

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 4, 1964.

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

QUESTIONS.**HOUSING FINANCE.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Paragraph 32 of His Excellency's Speech, on the opening day of this session, reads:

With the rapidly improving economic situation and the growing demand from private enterprise for labor, equipment, and the services of contractors, there has been some reduction in the rate of progress on Government projects.

I think that is reasonable, under the circumstances. However, in yesterday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "New Housing Body Meets", appeared an article that pinpointed the following four points: inroads on "socialized housing"; the problem of inadequate housing loans; outmoded building codes; and the need for a new management approach to marketing of houses. The conference apparently assembled yesterday and in today's press, under the heading "Housing Warning" the consultant to the Housing Industry Association, Mr. J. Handfield, said, amongst other things:

The bureaucrats of the Housing Ministry would advise the Government on what it should do. . . . The country's housing trusts and commissions were seven agents of socialism . . . Socialist proposals from the Liberal Party were more dangerous than from the Labor Party.

I do not desire to debate that at this stage. Has any representation been made to the Premier from this particular pressure group mentioned by Mr. Handfield and known in this State as the Builders and Allied Trades Association (the South Australian division of this new organization) for a greater sum to be made available at the expense of the State Bank, the South Australian Housing Trust and the Co-operative Building Society? If it has, is it the intention of the Premier to accede to any such request if and when made, particularly in view of the item contained in His Excellency's Speech?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Although I have seen the press report referred to by the honourable member, I do not know of any direct representation, nor have I received correspondence regarding it. In any case, the policy on housing in this State has been long established and has been subject to legislation approved by Parliament, and

the Government would be unlikely to consider any alteration of the policy unless there were something Parliament should know about. I assure the honourable member that when the Loan Estimates are introduced after the Address in Reply debate is completed they will not contain any appropriation for this authority.

Mr. HUTCHENS: There seems to be difficulty today for many people desiring to purchase houses to raise finance while awaiting bank approval, and they have to pay substantial interest on such temporary finance without knowing whether they are going to get bank approval ultimately. Further, in view of the foreshadowed increase in the price of housing (I noticed from a press statement that the price of Housing Trust houses will be increased by about £100), will the Premier consider amending the Homes Act to increase the maximum sum that may be borrowed when purchasing a house?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Undoubtedly there will be an increase in the cost of housing arising from the new award (probably by about £100), although not in all cases. However, many people qualify for the new grant of £250 by the Commonwealth Government. The relative position of anyone who has any money saved for housing (and a person wishing to purchase a house normally has some savings) is about the same. In those circumstances it would not be necessary to alter the present limit. In practice, few cases have come to my notice of people wishing to borrow the full amount provided under the Act. The upper limit is £3,500 and to borrow this amount a person has to provide 15 per cent deposit. More people wish to borrow £3,000 for a house, in which case they have to provide only a 5 per cent deposit. That is much more the type of house that seems to be in demand at present. There is no intention to alter the amount provided under the Act this year. If anybody cares to submit a proposal substantiated by information suggesting that the scheme would be worthwhile, it would naturally be considered, and, if necessary, submitted to Cabinet. Concerning the second matter raised by the honourable member by inference, namely, that some people have to wait for their loans to be approved, this is a rather difficult problem. I do not think there is any fair way to deal with applications except in their order of being lodged. At present, applications are dealt with in that order and I do not think any honourable member would want a system that would allow

some person to apply for a loan and receive priority over somebody who had lodged his application earlier.

Further, although it is true that the Government receives moneys allotted by the Loan Council at the beginning of the year, it is equally true that it actually gets the money only as the loans are raised. The Government receives a *pro rata* percentage of the loan raising, so that all the money is not available at the beginning of the year, but it is available through the year as loans are raised. It is necessary to provide for a flow of applications and at present some applications are approved by both the Housing Trust and the Savings Bank each month. A similar number is approved throughout the year, and this enables a continuity of building programmes which, I believe, is the only logical way to undertake such a scheme. If any person is contemplating building a house in, say, six or nine months' time he should lodge his application in time to be dealt with in its order of priority.

GOMERSAL WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: As the Minister of Works is aware, approval was given earlier this year for a reticulated water supply for the primary producers in the Gomersal district, west of Tanunda, by the extension of the main from Tanunda South. Can the Minister say whether it is intended to proceed with this work during this financial year so that the persons concerned will have the benefit of this supply during the forthcoming summer?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received from the honourable member the necessary contracts signed by petitioners requesting the scheme. The scheme is proposed under special considerations that have been conveyed to the petitioners, and they have signified their willingness to accept the conditions. Now that has been done, the way is clear for the scheme to proceed. It depends on Loan finance being available, but if the honourable member will ask me tomorrow or on Thursday I shall be able to tell him precisely whether the scheme is included in the present Loan Estimates. I think it has been but I should like to check before saying definitely whether it can be constructed in time to give relief this summer, and whether plant, machinery, pipes, and labour are available. I do not think there is any problem with the supply of pipes or machinery, but there could be some doubt whether the work force is available. I shall inquire about those matters and inform the honourable member.

OBSERVATORY SITE.

Mr. HEASLIP: On July 14 the *Advertiser* contained a report from Port Pirie headed "Site of Observatory being Investigated", which states:

A site on Mount Remarkable near Melrose is believed to be one of three in South Australia being investigated by a team of American astrologers who are at present in South Australia. The peak, one of the highest in the Flinders Range, is 3,170ft. high.

As it is estimated that this project would cost about £10,000,000, the people in that area are intensely interested as to its possible establishment in South Australia, and at Mount Remarkable in particular. Does the Premier know anything of the project? If not, will he see whether it could be established in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This project is one of a number of projects that have either been established or are to be established in Australia. I have, on similar occasions, assured the Commonwealth Government that any project that could reasonably be established in South Australia would have this Government's full support. I must confess that I am not aware of the identity of the three gentlemen mentioned in that report but I shall inquire and if there is anything I can do to further the project I shall do it.

Mr. CASEY: Only recently I returned from a trip into the Far North, where these American gentlemen were inspecting sites. I understand (and perhaps the Premier could enlighten me on this point) that Mount McKinley in the Gammon Ranges was chosen by these Americans as their future site. I understand that much preliminary work has to be carried out, taking about 12 months. The Premier might recall that Mount Serle, in that area, at the present time has two observers carrying out tests, and I think a similar test will be carried out on Mount McKinley. Does the Premier know of anything relating to Mount McKinley in the Gammon Ranges and the likelihood of a future observatory in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: What the honourable member has said is correct. There is quite a general opinion, expressed not only by Australian authorities and the Americans, but by overseas authorities generally, that we have in South Australia a large proportion of the nights that are entirely favourable for astronomical observations. Unfortunately, the first site that was sponsored by South Australia, at Mount Woodroffe, was ultimately ruled out because of

its inaccessibility. I believe that the site was entirely favourable in every other way and met every requirement, but ultimately it was discarded. I suppose there is not a more inaccessible area in South Australia than the Gammon Ranges. I believe that for many years, until quite recently in fact, no-one had crossed the area. Several authorities tried to penetrate into the area, and on one occasion there was nearly a tragic accident. The remarks I made to the member for Rocky River apply also to this question. The Government would not be concerned as to the precise locality of any work, but it would sponsor any project which could gain acceptance by the oversea authority.

CHAFFEY CHANNELS.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Irrigation a report concerning progress on the work of concrete-lining the channels in the Ral Ral Division of the Chaffey irrigation area?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Consideration has been given to recommendations submitted by the engineers which involve replacing some sections of earth channels with pipelines and the concrete-lining of others. The proposals suggest a programme of work to be carried out over a period of three to four years. Funds sufficient for the first year's work are being arranged for within the Loan Works Programme for 1964-65. I expect a recommendation to be submitted in the near future following completion of investigations into the working of the pipe/open channel scheme.

SPRINGBANK ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the last few months I have had correspondence and discussion on several occasions with the Minister of Roads concerning the western approaches to the new Springbank Road bridge at Clapham. The trouble is that the construction of the new bridge has, unfortunately, very substantially reduced the business done by the proprietors of a mixed business on the southern side of the bridge at the western end, because motorists now tend to pass by the shop and proceed over the bridge before they realize that the shop is there. The bridge itself, of course, is a very great step forward, and I do not complain about that at all: my aim is to endeavour to lessen the loss of trade of the proprietors of that shop by seeing that there is provided as wide a service road as possible between the shop front and the western approaches to the bridge, which are on a higher level. On May 26, the Minister of Roads was kind enough to allow me to see the

plans of these works, and these showed a strip of land projecting west from the bridge itself to a point just past the frontage of this shop but shaped (if I may put it that way) rather like a boot with the foot pointing south.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is expressing an opinion; I think he had better get to the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With respect, Sir, I am merely describing what I saw on the plan. I have said that this strip of land was shaped like a boot with a cut-in of 2ft. or 3ft. to allow a greater width to the service road in front of the shop, thus facilitating the parking of cars, and that would have been of some help. However, when I inspected the work itself on Sunday I found that that cut-in had not been made at all. The kerbing has been built, and it is simply now a tongue of land reducing the width of the service road in front of the shop: therefore it will not help the problem at all.

The SPEAKER: Not a tongue in the boot, I hope. The honourable member had better proceed with his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will now, at your urgent request, Mr. Speaker, ask the question. Will the Minister of Works take up with his colleague, again as a matter of urgency, this question with a hope that even now the shape of this projection of land can be altered to allow a greater width of service road in front of the shop?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DOGS.

