because it seems unlikely that any recommendations will now be made this session. However, I hope that when it meets next Tuesday it will consider the recommendations (especially the first four) made by Mr. Combe in his report. I hope, as I did when I asked a question of the Speaker, that the committee will consider the revised Standing Orders of the House of Representatives in Canberra because, although I would be the last to suggest their adoption without consideration, I believe it is always profitable to see how a similar body conducts its business.

I suggest that the fifth recommendation in the report could not be properly considered by the Standing Orders Committee because, in effect, it concerns a public accounts committee for this Parliament. On page 63 of his report, Mr. Combe says:

In my opinion, Parliamentary control of public finance will remain incomplete until the House of Assembly appoints a committee with functions similar in principle to those of the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons.

In 1959 the late Leader of the Labor Party (Mr. O'Halloran) moved that this Parliament should have such a committee. On that occasion I opposed the motion and voted against it on a division. I think that I am of that opinion still, but not, if I may say so with great respect, for precisely the same reasons as those advanced by the Treasurer in answer to a question last week.

I believe that members of this Parliament are not capable, for two reasons, of forming such a committee. First, the House of Assembly consists of only 39 members, nearly all of whom are members of one committee or another. As there are only 24 hours in each day extra work cannot be undertaken by members as Parliament is at present constituted. Secondly, with the exception of the honourable member for Stirling, I believe that no member of the House of Assembly has accountancy

qualifications and if a public accounts committee is to function properly it seems obvious that one or two of its members, at least, should possess accounting qualifications so that its investigations may be of value. The two reasons I have given represent, to me, a fatal objection to the establishment of a public accounts committee in this Parliament at present. However, so many Parliaments have such a committee that this recommendation should be examined carefully before it is thrown out of the window.

Mr. Hall: The same argument applies to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Jennings: You always say that the Treasurer is one of the best Treasurers but he has no accounting qualifications.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It would not be appropriate for a Minister to be included in such a committee; it must be made up of back bench members from both sides.

Mr. Clark: That was not the point of the interjection. Isn't the Treasurer capable of conducting financial affairs without his having accounting qualifications?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is saying that accounting qualifications do not matter?

Mr. Clark: They need not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On that point I am afraid we differ, because I believe that accounting qualifications should be held by some members of a public accounts committee.

Mr. Shannon: Have you looked at the composition of the Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What would I find?

Mr. Shannon: A paucity of public accountants.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Wasn't Professor Bland a member of that committee? I think he is a political scientist.

Mr. Casey: You say it would be highly desirable for these people to have some knowledge of accountancy?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Without reflecting on any member personally, I believe that to be effective a public accounts committee would have to have some members with accounting qualifications.

Mr. Hall: Would there be a public servant under the direction of members?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think a public servant would be the last person to be a member of a public accounts committee, to delve into the accounts of departments.

Mr. Shannon: In other words, to stand in judgment on his own administration.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; the person with accounting qualifications would have to be completely disinterested.

Mr. Hall: This is a reflection on all secretaries of departments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nonsense! The member for Gouger has misconstrued my comments.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You could have an outside accountant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If we did, he would not be a member of Parliament. Members on both sides are rapidly talking me out of my objection. What I did think members on the other side might say to help me on this point was that we should increase the size of Parliament.

Mr. Coreoran: Exactly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member for Millicent is prompting me, perhaps I might suggest that he should be anxious to support the legislation to be introduced later this session to increase the size of the House of Assembly. That may get over the only objection I have to a public accounts committee.

Mr. Riches: Will you support it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not seen it yet. Before we got on to this interesting diversion, during which a valiant attempt has been made to talk me out of my objection to a public accounts committee, I was going to refer members to the pages in Mr. Combe's report describing the activities and organization of the Public Accounts Committee in Britain. That is a valuable source of information. I should also like to mention one thing which, strangely enough, was not mentioned during the debate in 1959 on this matter: during the living memory of some members in this Chamber—in 1933 to wit—a Government Bill was introduced by the then Premier of the day to set up a public accounts committee.

Mr. Clark: You know what happened to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It passed the House of Assembly.

Mr. Clark: But!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes: upstairs, disaster.

Mr. Clark: Did you say upstairs was a disaster?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I said the Bill came to disaster.