Mr. JENNINGS: As we all know, the registration fee for a female dog, under the Registration of Dogs Act, is, for obvious reasons, more than that for a male. I have had complaints about this matter from the Enfield council and a request that I take it up with the appropriate Minister. This request results from the increasing practice today of desexing female dogs. The council sent me several letters received from ratepayers and complaints are being made by dog owners who say that they have had a female dog desexed at a cost of £5 5s. but still have to pay more in registration fee than do owners of male dogs. An anomaly appears to be involved. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Local Government whether the Registration of Dogs Act is likely to be amended to overcome this anomaly?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The revenue from registration of dogs goes entirely to the councils concerned.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They have been asking for an increase.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thought that that was the position. The question of a decrease under the circumstances put forward by the honourable member would first of all be a matter for the consideration of the councils which, if they felt inclined, could make recommendations to the Government and to the House concerning it. However, as far as I am aware, the Minister of Local Government has not been asked by any council or by the Municipal Association for any such move. I will check with my colleague and inform the honourable member accordingly.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Minister of Lands say how many applications have been received for assistance to take up and purchase land since the recent passing of the Rural Advances Guarantee Act? Also, can he say how many applications have been approved and how many have been rejected?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Seventy-seven applications under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act have been received up to the present and the position in the processing of these applications is as follows: approved, 25; declined, 19; withdrawn, 6; awaiting further information from applicants, 4; under consideration, 22; not eligible, 1.

CROSSING GUARD RAILS.

Mr. CLARK: On October 16, last year, I asked the Minister of Railways, through his colleague the Minister of Works, to consider the suggestion that old rails, at present used as safety rails at crossings, be replaced by light tubular steel rails, as I believed that this might lessen injury and damage caused in accidents. On October 29, I received a reply from the Minister of Railways, quoting a report from the Railways Commissioner that did not favour the suggestion. As I have received, since then, many further requests from my constituents, including railway employees, who strongly favour the idea, will the Minister of Works ask his colleague to further consider the suggestion?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be happy to do so.

TORRENS RIVER COMMITTEE.

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Minister of Works recall that some time ago I suggested to him that a committee be set up to plan improvements to the Torrens River upstream of the

Hackney bridge? I was later informed that Cabinet had agreed to set up such a committee. Can the Minister now say whether Cabinet has arrived at a decision on the personnel of that committee?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The constitution of the committee, as proposed, was to include certain Government officers and representatives of councils concerned with the project and Cabinet has approved the membership of the committee as follows: Mr. A. K. Johnke, Assistant Chief Engineer (Planning), Highways and Local Government Department (Chairman); Mr. J. A. Ligertwood, Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage, Engineering and Water Supply Department; Mr. S. B. Hart, Town Planner; Mr. E. J. Carey, Assistant Under Treasurer; Councillor K. J. Tomkinson, St. Peters Council; and Mr. F. V. Elliott, Town Clerk, Walkerville, and Secretary to the Torrens River Improvements Standing Committee, the last two members to represent the local government authorities in the area concerned.

ROAD TAX.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate the nature of the reply on road tax that he will make to Mr. Schiller, the Chairman of the District Council of Franklin Harbour?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have received a letter from Mr. Schiller but I have not replied to it as yet. I think the letter arrived last week while I was away. When I reply, I shall be happy to let the honourable member know the details of the letter.

PLATFORM TICKETS.

Mrs. STEELE: On Sunday evenings platform tickets are not procurable from the usual sources at the Adelaide railway station and notices outside these sources state that they may be procured at the station master's office. On inquiry there, intending purchasers are informed that tickets can be procured only at the suburban ticket windows upstairs. This, of course, puts members of the public accompanying intending passengers onto a platform to considerable inconvenience and on a number of occasions recently I have seen and heard many irate people complaining about this practice. Will the Minister of Works, therefore, ask his colleague, the Minister of Railways, whether better arrangements can be made for the sale of platform tickets or, better still, whether ticket-selling machines could be installed similar to those available in some central railway stations in other States?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

PORT PIRIE TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works say whether consideration has been given to tenders for work on the proposed new technical high school at Port Pirie? If a tender has been accepted, who was the successful tenderer?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot answer the honourable member's question today because I was unable to attend yesterday's Cabinet meeting. I do not recall a recommendation coming forward from the Public Buildings Department through the Auditor-General for me to forward to Cabinet, which is the procedure laid down for examining all tenders. It may have been forwarded, but I shall check up and inform the honourable member.

DRAINAGE RATING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister of Irrigation say when the Drainage Committee will next meet to hear applications from certain fruitgrowers at Cadell for alterations in drainage rating?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I will ascertain the date that has been fixed and inform the honourable member.

STATE LOTTERY.

Mr. LAWN: Prior to 1960, whenever I asked the Premier whether the Government would consider the introduction of a lottery in South Australia, the reply was that it would not do so because whatever money was gained from a lottery would be offset by the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and this State would be no better off financially. In 1960, when this State was no longer a claimant State, I asked the Premier a similar question and he replied that the appropriate time to consider the matter would be when framing the Budget. As that time has now been reached this year, will the Premier say whether Cabinet has considered the establishment of a State lottery in South Australia or, alternatively, whether Cabinet has considered making an arrangement with any other State about a lottery?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The answer to both questions is "No".

LICENSING.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about when effect is likely to be given to the new provisions of the Licensing Act providing for the serving of alcoholic beverages with light meals in hotels after 6 p.m.?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a report from the Superintendent of Licensed Premises on this matter, but I am not sure whether it is necessary to give the whole

of the report in answer to the honourable member's question. I shall read only that part of the report explaining why there has been some delay, but the complete report is available if the honourable member wishes to see it. The report states:

The delay over the months has been caused by a number of things, firstly, the first four months of the year were entirely taken up with our usually busy period for renewal of licences, annual reports to be presented to annual Court meetings, annual balance of fees, and also the introduction this year of the new licence fee administration and collection of all licence fees in our branch, etc. There has also been a shortage of special magistrates, and Mr. Johnston, S.M., who is chairman of the conferences, has been able to spare only a limited amount of time. In addition to this, the inquiries concerning Local Option Polls for new licences have considerably increased the work of this branch this year. In the *News* of 18/6/64 and the *Advertiser* of 19/6/64 it was reported that I had told reporters that the report would be ready for submission to the honourable the Attorney-General in two months. This was correct, and I still adhere to that statement. That means that the report will be ready on August 18, 1964.

BEEF ROADS.

Mr. CASEY: On several occasions I have mentioned the desirability of placing most of the main roads in the north and north-east of the State under the control of the Highways Department. As the Minister is aware, most of the roads outside the council areas are controlled by the Engineering and Water Supply Department as are the Strzelecki and Birdsville tracks and parts of the Alice Springs track down to Port Augusta road. Some roads, such as the Broken Hill road, are under the jurisdiction of the Highways Department and, because most money is available for these beef roads from this department, will the Minister of Works ask Cabinet to consider placing all of these roads under the jurisdiction of the Highways Department?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member will see there is on the Notice Paper a question by the member for Mitcham that I shall answer today. This question does not specifically ask—

Mr. Bywaters: A round-about way of getting it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member seems to be concerned about the reply I am endeavouring to give, although I do not think he has any reason for interjecting. There is a question on notice and I am not entitled to anticipate that.

The SPEAKER: The Minister would be out of order if he did!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Precisely. In the question on notice the member for Mitcham has not asked specifically, although he has asked, under section 2 (e), "Is any change in responsibility contemplated?" I take it I would be out of order—

The SPEAKER: You are not in order in referring to it at this stage, as it is on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MANNUM TECHNICAL COURSES.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about introducing technical education facilities, either by correspondence or by some other means, to assist young people desiring to remain in the country?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As I promised the honourable member in my reply of Tuesday last, I have had discussions concerning this matter with the Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology (Dr. S. Islwyn Evans) and the Superintendent of Technical Schools in the Education Department (Mr. M. H. Bone). Both agree that it would be difficult if not impracticable to conduct a correspondence course in industrial chemistry. The strong laboratory flavour associated with it and the need for close supervision could not be achieved in a correspondence course. In addition, the expense of conducting this complicated course on a correspondence basis could not be justified in the case of one student or of a very limited enrolment.

Mr. BYWATERS: I am disappointed with the reply regarding extra educational facilities for employees of David Shearer Limited, and I know that the father of the boy in the case I referred to with regard to industrial chemistry will be disappointed too. In view of this, will the Minister inquire of his department whether extra facilities can be made available by way of a travelling allowance and by any other arrangements so as to make the burden somewhat less than it is at present?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I share the honourable member's disappointment and I shall be pleased to see whether anything practical can be forthcoming from the Education Department in line with his request.

BERRI FERRY.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of last Tuesday regarding the likely completion date of the ferry approach at Berri?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not the information yet.

NORWOOD SCHOOL SITE.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Early this year the Minister of Education kindly consented to visit Norwood, investigate the Osmond Terrace school site and discuss with members of the school councils concerned, with the staff of the schools, and with me, the possible re-organizing of the schools in the area. Can the Minister say whether plans are under way for the building of a new combined girls technical high school at Lossie Street, Beulah Park, and whether proposals are in train so that, when the building is completed, the transfer will be arranged of the existing site to the Norwood Demonstration School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: All I can say with certainty at present is that the proposals are in train and receiving the personal consideration of the Director and the Deputy Director of Education, as well as my consideration. As soon as I am able to make a definite statement I shall be pleased to do so.

SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICTS HOSPITAL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: With a view to meeting the demands on medical and hospital attention that will be created by the increased population in this State during the present century, will the Premier cause immediate plans to be prepared for the establishment of a hospital at Oaklands Estate where land is held available for this purpose, so that a medical school can be founded at Bedford Park University College?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has not yet received a request from the university for an expansion of medical facilities for the proposed extensions to the university at Bedford Park. The extensions to the university there will, of course, take some considerable time and a large building programme is arranged and certain of the faculties have already applied to have substantial numbers transferred to that area. In the meantime, of course, the Government is heavily involved in the erection of a new Royal Adelaide Hospital, which is a teaching hospital containing additional teaching facilities. The Government has covered the position regarding land by purchasing an area a considerable time ago for this purpose. However, as no request has been received from the university—and I doubt whether the university could use it if it were provided—it is not intended at present to proceed with plans for that hospital.

HARBORS BOARD COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. RYAN: On numerous occasions I have raised with the Minister of Marine the matter of the number of Commissioners on the Harbors Board. In October, 1963, when I last raised this matter, I was informed that the Minister was considering an increase in the number of Commissioners on the board and its new constitution. One of the Commissioners retired in February of this year and the other two retire next February. Has this matter been finalized by Cabinet? For how long was Mr. Verec reappointed Commissioner of the Harbors Board?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As this is a policy matter I ask that the honourable member put his question on notice.

ROAD TRAFFIC CODE.

Mrs. STEELE: Earlier this session I asked the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a question about the printing of the Road Traffic Code and its distribution to motorists. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Roads reports:

With further reference to the question asked by you in the House of Assembly on June 11, regarding the Road Traffic Code, I have to inform you that I have been advised by the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board that a revised copy of the code has been prepared and the Government Printer is now examining the form and layout of the booklet. When this has been determined it is expected that an order will be issued for a sufficient number of copies for distribution to motorists.

TOWN PLANNING.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I noticed with some concern that this morning's *Advertiser* contained a report that Mr. Westerman of the Town Planner's Office had resigned as Assistant Town Planner to take a position in Canberra. Mr. Westerman made a statement to the effect that the difference between Canberra and South Australia was that Canberra possessed a blueprint upon which it would act, but that South Australia had a blueprint upon which it might or might not act. Can the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, say whether it is intended to call applications to fill the vacancy created by Mr. Westerman's resignation? Further, is it the Government's intention to act at the request of local government bodies on the blueprint known as the Town Planner's report?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall ask my colleague to supply the necessary information.

MURRAY PLAINS WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: Recently, questions have been asked by the honourable member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) and me relating to a water supply between Palmer and Sedan. This problem has existed for a long time now and eventually the Minister agreed to allow one of his engineers, Mr. Campbell (Engineer for Water Supply), to go to Palmer to discuss this matter with the councils concerned. I believe that was last Wednesday. Has the Minister had any discussions with Mr. Campbell since Wednesday, and has he anything to report on the present circumstances?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, I have not had an opportunity to discuss this matter with Mr. Campbell. I was not able to be in the city yesterday, but I shall check up now to see what the report is and let the honourable member know.

KAPUNDA HOUSING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week I asked the Premier whether he would obtain from the South Australian Housing Trust details as to the number of applications for rental and pensioners' houses at Kapunda. I asked also for details of the trust's building programme at Kapunda during this financial year. Has he a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the Housing Trust reports that the trust has no application for rental houses or pensioners' houses at Kapunda. In addition, the trust does not intend to build further houses at Kapunda this financial year.

NORTHERN ROAD.

Mr. CASEY: Can the Premier say whether discussion has taken place between this Government and the Commonwealth Government for the building of either a solid or an all-weather road from Port Augusta to Alice Springs? If no discussion has taken place, will the Government approach the Commonwealth with a view to providing an all-weather main road from Port Augusta to Alice Springs?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have had no personal discussions with any Commonwealth authority on this matter, but I believe that it was raised by the Minister of Roads at an interstate conference held in the Northern Territory, and that it received the support not only of the Commonwealth authority in the Northern Territory but also of other State Governments and road authorities. I shall have to check up to ascertain the precise position. I ask the

honourable member to repeat the question next Tuesday, when I shall probably have the answer.

VETERINARY SERVICES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Earlier this year I referred a letter received from one of my constituents to the Minister of Agriculture, concerning the treating and charges for treating of animals. I said, too, that in Melbourne an animal ambulance was available for people who would be otherwise unable to take their animals to a veterinary surgeon for treatment. The Minister promised to get a report. Does he now have one?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Unfortunately I do not have a report. I took this question up with the Chairman of the Veterinary Surgeons Board and the board examined the matter and decided that it could be more appropriately addressed to the Australian Veterinary Association. One of the members of the board is also a member of that association and he has been in touch with the association about it, but as yet I have not had a reply. When I receive one I shall let the honourable member know what it is. I understand that the association has been approached on the question of charges and attendance to sick animals, but not on the establishment of an animal ambulance. Quite frankly, I do not know where to send that question, for it is rather a difficult one to decide. Perhaps if the honourable member could bring forward some suggestions I might be able to help him in the matter. It is clearly not the problem of the Veterinary Surgeons Board, and I think perhaps a little further consideration might bring forward a more detailed suggestion.

CHOWILLA TIMBER.

Mr. HARDING: Obviously, many sleepers will be required soon for the building of new railway lines and the maintenance of others. Can the Minister of Works say whether millable red gum timber now growing in South Australia on portion of the site of the Chowilla dam is likely to be cut and used as railway sleepers or for other purposes?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member was good enough to advise my office that he desired some information on this matter, and I have a report on it from the Engineer-in-Chief who states that he has not been able to obtain the information from other States but will do so as early as possible. In so far as the timber on the Chowilla water-spread area within the boundaries of South Australia is concerned, it will be necessary to

permit selective felling only as it will be advantageous to allow some trees to remain standing. So far it has not been possible to make a detailed examination of the area. Any arrangement for the removal of millable timber should also oblige the licensee to remove all limbs and tree tops. This whole question will be examined as early as possible. I point out that in any case Chowilla reservoir will not commence impounding water before July, 1968.

RENTAL HOUSES.

Mr. CURREN: On Wednesday of last week I asked the Premier a question regarding the number of applicants for Housing Trust rental houses in Renmark, Berri and Barmera, and also the waiting time for each town. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At present the Housing Trust holds 13 applications for rental houses at Renmark, 12 at Berri and eight at Barmera. The usual waiting time for a rental house is nine months at Renmark, 12 months at Berri, and six to nine months at Barmera. The waiting time varies according to the number of vacancies which may occur in the houses and could therefore fluctuate accordingly.

TORRENS RIVER EROSION.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In Koolaman Street, Joslin, a constituent of mine has a property which backs on to the Torrens River. I believe this property has been inspected by officers of the Minister of Works' department. The northern end of the property has been eaten away by the river following on controlled tipping by the East Torrens County Board on the northern bank of the river; the northern bank has been pushed forward quite an amount by that controlled tipping. My constituent was able to point out to me where the bank had come forward some 30 yards. I understand that within the bed of the Torrens some work has been done in an attempt to protect properties on the southern bank, but now there is a divided course in the river itself for the Torrens to follow, and it is obvious that in recent periods where there has been any sort of flooding of the river the current has been thrown against the southern bank, and what work has been done there has been insufficient to protect it. Earth is falling away at quite a rate on the southern bank and properties there have been adversely affected. Will the Minister of Works see whether further action cannot be taken to provide protection for these properties on the southern bank, because they are losing fruit trees and fences at present, and this constituent of mine, who is an invalid, has a great

deal of trouble and worry arising from the eating away of his property?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will get an officer of the department to look at the matter and report to me on the position.

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS.

Mr. CUMBE: Last session this House passed the Aged Citizens Clubs (Subsidies) Act. Has the Premier knowledge of how this Act is working in practice, and can he say whether many applications have been made by local councils wishing to assist the establishment of senior citizens clubs in their districts?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will have to get the figures for the honourable member, but just judging it by and large by the number of applications I have seen come in I believe that the Act has been well considered and is being used. There appears to me to be a growing use of the legislation, and a number of local government bodies have applied for and received subsidies. I noticed the other day with some interest that there were now some overtures regarding a country application. If my memory is correct, one local government body applied and received subsidies for two clubs to be established in its area. I will get the information for the honourable member, for I think it is something of general interest to honourable members. I will obtain a list of the clubs in respect of which applications have been granted or are under consideration.

NORTHERN ROADS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is construction and maintenance of roads in the north and north-east of the State the responsibility of the Engineer-in-Chief?

2. If so, (a) what is the area of this part of the State; (b) why is it his responsibility and not that of the Commissioner of Highways; (c) what staff has the Engineer-in-Chief available to undertake this work; (d) how much was spent on such roads in each year since 1958-59; (e) is any change in responsibility contemplated?

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

1. The construction and maintenance of roads in the north and north-east of the State are the responsibility of the Engineer-in-Chief, with the exception of the Broken Hill main road, which is being constructed by the Highways and Local Government Department, and 20 miles of the Port Augusta to Woomera main road, which has been sealed by the Commonwealth Department of Works in the vicinity of Woomera.

2. (a) The area of the State in which road-works are undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department is approximately 250,000 sq. miles, and the department is responsible for the maintenance of 6,132 miles of road.

(b) The maintenance of roads by the old Engineer-in-Chief's Department developed by virtue of the fact that employees of that department were engaged upon the development of bores and water conservation works in out-back areas. It was considered logical and economical for these employees to also carry out the work necessary to keep the roads trafficable. The work on water supplies gradually petered out and road maintenance then became the main function of the men working in these areas. They performed a very valuable service to the State under difficult working conditions. In a number of cases their sons carried on where the fathers left off. They work in close co-operation and friendship with the station owners and other residents of the outback who realized that the employees were doing their best with the limited resources at their disposal to keep their road links open.