Mr. Jennings: Upstairs is the disaster.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On that occasion Mr. Butler said:

Practically every House of Parliament in the British Empire has at some time or other appointed a public accounts committee, so that it will be agreed that there must be some advantages in the system.

Then he referred to the position in Britain and said:

On occasions members in this House have explained to me how extremely difficult it has been for them to review the ordinary Budget figures and their difficulty in making comparisons with previous years . . . A small committee representing members, which will report every year, will not only lead to members taking a greater interest in future in the financial affairs of the State, but will also keep them better informed of the real position. That Bill passed the Assembly without a division: it was passed unanimously. That shows pretty clearly the importance of considering a public accounts committee although, as I have said before, I think that at the moment we are not equipped, as a House of Parliament, to maintain one.

Mr. Loveday: It shows the frustrating effect of an Upper Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that. I was too young then to be frustrated by the Upper House.

Mr. Riches: Why did they oppose it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know.

Mr. Riches: There were 46 members then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When we have 40 to 42 members we may be big enough. I raise this matter in Committee because I do not believe that we, as a Committee, give close enough attention to the details of the Estimates. Theoretically we do, but do we, in fact, in practice? I think there are reasons why we do not: first, this Committee is a large one—there are 38 members including your honoured self, Mr. Chairman; secondly, the atmosphere for unhurried discussion and consideration is often conspicuously absent; thirdly—and I say this with great respect to the front bench—it is sometimes not easy to make Ministers yield the information that private members require during the Budget debate; fourthly, there is no opportunity in this Committee to call and examine witnesses from departments or elsewhere; and fifthly—and I know members opposite will support me at least in this one—the Auditor-General's Report is usually received just as the debate is beginning. To do that document justice requires many hours of study and it is not easy for members of

Parliament to fit in the work required to get the most out of the Auditor-General's Report.

This year in his report the Auditor-General has raised, I think, 19 matters that he considers call for redress. He says in what I suppose is the letter or dedication to the Speaker and the President:

In certain departments I consider that there is insufficient control exercised to ensure that capital works are carried out at the lowest possible cost necessary to provide adequate facilities.

Mr. Lawn: Are you supporting the appointment of a public accounts committee?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member has unfortunately missed most of the pearls that I have cast before him. I shall supply him with a *Hansard* pull tomorrow morning. Having raised this matter and having referred to the matters which the Auditor-General has raised in his report, I shall be interested to see how many of these matters are debated in detail on the lines of the Estimates, how we get on with those that are and, finally, what is done to remedy the matters raised. I have now finished the two points I wanted to raise as a general topic on the first line. I hope that we shall have ample opportunity, in respect of the fears I have expressed, during the debate on the lines to go into detail on the Estimates. If we do not, then, of course, what I have said about a public accounts committee will be underlined by the lack of attention that we give to these matters. I hope that will not be the case. I support the first line.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): My remarks will be relevant and confined to the Financial Statement. It has caused me considerable concern and dismay that some of my esteemed colleagues' remarks have not been relevant during this debate, but my concern has been somewhat allayed by the fact that the member for Mitcham's speech was not particularly relevant to the Financial Statement. I had to listen to him. A couple of his statements were, I thought, indicative of his general attitude.

Mr. Clark: He is well to the right of the Tories.

Mr. JENNINGS: Only one thing stops him from supporting slavery: the fact that he was born a couple of hundred years too late. As an indication of his tolerance, on one occasion he said, "I cannot see how his view would be any different from mine" and, later, "Honourable members must agree with everything I have been saying." These statements indicate the honourable member's attitude to matters that affect the political life of this

country. However, I was rather astonished in one way. Realizing that recently he had a serious contretemps with the Premier and Cabinet, on which I supported him—and his views then expressed were such that most of us agreed with them—I was amazed today to note that he was joining the gang of nodders. I do not mean “yes” men; I mean the nodders. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), of course, always takes first place as the principal back-scratcher. I must admit, however, that the former member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) was better, but members know where it got him—into the wilderness. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) in an otherwise good speech said, in effect, that we only live because the sun shines on Tom Playford. We have had a similar sentiment expressed today by, of all people, the member for Mitcham. As I am a close and honoured friend of his and give him advice, I say to him, “Don’t worry about your political future. You do not need to praise the Premier because the time is coming when you are going to be more popular by opposing the Premier than by supporting him.”