(c) There are eight road gangs working on the construction and maintenance of roads, each gang being under the control of a road foreman. These gangs are supervised by a district superintendent stationed at Quorn who in turn is responsible to the Regional Engineer, Crystal Brook, where modern departmental workshops are located with facilities for overhauling and repairing the road plant.

(d) The amount spent on the construction and maintenance of roads each year since 1958-59 is as follows:

	District Roads.	Main Roads.	Woomera Road (Commonwealth)	Total.
	£	£	£	£
1958-59	47,176	32,721	35,290	115,187
1959-60	57,851	37,045	37,863	132,759
1960-61	72,343	37,098	36,137	145,578
1961-62	127,223	46,087	44,512	217,822
1962-63	128,158	28,926	41,071	198,155
1963-64	128,294	51,133	40,305	219,732

It is pointed out that the total revenue to the Government from rentals in respect of the 250,000 sq. miles referred to in (a) is £134,650.

(e) The Engineer-in-Chief and the Commissioner of Highways have recently discussed the possibility of certain station roads east of Burra being taken over by the Highways and Local Government Department, but no decision has yet been reached in the matter.

CATTLE CARRIAGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): How many cattle have been transported by rail, each way between Marree and Adelaide and Alice Springs and Adelaide, respectively, in each year since 1954?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Railways Commissioner reports:

Cattle transferred at Port Pirie Junction from the Commonwealth Railways to the South Australian Railways:

Year.	Area.	ex Alice Springs	ex Marree.
1954-55 and previous years		Not available.	
1955-56	44,184		21,173
1956-57	30,922		17,093
1957-58	37,146		10,455
1958-59	40,045		16,581
1959-60	45,175		7,076
1960-61	48,790		7,654
1961-62	21,212		7,158
1962-63	36,295		7,608
1963-64	11,016		6,348
Total	314,785		101,146

Grand total .. 415,931

Cattle transferred at Port Pirie Junction from South Australian Railways to Commonwealth Railways:

Year.	No.
1954-55	817
1955-56	525
1956-57	2,523
1957-58	2,783
1958-59	1,614
1959-60	712
1960-61	944
1961-62	5,385
1962-63	3,860
1963-64	1,092
Total	<u>20,255</u>

The numbers for the individual stations on the Commonwealth line are not available, but practically all the cattle would be for Central Australian Territory.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption of the Address, which Mr. Frank Walsh had moved to amend.

(For wording of amendment see page 135).
(Continued from July 30. Page 150.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the motion as amended by the Leader, and commend the Leader for the excellent way in which he presented his case. The Leader was most effective when dealing with many items of the Governor's Speech of interest to this State. He referred to the important and controversial subject of the constant spiral of increasing prices. This House does not have to be reminded of the need for an inquiry into this unpleasant state of affairs. References have been made for some time to the inflationary trend in this country that, in recent times, has spiralled to an extent not known for some time. Both newspapers published in Adelaide have increased their price by 25 per cent; other suggested price increases are for bread, milk and many grocery items; and today a question was asked about the increased cost of houses. These price increases seriously affect the wage earner and all young people who wish to purchase a house. Members on this side, who are aware of the situation because of the constant representations made to them, consider that, in the interest of the public generally, it is necessary that this motion be carried in its amended form.

No-one would deny that he is concerned with the present situation. At the weekend a person asked me, "What is the Labor Party doing about increased prices?" I told him that the Party was in opposition, but had an amending motion before the House at present which, if carried, would show to the people of this State that this Parliament was as much concerned as anyone with this state of affairs. I urge the House to support the Leader's amendment so that the problems resulting from increases in prices may be overcome. The Leader spoke on several pertinent subjects, one of which was the railways. The Leader has first-hand knowledge of what is required to ensure that workmen employed by the South Australian Railways can produce much of the rolling stock that is now being imported from overseas and from other States.

In his speech the member for Whyalla impressed everyone by the amount of research that had gone into the presentation of the case he put for the people of Eyre Peninsula. When he was invited to visit that place by interested people, he went there to ascertain the

facts. He did not make political capital at any time while in Port Lincoln, and in his remarks he expressed concern at the situation he found there. The member for Whyalla said that he was concerned at the haste with which the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act had been passed by this House: it was introduced on November 12, and the debate on it was completed on November 14. Some criticism has been levelled by Government members about the way members on this side did not do more about it at that time. We were aware of similar legislation in other States, but we were assured by members opposite that the legislation would not affect the average farmer. Adequate consideration was not given to those who were not "average". The member for Whyalla is to be commended for presenting to this House information about which we knew little. I was surprised that the mover of the motion did not refer to the situation on Eyre Peninsula, although his electoral district covers much of the peninsula. Surely the member for Eyre must know about the situation, especially if he reads the local newspapers, because by reading them in the library I know about the upheaval this Act has caused there.

The member for Stirling spoke at some length on subjects with which he was familiar. I was interested in his comments on the Workers' Educational Association and the adult education organization in this State. We are all aware of the importance of these organizations in our life today. Adult education is in its infancy but is growing rapidly every day. I know the honourable member will agree with me when I say that the W.E.A. is to be commended for its efforts in the field in which it has embarked, and that it is hoped that extra funds will be made available to it in the forthcoming Budget so that it can extend its work. From time to time the grant to the W.E.A. has been increased but, because of the amount of work that it is doing and the need for that work to be done, the increase is justified. As Chairman of the Murray Bridge Adult Education Centre, I am interested in adult education. A large growth has occurred in that centre, and I believe that it is probably the largest centre in the State according to enrolments.

The work of the principal and vice-principal in that district is being respected and encouraged in every direction. Last week we had an excellent school on wool classing that was given much prominence by the local newspaper.

Many people were interested and this interest has been evident in other places where the class was introduced.

I am sorry that the member for Gouger is absent but he will be able to read in *Hansard* what I have to say. In his speech he queried the size of the Ministry in this State. The Labor Party's attitude in not supporting the Constitution Act Amendment Bill as it was presented last year, has received publicity in the press and on television. He went on to say that ours was the smallest Ministry in Australia. We on this side are not opposed to the enlarging of the Ministry, but we believe that, in comparison to the numbers in this House, a larger Ministry is not warranted at this stage. We believe that first we should have a much larger House than at present.

Mr. Jennings: And a more representative one!

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes. If we look at the size of the Parliament in 1938, we find there were 46 members, but I think our population then was only about 500,000. Today, we have about 1,000,000 but only 39 members in this House. Surely this demonstrates that the Parliament should be enlarged. If it were, then I believe that we on this side of the House would agree to a larger Ministry.

Mr. Loveday: It would give a greater basis for selection.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, it certainly would. One thing that seemed most unjust in the honourable member's remarks was when he referred to the "bureaucrats" in our public service. I think he did a grave disservice when he classed our top public servants (because I could think of no-one else he could have been referring to) as a bureaucracy. He said, "We are being subjected more and more to bureaucratic control." That was totally uncalled for when the member for Gouger was referring to the Constitution Act Amendment Bill that was rejected in this House last year.

I noticed in the *South Australian Farmer*, which has a fairly wide coverage, that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins of another place criticized my colleague, the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), and me in relation to our opposition to the redistribution of boundaries. This is the only occasion since I have been in Parliament that I have had someone else to write my speech for me. I did not have to ask him to write it for me; it was already done for me. On that occasion when the Electoral Bill was debated I read practically all of my speech from the *Murray Valley Standard*. The opposition that I expressed on that occasion was the

opinion of people in my district, because I had people coming to me from all sides agreeing with the article published in the *Murray Valley Standard* on that occasion. So, if the honourable Mr. Dawkins considers that he will score by stating that my opposition to a redistribution Bill would affect me in any way, I assure him, and all those people interested in this matter, that on this occasion the sentiments I expressed in this House were not only mine but those of my constituents, and I agreed with everything contained in the article. The honourable member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), as usual, made a good speech and on a subject on which he had some knowledge. One point was made with which I heartily agree: he referred to the committee that has been set up to investigate the Torrens River and the surrounding area and the need for a similar committee to be established in relation to the Islington sewage farm, which will soon be vacated. The Minister of Lands, I think facetiously, interjected that if the member for Torrens did not watch out this area would be made a fauna and flora reserve. I think the Minister could easily have said that this area could be reserved for future local uses and for general uses by the city and metropolitan area for recreation. There is an urgent need for recreation areas. Certainly there is a need to reserve land so that it is not cluttered up and lost for the future. I agree with the honourable member in his request that a committee be established so that it could consider such matters, for I know many people are interested and anxious to see that areas are reserved for the future benefit of young people, especially as to recreation facilities.

I come now to the Final Report of the Industries Development Committee sitting as a special committee, to inquire into decentralization of industry. This report is quite a lengthy one and a good deal of work has gone into its presentation. Like many people who have read the report, I am disappointed that it has omitted certain recommendations which I consider should have been made. The report was lacking in many ways, and although I was pleased to read about some matters in the report I do not think sufficient stress was placed upon certain points. We find that the committee met 106 times and that the total costs of the inquiry, including fees, travelling allowances, hire of cars, fares, stationery and sundries amounted to £2,889. This was a remarkably low sum, bearing in mind the amount of work the committee undertook. I commend the committee for its austerity and the fact that it kept costs to a minimum

despite the amount of work it did. The report states:

All country local government authorities were invited to submit their views or arrange for local committees to do so and in consequence during the course of its inquiry the committee visited 38 country towns for the purpose of hearing evidence from country residents. In addition, the committee asked many expert witnesses to submit their views regarding their particular fields. In all, 320 witnesses (see Appendix II) appeared before the committee for the purpose of giving evidence (including multiple appearances). The principal ideas submitted at country meetings of the committee are set out together with brief comments in Appendix I. The committee is very appreciative of the help given by these witnesses, often at great personal inconvenience and in an honorary capacity.

I agree that the committee spent much time in gathering evidence and it was not an easy task, something which is borne out as we further explore the report. It was difficult to know just what was necessary to put before the committee. After all, many witnesses were not experts but men in ordinary walks of life with an earnest ambition to see some assistance afforded by way of decentralization. This is a problem, of course, that is not only associated with this State but every State in the Commonwealth, although some States to a lesser extent. Men, such as those to whom I have referred, undertook much work in presenting a case. On pages 5 and 6 we read some interesting remarks from the committee dealing with the social aspect of country living. Some, of course, claimed that people living in the country were at a social disadvantage, but the committee (quite rightly, I consider) said that in its observations that was not the case. In many instances there is much greater opportunity for social life in the country than there is in the city, and certainly there is a friendlier atmosphere in the country. The committee went on to say:

There are many former country dwellers, now living in the city, who would return to the country given suitable employment opportunity. The committee has noted little desire among country people to transfer to the city merely on the grounds that living conditions in the city are allegedly better, although admittedly its contacts have been with older representatives of country areas.

I notice that the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), who was a member of this committee, disagreed with that statement, for he said:

One cannot but suspect that many younger people prefer to live in the city and are not averse to leaving their homes in the country to do so, even though it means leaving their parents.

The member for Mitcham went on at some length to say that he could find no evidence of city people wanting to go to live in the country. I consider that this was not the purpose of the committee's recommendation in this instance: it was merely in relation to country people leaving the country to go to the city. I think the committee's report there was better, even though it was objected to by the member for Mitcham. Still dealing with the aspect of social life, the committee, on page 9, stated:

It was suggested by one witness that social life was a strong factor influencing location of industry, that the wives of industrial leaders were unwilling to leave the social contacts and status of the city for the more backward social life of country towns. It was suggested that this was quite a strong factor. The committee considers that social contact is far more developed in the country than in the city, that country people are far more gregarious and socially minded, that far more effort and interest are evident in community projects. This has been stressed in conversations individual members have had with country representatives and their wives who have indicated a strong preference for country town life and its social contacts. Perhaps there is a misconception in the minds of city dwellers regarding life in the country, a misconception fostered by fiction and films of life in the country which have failed to portray modern conditions and have emphasized the hardship and primitive amenities of the turn of the century.

Here again we find that the member for Mitcham is opposed to that last sentence, whereas I can wholeheartedly agree with that. We do know, of course, that some people are misinformed about life in the country. Only recently I had the situation presented to me where a doctor had been approached to go to the country but his wife would not go, and I am sure that once having lived in the country she would be perfectly happy in her surroundings and would find it entirely different from what she imagined it. I agree that there are many mis-statements made about life in the country, and it is for this reason that I make these points in this debate.

On pages 26 and 27 of the report we have an item relating to the poultry industry. This matter refers mainly to the possibility of processing plants in relation to the broiler industry, and there is also a reference further on in the summing up to the raising of turkeys on Kangaroo Island. In Murray Bridge there is at present a very large and growing industry in broiler fowls, and quite a number of people are now under contract to a city firm. I consider that the time must come when an abattoir will be established somewhere in the area.

Broiler fowls are not limited to the district that I represent, and the industry is growing in other places. From my own observations I can say that this will become a large industry when the prices become competitive (as we hope they will) with other meats. I consider that this industry will grow, and I hope an abattoir will be established in the district that I represent.

Very little is known by the Agriculture Department about the mass production of turkeys, and I believe that this has a number of pitfalls for the unwary. In the past, of course, some people have produced a large number of turkeys on open range, and I believe that some members of this House do so; but to mass produce them, as they are doing in the broiler industry, is something that is comparatively new in this State. From inquiries I have made I find that the Agriculture Department and the Poultry Division know very little about the mass production of turkeys, and it is because of this that I say there is a need for the department to make further exploration into the turkey industry. We have in my district a man who has started producing in a comparatively small way, but he hopes that his industry will grow into a large one, supplying turkeys not only for the home market but for export. This man has had all the difficulties it has been possible to encounter. He had read very widely of what has taken place in other parts of the world, including New South Wales and Queensland. I understand that there is quite a big market for turkeys, particularly overseas. Having spent practically all his life's savings in the establishment of a turkey farm, this man went to the Development Bank for assistance. The bank referred the matter to the Agriculture Department for further information as to the possible success of this industry, but as the department apparently did not know anything about the subject this man's application failed.

Surely that is entirely wrong. Here is an industry which could be developed, but through a lack of knowledge it receives no encouragement. This is something that I consider was lacking in the recommendations of the Industries Development Committee. The committee dismissed this item in a very few lines, and merely suggested that this could be an industry suitable to Kangaroo Island. As a result, no recommendation went forward that these things should be explored or investigated. A recommendation should have come from this committee that something should be done about these possibilities. Surely, having had this matter raised by people with whom

they spoke in various country towns, the committee would have had experts available to it from other States, or reading matter from overseas, to enable it to say whether this was an industry that should be promoted. After all, one of the terms of reference dealt with primary products and industries ancillary thereto. This surely is one matter that could have been investigated and a much stronger report brought down to the Government.

The committee then went on to deal with fruit canning. Here again we see rather a lengthy statement practically agreeing with a report of the Fruit Canning Inquiry Committee which conducted investigations some time previously. The Industries Development Committee is definitely opposed to any small cannery being established or even being allowed to continue, if one can accurately gauge the remarks that the committee made, yet we find that a cannery in Murray Bridge with which I have had quite a good deal to do has proved that that statement is entirely wrong. This cannery has in the last two years shown a profit; it has certainly been only a small profit, but two other large canneries in this State have shown consecutive losses, and this is something that gives the lie to the committee's finding in this regard. I consider that the committee was not sufficiently well-informed to make a report such as that. This industry is quite an asset to Murray Bridge. Last year it employed an average of about 60 employees, but at its peak period had almost 100 working for it. In wages, the industry paid out in 1963, £23,900 and in 1964, £45,697. Of course, this money is an asset to the district as it is spent there and keeps other people in employment as well. In 1963, the money value of the production of the industry was £89,980 and this year it was £151,004. Therefore, it can be seen that although this is only a small industry it is a definite asset to the people of the district.

The people in the district of Myponga, although it is only a small fruitgrowing area, were faced with a monopoly before the advent of this cannery. They were told that they would receive a certain sum with no option and there was no competition in this field. Since the cannery has been in operation not only are they receiving a good price from the cannery, but also the other firm has put up its prices and been more competitive. For these reasons, I take exception to the report on the cannery position although they accepted the words of the committee, which was intended to inquire into the canning position. However, I feel that the committee of which they took notice was,

in fact, inquiring into the firm of Brookers (Aust.) Ltd. and was there to see that this firm no longer kept in business.

The committee mentioned closer settlement and this was one of the points brought up forcibly in the committee with which I was associated. It was suggested that the only thing of value to Murray Bridge was that vegetables could be grown there. The people of Murray Bridge were not happy about this report. We agree that Murray Bridge is the right place for fruit and vegetable growing. In fact, I have raised this matter so often in this House that I feel all members know my views on it. The people of Murray Bridge have pointed out the opportunities offering alongside the river and the fact that this is a likely place for the food production of the State. This also applies interstate. The position applies not only to my district, but to others along the Murray River. However, as Murray Bridge has been mentioned in this regard I shall address my remarks to it. There has been a great expansion in the food-growing industry in this locality. The number of tomato glass houses and the growing of cucumbers has increased each year. Some market gardeners have come from Adelaide, the metropolitan area and other parts of the State to this area. However, very little support has been forthcoming other than the suggestion by the committee about how the area could be improved. I believe that the committee could have brought down a recommendation that as Murray Bridge is so near the Murray River it could be regarded as the area that should be thought of for development. Because of this, provision should be made to encourage market gardeners and others to come to this locality.

I have pointed out to the House on many occasions the high cost of water for vegetable growing. Growers in Murray Bridge pay the same as and, in some cases, a little more for water than do people in the metropolitan area. This presents an opportunity for the committee to recommend that this area is ideally situated as a market-growing area and should be provided for and charged flow-past rates. This would be better than taking the water to outlandish places because here it can be provided much more economically. It could also be recommended that fertilizers used in the production of vegetables could be provided at a concession price in the same manner as superphosphate is provided for farmers. These matters are lacking from the report, which makes me believe that it is not a final report, although it is said to be.

I now turn to the situation relating to what constitutes a large town. The committee suggests that it is not feasible for industries to be established in a town that is not large. The report states:

What constitutes a "large" town is not capable of exact determination. Some witnesses have stated that success in attracting secondary industry, used in the sense of a purely decentralized industry, to towns with a population of less than 10,000, is not likely. Whatever may be the marginal size at which a town commences to be large in this sense, there are few towns in South Australia which would qualify.