Mr. Millhouse: The only thing wrong with that is that I believe in giving praise where praise is due.

Mr. JENNINGS: In that case I only wish the honourable member’s judgment were better.

Mr. Shannon: When are you coming back to the text you started with?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am going to be completely relevant and discuss the Financial Statement. I draw attention to some Liberal Party propaganda recently published in the press.

Mr. Nankivell: There is money in this, too!

Mr. JENNINGS: In the Liberal Party commentary published last Saturday—

Mr. Clark: Do you read that?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not usually bother to read it, but I did on this occasion because the heading intrigued me: “7,000 Voted Wisely”. I know that one cannot be absolutely accurate in these things but surely one can be reasonably accurate. Not 7,000 people voted. I have the official figures which reveal that 6,684 people voted.

Mr. Bockelberg: There was a City Council election on the same day.

Mr. JENNINGS: Only 6,684 people voted. I think it is indisputable that 4,089 voted

unwisely; 2,273 obviously voted very wisely for Mr. Stevens; the 258 who voted for Mr. Nettle voted unwisely—in fact, I think I would rather have seen them vote for the present member—

Mr. McAnaney: Thank you!

Mr. JENNINGS: The 64 people who voted informally just wanted their names scratched off the roll.

Mr. Clark: They did not fancy any of the field!

Mr. JENNINGS: The commentary stated:

Last Saturday some 7,000 voters living in the Stirling electorate expressed the view of the people of South Australia when they overwhelmingly voted for the L.C.L. candidate, thus securing the Playford Government in power. The figures are as inaccurate as the article: 7,000 people allegedly expressed the view of all South Australians.

Mr. Lawn: They did not express my view.

Mr. JENNINGS: Nor mine.

Mr. Ryan: Nor that of the majority of people in South Australia.

Mr. JENNINGS: The article continued:

By not voting for Mr. McAnaney they could have turned out the Government, but they wisely chose the L.C.L. political line and emphatically rejected an A.L.P. Socialist Government.

Mr. Lawn: Did they advertise for any members in that article?

Mr. JENNINGS: The article also stated:

People all over South Australia followed the result with interest, for the people of Stirling could have changed the political destiny of this State by voting for the Independent or Labor candidates.

Certainly they could have, and I think they should have, but I believe it is wrong that a seat in which there is an effective vote of fewer than 7,000 should be in a position to change the political destiny of a State. We know that well over 50 per cent of the people have already decided that they do not want the present Government. It is only the rigged electoral system—which my honourable friend the member for Adelaide sometimes describes as a “gerrymander”—that keeps the Government in office. We believe—and we have strong grounds for believing—that the vote in the Stirling by-election was a severe censure of the Government.

Mr. Shannon: You are at odds now with your Leader.

Mr. JENNINGS: No. He is not my master. He is the Leader of my Party because a

majority elected him to be Leader, and I give him my support as such. I was saying that the vote in Stirling was a severe censure of the Government. If we apply it to the general Party vote we see that in the last Senate vote—

Mr. Coumbe: Here it comes.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think it is the only way in which we can arrive at a complete Party vote, rather than bring personalities into it. Only slightly more than 1,500 people in the district voted for the Labor Party in the Senate election, whereas in the by-election 2,273 voted for the Party.

Mr. Shannon: Earlier it did not promise £200,000 to be spent in the district.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that is an ill-advised interjection. I am now going to refer to an advertisement that has been referred to already.

Mr. Shannon: Read it. It is jolly good stuff.

Mr. JENNINGS: Can the honourable member take it all? I can't. I know the advertisement cost £252.

Mr. Lawn: Is it paid for yet?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think they need to pay for it. It cost £252 for sure. It was designed in a way that would mislead the people into thinking that it was not an advertisement. It was put in an obscure position in the paper.

Mr. Shannon: It was at the top. Is that an obscure position?

Mr. JENNINGS: Usually the advertisement is put at the bottom but this one was put at the top in the left-hand corner in an obscure fashion. I wonder whether the few members on the other side who have a conscience are now feeling their consciences troubled by what I am saying.

Mr. Coumbe: What are you saying?

Mr. JENNINGS: I will come to it soon.

Mr. Coumbe: Is it relevant?

Mr. JENNINGS: I said I would speak to the Budget. In the advertisement in the paper Sir Thomas Playford said:

In the current financial year the Liberal and Country League State Government plans spending just over £103,300,000—a record expenditure for any year. Later in the advertisement there was the following:

Our timber industry, located mainly in the South-East, has also achieved remarkable progress. Government forests constitute a most valuable asset, having already returned far more than their cost and promising much greater returns in the future.

The forests in the South-East were started by a Labor Government. On the same page there appeared the following statement by Sir Philip McBride:

We should always understand what we are aiming at.

That is sound advice. Then he said:

I do not hold with the old slogan in England "Your Party, right or wrong", but I do believe you want to know where your Party is right, and where the other Party is wrong.

It must be the other Party that is wrong.

Mr. Clark: Strictly speaking, it means the same thing.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. There was some reference today to the visit overseas by the Clerk of the House of Assembly. One of the important attributes of the British Parliamentary system is that the Opposition and the Government sit on opposite sides of the House, so members know that members opposite to them are wrong. In other Parliamentary systems there are circular Chambers, so members there cannot be sure who is right and who is wrong. I think it may have been more relevant if instead of putting in the statement by Sir Philip McBride they had put in a statement Mr. Geoff Gerard made earlier this year. Members do not need me to remind them that Mr. Gerard is a former State President of the Liberal Party, and a former President of the Chamber of Manufactures in South Australia. He said:

Australians will have to get used to the idea that there will always be about 70,000 or 80,000 people out of work.

This gentleman said that the people of Australia must get used to it and acknowledge it. I think that, if the Liberal Party wanted the public to know that, they should have put it in instead of the fatuous statement by Sir Philip McBride. There were some further inaccuracies. In another advertisement there was the following:

Join the Liberal and Country League now. Here are the main aims of the Liberal and Country League: the preservation of government whose members are free to criticize or to differ without penalty.

Mr. Loveday: There is silence.

Mr. Shannon: We do not want to name one or two men who were booted out of your Party, but there is one of them here.

Mr. JENNINGS: I appreciate the number of interjections I am getting. I must draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the member for Onkaparinga is referring to the present Minister of Lands. He says the Minister was expelled from the Labor Party, but that is not true, and the Minister knows it. He resigned. He had to! I admit that I am glad he did. What happened was that the honourable member was suspended. That suspension would have resulted in his continuity of membership being broken, which would have rendered him ineligible for endorsement, so he resigned.

Mr. Shannon: The same as poor old Cyril Chambers.

Mr. JENNINGS: I return to this advertisement.

Mr. Clark: What became of Mr. Travers?

Mr. JENNINGS: He was one of the best members we have ever had, but he did not suit the Establishment, and as a consequence he did not get his endorsement. The advertisement continued:

Join the L.C.L. There is a branch in your electorate.

I am aware that my colleague, the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens), knows that there is no branch in Hindmarsh. I keep my ear reasonably close to the ground in Enfield, and I know there is no branch there. I do not think there is any branch in Port Adelaide.

Mr. Fred Walsh: There are several in mine, but they are not very effective.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, there are several in West Torrens. We know that in the few branches the Liberal Party has the members are sometimes transported from one place to another when they cannot get a quorum. The advertisement continued:

What are the Party aims? Freedom of the individual—

I think we all agree that that is most important—

Free enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that militates more against free enterprise or private enterprise than the policy that is condoned by the Government sitting opposite. It allows restrictive trade practices.

Mr. Law: They call that free enterprise.

Mr. JENNINGS: It supports monopoly capitalism, which is the very antithesis of free enterprise. The members of the Liberal Party, not only through their direct association with big business but through their association

with trade associations, do everything they possibly can—perhaps not deliberately, but they condone it—that is completely opposite to free enterprise. I think the only genuine supporter of free enterprise is a Socialist. A capitalist is not a supporter of free enterprise, nor, indeed, is a Communist. I think a democratic Socialist of the type that we on this side all are is the only genuine advocate of free enterprise. The advertisement goes on to say that Loan money helps all. This is a mighty peculiar statement to put in a Party advertisement. The impression intended to be given is that the Government is giving the money to the people, whereas we know that the people are paying it all, anyway.