This point amazes me because despite this many towns with a much smaller population than 10,000 have progressed considerably in recent years and this is borne out in quite a few of the towns along the Murray River. Places like Swan Reach, Waikerie, Loxton, Renmark, Berri, certainly Murray Bridge, and to some extent Mannum, have a much smaller population than 10,000. In Victoria, Wangaratta had a population of only 5,000 when it secured a large industry from overseas, and this, in turn, has enlarged the town because other industries have come there. Its population has now reached 14,000. Bowen in Queensland had only about half the population of Wangaratta but also recently had an industry established there from overseas. This reminds me of the experts of aerodynamics who stated that the humble bumble-bee, when they had measured it and taken its weight and all particulars about it, could not possibly fly. Of course, the bumble-bee knew nothing about the experts but went on flying just the same. In Appendix 5 the committee sets out in detail evidence taken about the railways. This was one specific thing it had to consider. I know that the member for Frome and I considered the matter thoroughly with people in our districts and presented a case. I urge members to read the questions and answers in this evidence. They are enlightening but disappointing because nothing is recommended on what should be done. The committee made this statement:

The committee has been impressed with the thought put into the submissions made by representatives both Parliamentary and local of towns where there are established railway depots. As shown in the context of this report the answer to this term of reference is quite clearly, "Yes", an answer to which the Railways Commissioner readily subscribed but he has hastened to add that such action would add substantially to the cost of the operation of the South Australian Railways. It is left at that. Although the committee was favourably disposed to believe that here

was an opportunity of decentralization and to develop already established railway workshops in country areas, the weak reply is that because of the cost to the Railways Commissioner it is not possible. If we read Appendix 6 the answer in every instance is that it would be more uneconomical to produce in the country than at Islington and in other States. The committee suggests that no subsidy should be provided for private enterprise. Many industries in the metropolitan area and in the district of the member for Whyalla are heavily subsidized by the Government, and I believe that this committee could have readily brought down a report strongly recommending that the Railways Department be provided with money from grant money to assist in carrying out work at country depots. At present the work force at country depots is declining. I do not know the position in the district of the member for Frome but in my district there are many empty houses while people in the metropolitan area are crying out for houses. This is not a position that should exist in the State today.

Chrysler Aust. Ltd. is to have a railway line provided into its workshop. I have nothing against that, but it is being subsidized by country people as well as by those in the metropolitan area. The South Australian Railways should be subsidized so that it can provide work for employees in country towns. The committee has fallen down on its job in not making stronger recommendations to the Government on this point. I suggested that we should make Bluebird cars at Islington, but the Commissioner says that it is not possible and that they will not be made in this State. The Bluebird is becoming popular and attractive to the travelling public and is one of the best railcars in Australia. I have travelled in all States, and I know that the Bluebird is a fast and comfortable means of transport.

I understand that the Commissioner claims that Bluebird cars are uneconomical to run: maybe they are. I do not blame the Commissioner because he is placed in the position of making ends meet. Surely this is a chance to provide employment in our own State, with work being delegated to country towns so that men remain in employment in those areas.

This is something that the committee should have recommended and the Government should provide money to see that it is done. In the report the committee refers to legislation that is already available for assistance to country and city industries by a guarantee under a

guaranteed loan to banks or by loans from the fund itself from the Government, and originally an amount of £100,000 was set aside for experimentation and research into possible industries and to assist industries to develop. Little of this has been spent and not much use made of it. The committee has admitted that perhaps sufficient knowledge of recent legislation is not known to people. Even if it were I doubt whether this would encourage industries to go into country areas because this assistance is already available at places like Elizabeth and in the city. In all fairness, the Government has assisted two industries to establish in Murray Bridge, and they would not exist today if it were not for this provision. I understand that one of the main recommendations of this committee is that a committee should be set up to publicize country areas. This is what I consider to be the crux of the committee's report. On page 78 it states:

As set out in the body of this report the committee believes it to be desirable that industries have some definite point of contact with the Government which can give information on the various aspects of the State's industrial and economic forces and give advice and assistance on the various technical aspects of choosing and operating from a particular location. This can best be achieved by setting up a special department or branch of a department to promote industrial expansion and, in association with the local committee, publicize the natural advantages which certain locations may possess. Such a department could provide a most valuable service to industry generally and to decentralized industry in particular.

This should be brought to the Government's notice as often as possible. This committee should not be set up in the Premier's Department, but should be a separate department to which people come to set out the advantages of their town or district and where they can be informed of industries interested in coming to South Australia. I believe that they could go to this committee from both sides with an unbiased opinion, and that every opportunity should be given for the location of industries in a suitable district. These are the factors that should be stressed even more than the references contained in this report. We notice in the committee's recommendations—and I mentioned this earlier—that the report is generally opposed to any form of subsidy for the location of industries in country areas. I was pleased to note that the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) expressed opposition to certain statements contained in the report. Paragraph 4 on page 49 of the report states:

It is difficult to justify the expenditure of public funds in the siting and continuance of

operations of an industry at a completely uneconomic location.

The member for Stuart said:

It may be just as desirable to subsidize freights for secondary industries as it is to continue subsidies on superphosphate, etc., for primary industry.

I would also add to that the subsidizing of secondary industries in the metropolitan area. The committee, at paragraph 12, states:

A Government department to encourage and co-ordinate decentralization efforts should be set up.

Mr. Riches expressed the following view:

The Government department should be authorized to initiate, as well as co-ordinate, efforts to decentralize industry, and even to recommend establishment of industries and services in the country by the Government.

Then at paragraph 22 we read:

A Government-financed service abattoirs should not be established in the country.

Here again the member for Stuart said:

I believe that a Government-financed meat-works with full trading rights, could be worthy of further investigation.

I heartily concur in those remarks. This afternoon, mention was made by way of question and a reply from the Minister of Education that it was impossible to provide this specialized education that I requested for a constituent of mine at Mannum. I have spoken to a representative of David Shearer Limited, a company situated 50 miles from Adelaide, which is a fully decentralized industry and which has had quite a tussle in many ways to compete with the city through lack of facilities at Mannum. One of the matters concerned was, of course, housing. On many occasions approaches were made to the South Australian Housing Trust for additional housing for David Shearer employees. Right throughout, David Shearer Limited has required skilled men. When we discovered that in Whyalla houses were being made available to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, we went to the Housing Trust again, and I am pleased to say that at least a contract has been called for to erect 16 houses to assist David Shearer Limited.

David Shearer Limited has been faced with the task of keeping young men, and top young men at that. This question was asked to provide additional accommodation for such people. Here we find that such accommodation cannot be provided because it is considered that this is an isolated case. Every facility should be extended to a company such as David Shearer Limited, which is already in existence and proving that a decentralized industry can function

efficiently in the country. That company employs about 400 people who earn and spend their money at Mannum. Surely this is something the committee could have stressed by way of recommendation. I know Mr. Bottroff appeared before the committee, and I know what he said, because he told me of some of the statements he made. He told the committee of the difficulties associated with the industry. Surely a recommendation could have come down from this committee to the effect that these problems associated with the industry should be investigated and that further consideration should be given to assist them.

These are the things about which I am disappointed in the committee's report. I do not decry the efforts that have been put into the report. I heartily agree with many things that were considered, but we have advocated for those things in the past. About all the committee did say at the finish was "Amen", because it said that this was a final report. The thing we asked it to do in the first place was to "inquire into and report upon." It was expected that the committee would bring back strong recommendations such as I have mentioned. The committee read the reports of other States' committees and found that they were faced with much the same problems that it was confronted with itself. The report contains the recommendation that the Commonwealth Government might look at the situation in relation to income tax on country industries. Here we have a group of States all concerned with the problem of decentralization and all with a similar problem. Only recently we found that the Rt. Hon. Mr. McEwen of the Commonwealth Parliament agreed that it was a Commonwealth responsibility to provide for decentralization. Surely in a report such as this one of the strongest recommendations that should be made would be that all the States should combine at Premiers' level to go to the Commonwealth Government with this specific request in mind. It is a problem associated not only with South Australia but with other States too. They would all agree that extra finance is required to do the things they want to do.

I said that I intended to speak about the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan, which is causing much concern in the poultry industry. At the moment I think much untidy thinking exists in relation to this scheme, at Ministers' level. I am not saying that the Minister is the only one concerned but I think that he has overlooked some important factors.

He has stated in this House, in answer to questions asked about this plan, that it would not be right that people with 30 or 40 fowls should be saddled with this plan, when they form a majority. I point out that these people are not making a livelihood with 30 or 40 fowls. It would purely be a sideline with them and they could get by with the utmost of ease. Recently meetings were held in my district seeking the assistance of the Minister of Agriculture to put this plan into effect. It appears that every other State but South Australia is prepared to go on with this plan. It seems the Minister considers that it is only the big producers who want this plan, but that is not true. Probably all members received a letter today from the Red Comb Association contradicting remarks made by Mr. Carter, who is probably the largest egg producer in Australia, having, I believe, hundreds of thousands of birds. Mr. Carter runs his own semi-trailer between the States, and he is not paying a penny levy. The purpose of this plan and the proposed legislation that has been sent to the Minister from the Commonwealth Government is for everyone to pay a levy.