The advertisement went on to speak of the coming year being a year of contemplated record expenditure of Loan money by the State Government, and it listed the details. I would be advised by you on this matter, Mr. Chairman, but I do not think it is right to say that the State Government votes money. I believe it is the State Parliament that votes the money, and the Parliament at present, as we all know, is comprised of the same number of members on this side as on the other side. Indeed, we know that the only reason the members of the Liberal Party are not sitting over here and we are not sitting opposite is that one supposedly uncommitted member consistently gives his casting vote in favour of the Government.

I now wish to make some further relevant comments on the Budget. I was interested last night to hear the Premier say that he had now decided—and that is the end of it: the Premier has decided—that deserted wives, unmarried mothers, and other people in straitened circumstances would be eligible for additional State relief to the extent of up to £3 a week under a revised benefits scale. It is interesting that not much about this subject was said in this place during a debate on a Bill on this very matter. I think this indicates the position about which I now wish to comment. I have waited until the Premier returned to this Chamber. I know, of course, that he will not take any notice of me, but I want to make my comments in his presence as they concern government of this State through ADS Channel 7 and radio station 5 AD. I remember once when I was a member of a deputation to the Premier and we were discussing with him the then current and sad position of fires in temporary houses. It was on a Wednesday, apparently, and admittedly

Parliament was not in session at the time. We made our point, and the Premier said—as he customarily does when one sees him on a deputation—“All right, I will refer this matter to Cabinet.” Can anyone imagine the Premier referring anything to Cabinet? Cabinet is the Premier, and the Premier is the Cabinet. We knew that was the usual brush-off, so out we went. That night over station 5 AD (this was before television) the Premier said he had already arranged for the abolition of temporary houses. While we were seeing him, that had already been arranged.

Many times things should have been announced to this Parliament but they have not been announced. The Leader of the Opposition has often asked an important question about State matters and has received a vague and nebulous answer from the Premier, only to read in the *Advertiser* next morning that the information was available. This information should have been given to Parliament. Recently the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) asked a question about his district; he did not get a reply, but a reply was given over ADS 7 that night. The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) asked a question during, I think, the Loan Estimates debate, only to find that a reply had already been given over ADS 7. I suppose that, because of the honourable member's natural and understandable revulsion to watching the Premier on television, he did not watch the telecast and, in any case, it was a night when Parliament was in session. Despite this, the Premier still did not give the honourable member the information he required; he wanted to have the headlines in the *Advertiser* the next day.

Mr. Clark: They were there!

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes; they always are. Although we do not particularly like the Premier in many ways, he appreciates genuine talent, and in consequence of that he must like me, as he told me he would mention me over ADS 7.

Mr. Clark: Is that a compliment?

Mr. JENNINGS: Sometimes I wonder.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I did a very good job with you, if I may say so.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes; the Premier was quite wrong. He said I had raised a matter a few weeks before, but it was 18 months before. I thought it could be only one of two things, so I thought I would get in first for once and beat ADS 7 to it. I thought I would go on with the second thing if the first did not prove right but, because of my natural

political sagacity, I picked it in one. In the Premier's reply in Parliament he said that the answer he was going to give would please me. I was entitled to the answer here; not only was I entitled to it, but Parliament was entitled to it. However, it had to go over the telecast. I wish all people in South Australia would watch ADS 7 every Wednesday night, or whenever it is, as Labor would be tremendously assisted politically if they did. Television is an effective way to bring someone into one's sitting room, and I think people would have to know the Premier only as well as we know him and we would not have to spend nearly so much money as we do in fighting elections. The unfortunate thing is that we know the script is given to the *Advertiser*, and those who cannot countenance watching the Premier on television read about his statements in the press the next morning and say, “Good old Tom; he's done it again.” As a Parliamentarian—and I know your great respect for the institution of Parliament, Mr. Chairman—I sincerely believe that it is absolutely contemptuous of this Parliament for the Premier to behave in this way. I hope that for the few brief and fleeting months he will remain Premier and Treasurer of this State he will for the first time be considerate to Parliament, which, after all, because of its gerrymandered composition, has been very good to him. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I have been different from some members and have spoken relevantly. I support the first line.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): In the short time I have been a member it has seemed to me that members opposite practically collapse from physical exhaustion caused through slapping the Treasurer on the back and praising him. It is a good opportunity for some who on occasions have got off side to square off.

Mr. Lawn: We saw that today, didn't we?

Mr. McKEE: Yes, there were two good examples today. However, good luck to them, because it is nice to know that they have an opportunity to get out of trouble. When the Treasurer was presenting this Budget he told us that secondary industry was continuing to expand satisfactorily in South Australia. He said that the number of factories was now nearly 6,000, but he omitted to say that most of these industries were established in the metropolitan area. I agree that when people migrate to the city work has to be created for them, but I am sure that most people would prefer to remain in the towns where they were

born and bred. However, they have no choice, and instead of breaking up their families they decide to move to the city so that the family unit can remain intact. I suggest that members opposite should take stock of this position, particularly at Strathalbyn.

I was at Strathalbyn for a brief time before the Stirling by-election and I know that business people there are far from happy about the situation. My remarks apply also to people who have children of school-leaving age. These people are most concerned at the thought of having their families broken up at an early age. If the Government wishes to hold the Stirling district it should give immediate attention to the needs of the people in that district and supply work for the young people so as to keep families together. After all, it is the responsibility of a responsible Government to see that employment is provided for people so that their families can remain together. If members opposite study the by-election figures in relation to Strathalbyn, they will realize that what I have said is correct. So I suggest that the Government look at the position. Otherwise, the place will become a monument to the Playford Government in the way of a ghost town. We must realize, too, that not only is decentralization important for the development of the State; it is also important from a defence point of view. We should be mindful that, if an enemy wished to occupy Australia, all that would be needed would be a few atomic bombs dropped on the five capital cities. The honourable member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) will agree with that. That could create such destruction and confusion that the way would be completely open for the invaders. Commonwealth and State Governments should be made to face up to their responsibilities as leaders. They should take all steps necessary to safeguard Australia and its people.

Most people will agree that the greatest challenge facing us today is the future of our nation. Australia lies in the eastern world and the challenge that presents itself is whether we can survive as an independent nation in the face of the rapidly increasing populations of our neighbours. We all know that the history of mankind is largely the story of an interminable struggle for food and raw materials, and hungry people naturally will demand subsistence for their families. If it is not obtainable in their own countries, they are inevitably forced to try to take it from others who have more than they need.

The challenge to us today is that of a small community of 11,000,000 people in the most sparsely populated country in the world. Our most urgent need is population of the right type for reasons of development and defence. It is essential that we populate the country as rapidly as the economy will permit. To do this effectively, consideration must be given to some changes. Closer settlement would attract immigrants and would certainly be a most effective way of bringing about decentralization.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you think that our immigration would be sufficient?

Mr. McKEE: It should be stepped up but we have to provide employment for them and to do that some changes must take place. Many people in Australia will, of course, say that South Australia at least does not lend itself to closer settlement because of lack of water. I agree that this is a problem, but I think that more could be done to conserve our water by damming the natural water courses. I notice that the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) is not in his seat but I think he would agree with what I say about the Broughton River, which rises in the district of the Minister of Lands, around Clare, and takes in the catchment of that area. I doubt whether the member for Rocky River has ever seen the Broughton River dry around Merriton.

Here we have millions of gallons of good rainwater just running out to the sea, and only four miles from the Broughton River there is an ideal site that several people in the district and I have inspected. This site would be ideal for a huge dam. I doubt whether it would cost as much to build as the Myponga dam. The Broughton River floods at least once every year and sometimes six times a year, so one can imagine the vast quantity of water allowed to go to waste. Its catchment commences around Clare, where there is a fair rainfall. Although it floods as I have just indicated, there has been no effort to do anything about it.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I am not so sure that some consideration has not been given to it.

Mr. McKEE: Perhaps so, but I should like to see further thought given to damming the Broughton River, because it would be a great advantage to the people around the foothills of the Flinders Ranges. In fact, it could irrigate 80 to 100 square miles of fertile land along those foothills. Also in this area, as the Minister of Lands well knows, there is about

4,000 acres known as Block F, I think, which at present is under mallee scrub. I understand it is a good breeding place for foxes and rabbits. If water were available, this could be cleared and subdivided or cut up into market gardens or mixed farms. The soil is beautiful; in fact, it is as good as one would wish to find anywhere, and it would grow anything. Another favourable factor is that there is seldom a frost there, which is a big advantage. At present water is the problem, but it should not be. Every year millions of gallons of this beautiful rainwater run to waste into the sea. We know that to build dams costs money, but an assured supply of water in a State like South Australia is as good as money in the bank.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I understand one difficulty is that it would not hold water; it would be too shallow and the evaporation would be excessive.