Surely, in the interests of the industry, if there is to be a levy at all it should be paid by everyone and not just by a few. One farmer told me that he has 400 birds and that he is perfectly happy with the present situation; and I do not blame him one bit. This man has a pick-up on his property and he sends to other States, and he pays no levy whatever. I reminded him of the situation here in 1961 and 1962 when the buyers in other States stopped buying and all the eggs were thrown on the South Australian market. We all know the chaos that resulted then. I tried to point out to this man that this could happen again, but he said, "If it does happen, what does it matter to me? I will chop off their heads." This man is a wheat and woolgrower, and eggs are only a small part of his livelihood; but we have other people who rely entirely on poultry for their livelihood. These men need between 2,000 and 3,000 birds to make an ordinary living, working seven days a week, trying to be their own employers, and they are the men the Minister classes as big producers. I do not agree with the Minister in that regard. These men are ordinary people, ordinary producers, and they are not in a big way at all. Men like Mr. Carter are the men who are the big producers, and at present they are escaping the levy. Those are the men who are the greatest opponents of this scheme. A suggestion that this is going to cost all sorts of

prices is something which has still to be realized. It is quite evident that if all the producers are brought into it the levy overall must be reduced. I understand that at present about 50 per cent of the producers are now escaping the levy. With the number now liable to pay, the levy would work out at about 3s. 7d. a bird, based on the egg production, but if everyone was brought into this scheme (as I think they should be) I consider that the levy would be reduced rather than increased. I know that there are many matters that do not please members or the people in the industry, but these are the things that should be ironed out at a different level. I think the Minister should further consider this matter from the poultry farmers' point of view and not so much with regard to these small backyard farmers who have such a small number of birds. I do not think this latter category will be affected by it at all, and they should not be allowed to dictate to the industry.

I was interested to read in the *Sunday Mail* of last week another of these very large advertisements by the Liberal and Country League. The advertisement states:

Nobody can accuse South Australia of stagnating. Since March, the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, has announced projects worth many millions of pounds. Under his wise leadership South Australia probably is expanding quicker than other States.

I think that is something that should be answered. When I was in New South Wales recently I saw in a newspaper a heading which was not, of course, paid for by the Labor Party or by the Liberal and Country League, but was an item prepared by the newspaper itself. This article stated that more than £100,000,000 would be spent to boost industry in New South Wales, and it went on to say:

Overseas interests have secret plans to start more than £100,000,000 in new industries in New South Wales by 1967. This was revealed yesterday in a report of the Department of Industrial Development and Decentralization.

We see that the advertisement in South Australia tried to create the impression in people's minds that South Australia was the only State that was doing anything, and because of that South Australia was progressing much more rapidly than other States. It is quite apparent that these people have not been out of South Australia.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I think it might be true that with our power and water supplies our progress is probably better even than that of New South Wales.

Mr. BYWATERS: At least members opposite are interested now in what I am saying. We cannot deny the fact that industries are being established in other States. What I am trying to convey is that South Australia is not the only State that is progressing, and I think we would all agree with that.

I now wish to refer to the unnecessary outburst against my colleague the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) last week. The honourable member raised a question in this House which apparently upset Government members. He asked a question at the request of a committee set up inside the Labor Party, and apparently he touched a very sore spot for several of the Ministers. I consider that the outburst which ensued was unjust and uncalled for. The Premier in his reply (and this is reported in *Hansard*) referred to it in a round-about way. Under our democracy, surely the member for Port Pirie is entitled to ask a question on behalf of the Labor Party. We have in our Caucus various committees, and the honourable member was a member of the committee that dealt with the question that was raised. Apparently it is all right when the Government does this sort of thing, because frequently we find that constituents of ours approach the Ministers concerned; and they are quite within their rights in doing so.

Mr. Hall: What was the question about?

Mr. BYWATERS: It was a question forwarded from the Port Lincoln sub-branch of the Australian Labor Party to the Executive of the A.L.P. and it went through the correct channels in our Party. The member for Port Pirie was within his rights in asking that question, and I think the attitude of the Ministers opposite was unwarranted. The Ministers concerned should apologize for the attack they made on the honourable member. This is a situation that can quite easily arise in the future, and that is why I brought the matter forward. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) today asked a question in which he is interested, and he was quite within his rights in doing so. But let it be even on both sides of the House. This is something that applies quite frequently, and these are the sort of situations that are just unfair. I consider that in this instance the Premier and the Ministers concerned should apologize to the member for Port Pirie. I support the motion, as amended.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) and seconded by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). I

congratulate the member for Stirling on the matter which was contained in his speech and which was well worth considering. If his experience was anything like my own, the honourable member had difficulty in preparing and delivering his first Address in Reply speech. I join with others in expressing loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and also extending my congratulations to the Royal Family on the birth of a son. The Queen's representative in this State, His Excellency, Sir Edric Bastyan, and Lady Bastyan continue to give devoted service to the people of South Australia. They are continually taking an interest in the things that are important to this State both in the rural and metropolitan areas. On several occasions they have availed themselves of the opportunity of visiting Yorke Peninsula and we are pleased to know that they will visit that part of South Australia again. Last August they attended celebrations in connection with the 75th anniversary of local government at Warooka and on that occasion they expressed a desire to come back to the southern part of Yorke Peninsula so that they could see some of the coastal parts of the area which contain some of the best coastal scenery in this State. The opportunity to do this will present itself to them on their return some time in September.

I wish to refer to the passing of two former members and another who was a member of this House at the time of his death. Sir Walter Duncan was a great statesman and some of my earliest recollections of men in politics were associated with his life. Sir Shirley Jeffries gave many years of valuable service to the State, particularly as Minister of Education, and I think it is gratifying to observe that his memory will be perpetuated in the form of a memorial that is being erected at one of the recently established schools in the State, in which he took a leading part and interest. William Jenkins, whom I knew long before I entered Parliament, was one who displayed all the characteristics of a good man. He was kind and amiable and always tried to do something to help his fellow members.

I believe that the buoyant position of the State can be partly attributed to the good seasons and increased cereals sown in 1963 that culminated in a record harvest. This could be observed in areas where grain was being delivered at silos and terminal points during the last harvest. I notice that in the Governor's Speech reference is made to the continued research into activities connected with all branches of primary production. Several references were made in the Speech to the

experiments that were being undertaken on the southern part of Yorke Peninsula. I believe there are many people who do not know anything about this part of the peninsula or its terrain. I am speaking in particular of that part of the land west of what is known as Peesy Swamp. The Peesy Swamp area is land that separates what is known as the foot of the peninsula from the rest of my district. The swamp contains many salt lakes that produce some of the best salt harvested in South Australia. Land in this area has been considered by many people as waste country but this is not so. Herein lies thousands of acres in an exceptionally good rainfall area that is capable of development in both cereal and pasture and if the land is developed it could materially increase cereal and meat production.

The experiments carried out in this area last year by the Department of Agriculture give promise of great success. Land that had almost totally failed to produce from two previous sowings of cereal, by the application of a manganese spray produced seven bags to the acre and, in some cases, even greater yields up to 10 bags. Landholders are so confident that a solution has been found to overcome the serious trouble in connection with cereal production, that instead of walking off their holdings, as some had intended to do, they are continuing with renewed hope, interest and courage. Great progress has also been made in the manufacture and application of manganese sulphate spray. Originally manganese sulphate was supplied in the crude form which necessitated laborious mixing with water to bring it to the desired solution to apply to the crop as a spray. Impurities in the solution corroded the jets on the spray and generally retarded its application.

Improvements in the manufacture of manganese sulphate now permit of the purchase of this material in a more refined form and some manufacturers are also supplying manganese in a liquid form that is 100 per cent soluble when added to the water in the spray tanks. This form of manganese has not yet been field-tested, but I believe that it will have equally beneficial results when applied to crops in this area.

Mr. Hall: How much does it cost?

Mr. FERGUSON: I understand about 2s. 3d. an acre with the more refined form of manganese sulphate and the liquid form costs about 4s. an acre.

Mr. Hall: What cost is added to that?

Mr. FERGUSON: You add to that the cost of applying it to the implement used and the

time taken in spraying. I am sure that the landholders in the area are grateful to the department for the keen interest and co-operation that has been displayed by its officers in the experiments it has conducted.

I was greatly interested in the remarks made by the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) concerning the great progress that has been made in the development of Eyre Peninsula or what is commonly known as the West Coast. I can appreciate what has taken place there because I was farming in the area in the early 1930's when we did not have the facilities available for clearing land and did not receive payable prices for our products. However, with the great advances made in the methods of land clearing and a return to stabilized prices for cereals and other primary products, huge tracts of land have been brought under cultivation in this area of the State. Great development has taken place not only in the west of the State but also both in the east and the south the same pattern can be seen. Hence there is a great increase in the production of primary products. The development of new lands is not the only means of increased production at our disposal; I believe that by the greater concentration of use of land already in production and by the conversion of some types of product already produced to other produce, we can greatly increase the capacity of areas already developed and under production. I was most interested to read a recent article in a weekly journal headed "Unless Local Production Increases, South Australia may be Importing Meat by 1990." The article stated:

Figures recently produced had shown that, unless meat production was considerably increased during the next few years, South Australia could be importing meat by 1990, 70 lamb producers were told at Alford. The speaker was Mr. R. W. Correll, deputy chairman of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. Mr. Correll was speaking at a lamb carcass demonstration sponsored by the Northern Yorke Peninsula Field Trial and Show Society, and held under the auspices of the Alford agricultural bureau. He said there was no doubt that South Australia had been going through a period when it had been very easy to sell meat, both locally and overseas. "However, it will be a sad state of affairs if we ever have to import meat, and it appears that this will be necessary unless we increase production to cope with the needs of the expanding population," he said. This increase could be achieved in a number of ways, one of which was by better management and husbandry. "If we are to maintain our existing markets and secure new ones for our export meats, producers will have to pay more attention to the breeding of export stock," he said.

I was fortunate enough to be present at a display of carcasses for this bacon, pork and lamb carcass competition. The display was held at Kadina last Friday under the auspices of the Northern Yorke Peninsula Field Trial and Show Society, and the awards were presented there. The Chairman of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, Mr. David Waterhouse, urged producers to go on producing as much meat as possible, saying that he believed that the day was fast approaching when the demand would catch up with the supply. If, 10 or 15 years ago, 1,600 pigs were supplied to the abattoirs market on a Wednesday the market was considered to be over-supplied. Now, however, the market is not considered to be over-supplied unless 3,000 pigs are supplied. It is expected that the population of Australia will double before the next half century passes. The population of South Australia will double in that time, and, despite improved methods of production, I doubt whether we shall be able to keep up with the demand for meat.