Mr. McKEE: But you could pump into it from the Broughton River. The site for the dam that I mention is at a place called Clements Gap.

Mr. Hall: The topography of the country would not be suitable for it.

Mr. McKEE: I think the honourable member is wrong. It is not far from Crystal Brook—near Merriton. We get more dry seasons than wet. The people pay fairly heavily for the water they are getting at the moment and when they really need water in a dry season restrictions are imposed. I should like the Government to consider a scheme for the Broughton River and find out whether it would be an economic proposition. I think it would, because it would reduce pumping costs. Something should be done about it. The Treasurer said recently that he was considering a closer settlement scheme, but he also knows that the water problem has to be solved first. Secondly, to bring about closer settlement consideration would have to be given to cutting up large pastoral holdings and farming estates that are at present controlled by monopolies. Large industries, particularly those with overseas capital, should accept their responsibilities and be made to face up to them. They should contribute to the development of a country that has been kind to their shareholders by producing some of the lighter parts of their products in country towns to help to maintain the population there.

Another matter high on the list of challenges today is the need for improved education. This

is imperative if we are to compete successfully with the Communist world. Honourable members opposite have spoken about communistic influences, and I believe that more attention and money should be allocated to the training of young people; first, to teach them to become good citizens, and secondly, to enable them to make worthy contributions to their various vocations. Education should be completely free from the kindergarten to the university. Thousands of good and intelligent young Australians are being denied the opportunity of taking their rightful position in society because it is beyond the financial means of their parents to continue their secondary education. The pupils who show sufficient enterprise and industry to qualify for university courses should have not only free tuition and books—and similar help—but also a living allowance so they do not become a burden on their parents. I believe that the children of parents in indigent circumstances should be provided with free uniforms. These children are sent to school poorly clad, and naturally compare themselves with the majority who are well clothed. As a result, they experience a sense of inferiority that often engenders anti-social resentment. This is the initial stage in the development of some delinquents.

As soon as they begin work they spend their money lavishly, and dress and behave in a manner to make themselves conspicuous. This is a natural psychological reaction to the years of resenting their social inferiority at school. Providing them with uniforms would remove the stigma that these unfortunate children have had to carry throughout their school years. These uniforms should not be issued at schools, but purchased by the mother at the store of her choice with a voucher from the department, to avoid criticism from children whose parents are in a better financial position. After all, we provide uniforms for our soldiers, why not for our students? I have here an itemized list of requirements needed by a first year high school student, and it is signed by the parent. It costs the parent for sports, sporting equipment, summer and winter uniforms, and various other necessary items, about £140, and that does not include the cost of feeding the child.

Mr. Bywaters: And that is apart from all the extras, too.

Mr. McKEE: Parents receive about £8 book allowance from the Government. Teaching should rank as one of the most important of the professions. We know man is a creature of habit, and his behaviour is conditioned

almost entirely by his education and his associations, and not by his own thinking—as he so fondly imagines—and everywhere we see how educational influences determine his habits. We must realize that the conduct of the majority of people forms the conduct pattern of the herd. If the majority is earnestly following what is true and right, the conduct of the herd as a whole must be automatically uplifted. With such a tremendous responsibility given to our educationists, it is imperative that the best types of men and women should be attracted to the teaching service. They should be carefully selected for their capacity to teach and to give the right inspiration to our young people. These highly qualified teachers, who are directly responsible for the cultural and moral future of our nation, should be highly paid. Class sizes must be reduced, because it is frustrating, even for the most highly qualified teacher, to control a class of 40 or 50 pupils, as happens today. To sum up the Budget, little in it excites my enthusiasm. Port Pirie is possibly one of the best revenue producers in this State.

Mr. Jennings: And the best represented, too!

Mr. McKEE: I agree with that! It is time that the Government recognized the benefits derived from this revenue, and more of it should be ploughed back into the town to give it some benefit from the money it produces for the Government. Apparently honourable members on the other side are exhausted from their back-slapping speeches, and have gone into retirement. I support the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following final reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Athelstone, Elizabeth Field, Hawthorndene,  
Parafield Gardens, Pooraka and Steven-  
ton Primary Schools,  
Dental Hospital Additions.

Ordered that reports be printed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.1 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 15, at 2 p.m.