I had the pleasure of hearing an address given recently by Mr. Henry Wilckens, of Wilckens and Burnside, a firm of constructing contractors in this State, who had recently returned from leading a trade delegation to the Near East, I believe on behalf of the Commonwealth Government. He said he believed that, in the development of the Near East, Australia and Japan would play a big and important part, Japan from an industrial point of view and Australia in supplying food and primary products. He also stressed that, in the great industrial development of their country, the Japanese would need much of the primary produce that we could supply. When it is realized that Japan has five construction companies with a turnover greater than that of any Australian company, the development of that country can be appreciated. I believe there is a great future for primary production, not only in South Australia but in the whole of Australia.

In seconding the motion, the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) said that there had been great improvements in the manufacture of farm machinery, which has taken the laboriousness and drudgery out of farm life and has given the farmer conditions to work under in keeping with modern times and conditions. I was greatly interested recently to see the Premier putting into motion the first propelled header to be produced in South Australia. I do not know whether he gave the machine a fair test or not; it was not good

harvesting weather and he would not have had any cereal to reap, so he could not have proved whether it was dust-proof or not. This machine was produced by Horwood Bagshaw Limited, a director of which is Mr. O. H. Heinrich, O.B.E. Mr. Heinrich is one of the most progressive farmers who has ever farmed on Yorke Peninsula. The header is named the "O.H. Header", and I suggest it is a fitting tribute to a man who has contributed so much to the agricultural life of the State.

Many small engineering firms in country areas have given great service to primary producers by inventing and producing implements to suit local conditions. Foremost among these firms is one in my own district, which has given much attention to bulk handling equipment and to the storage and aeration of barley for bulk handling. It is generally known that the moisture content of barley is one of the difficulties associated with its bulk handling. It is also well known that two-row barley is subject to very great loss if heavy winds are experienced when the grain ripens before it is harvested. Barley absorbs moisture readily after harvesting in damp cool weather if it is left in the paddock either in bags or in a silo. Last season Bourne Engineering Company, of Pine Point, invented a 500-bag silo with an aeration system. Barley reaped and placed in this silo at 18 per cent moisture content after experiencing weather suitable for drying was marketed at the required moisture content of 12 per cent or less. It was proved that silos half filled at the time of a rainfall of over one inch were not affected and that very little loss occurred to barley through dampness or damage.

It is pleasing to note that the Australian Barley Board will undertake experiments this year into moisture content and storage of grain to ascertain whether barley can be received at higher moisture content than at present. It is most encouraging to barley growers throughout this State to note that very good progress has been made in the formation of an all-Australian Barley Board. Negotiations have been proceeding for some months between representatives of the States, and submissions have been made to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry. I believe we can look forward to an announcement on this matter in the very near future. I pay a tribute to two gentlemen, Mr. T. M. Saint and Mr. R. W. Humphrys of Maitland, who have given much of their time and have taken a keen interest in this project.

Much has been said about the foresight of and improvements taking place within the Education Department, and the announcement that the Public Works Committee has recommended the construction of a new area school at Maitland was well received by the community. People of this area are keenly anticipating the time when this school will be built and opened for use. People living in my district know little about railways because there are no railways in the area, but they are concerned about a railway line that they have to cross twice when coming from and going to the peninsula. Not only does the Yorke Peninsula traffic pass over this line but northern-bound traffic and traffic going west travels over it. Two passenger trains a day and two goods trains a week, plus grain trains, use this railway line. It is time the Railways Commissioner placed a flashing light signal at the Port Wakefield crossing in lieu of the "stop" sign, and relieved the travelling public of a waste of time and fuel. In my recent travels in the southern parts of Western Australia, I noticed that railway crossings of far less importance than that at Port Wakefield had flashing lights installed.

It is the responsibility of councils to have noxious weeds eradicated. The Agriculture Department provides an excellent service and advice is given to councils and landholders on weed control. I give credit to some councils that are doing everything possible to ensure that the Act's provisions are carried out. It must be remembered that it has taken some weeds many years to establish themselves, and that it will take a long time before they can be eradicated. Good rains experienced in the hills areas this year will ensure that water storages will be filled to capacity. Water reticulation continues and further extensions of reticulated water have been commenced in the southern part of my district. Disappointment has been expressed by residents west of Warooka that further worthwhile underground supplies have not yet been exploited. In reply to my recent question the Minister of Works said that it might be worth while to harness some underground water in this area. Complaints also have been received about the poor water pressure from the Para Wurlie scheme in Warooka.

A topic often discussed today is the assimilation of aboriginal people, and much progress has been made in providing improved conditions for them. It was pleasing to see that the Minister of Works answered questions about this matter in a constructive and informative manner. One of the reserves discussed, situated

in my district, was the Point Pearce Mission Station. I congratulate officers of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs on the practical way in which they are tackling these problems. For many years I have had the privilege of visiting this reserve and have noted great improvements since the care of this reserve has been placed under the supervision of the present department. What has happened at Point Pearce must also happen at other reserves in this State. I am sure that with the legislation contemplated this session the people of this State can be assured of good, responsible government, and I support the motion.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I support the Address in Reply as amended by the Leader of the Opposition. I join with previous speakers in expressing my deepest sympathies to the families of deceased members, the late Sir Walter Duncan, Bill Jenkins and John Critchley. Most matters contained in the Governor's Speech are merely repetitions of previous speeches, and I agree entirely with the member for Yorke Peninsula when he says that the mover and seconder must have found it difficult to justify a case to reply to the Governor's Speech. I say that the speech is a repetition of previous ones because many of the industries referred to have been mentioned before. The pulp mill in the South-East is still getting a mention, although some projects, such as the Port Paterson salt works, have been omitted. This project was prominently featured during the Grey by-election campaign but is now unheard of. They are portable industries, and we have had much experience of them before. Plans are still being prepared for the Government office block in Victoria Square.

Mr. Lawn: I thought you meant the new Government next year!

Mr. McKEE: Yes. I think there will be implications in that one. I am sure that we shall hear more about the office block in the Governor's Speech next year. The Morgan-Whyalla main is proceeding and, no doubt, will receive a mention again next year. The Governor also spoke about improvements to the railway system.

Mr. Ryan: Where are they?

Mr. McKEE: This news can be amusing but, if by the merest chance there is some truth in it, it will gladden the hearts of many people in this State, particularly of those in my area. The Speech states that new school buildings and renovations to old buildings are proceeding vigorously. "Vigorously", mind you!

I am pleased to report that work will commence, I hope, on the new technical school at Port Pirie this year or next year, but I hope we shall not hear more about that in the Governor's Speech next year. Paving and draining have been completed at the Port Pirie West Primary School, resulting in improved conditions to the school grounds and particularly to the playing areas. This school is an old one and, although I do not agree with the Education Department's policy regarding timber frame prefabricated buildings that are at present concentrated on the playing areas and restricting it, the buildings have adequate natural light, which is essential to both students and teachers. However, I should be grateful (and I speak for the teachers, the students and the parents) if the Minister would consider having this old school renovated, because the building is solid and with some renovations it could be made to provide the facilities required to carry out the important job of educating our children. I believe in giving credit where credit is due and I take this opportunity of paying a compliment to the heads and the staffs of the various schools in Port Pirie and surrounding districts for the efficient and conscientious manner in which they conduct their schools.

Mr. Ryan: In very difficult circumstances.

Mr. McKEE: In adverse circumstances. These people have set a high standard for those who will follow them in the future. And now, at long last, it is encouraging to hear that the Department of Aboriginal Affairs intends to increase its activities. If it has increased them, it has at least made a start. The appalling conditions under which these people live in the sandhills outside Port Augusta would have to be seen to be believed. I notice that the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson), who has just resumed his seat, praised the department on its activities at Point Pearce. I can only say this about Point Pearce: the dwellings there on the reserve are little better than the wurlies in the sandhills at Port Augusta. The way in which these people have been retarded, pushed aside and forced, through economic circumstances and lack of education and understanding, to live in filth and squalor in this jet age is a complete disgrace. So far the Government has very little to be proud of, as it has done nothing for these people about which it can boast. It is only agitation from the Australian Labor Party and people interested in the welfare of these unfortunate people that has forced the Government to take some action. It will be interesting

to watch the proposed activities. I believe, however, that some economic circumstances will shortly force stringency on spending in this department, so we may not get the result the Governor contemplated in his Speech.

The Governor referred to a number of Bills that would be introduced this session, one being a Bill to enable the Government to grant financial assistance towards the erection of a festival hall in the City of Adelaide. I will not deny the people of Adelaide a festival hall but at the same time, if the situation warrants giving Adelaide a Government grant to build a festival hall, I presume a similar opportunity will be given to country towns requiring like assistance. I am sure most honourable members have some idea of just how badly Port Pirie needs a new civic hall. If this Bill is approved, I think there will be an early application for a similar grant.

The Governor also touched briefly on the totalizator agency board system. Some form of off-course betting should be made available to people in country areas who desire to have a bet. I do not think for one moment that that is a difficult problem to solve but I am confident that we shall hear more about that in the Governor's Speech next year. (Kevin Sattler will also have a further opportunity to air his views!) The winning bets tax, which does not exist in any other State, is in my opinion straight-out robbery: in fact, it could be termed a form of pick-pocketing by forcing the people to use their own hands. I do not know of any place in the world where a bettor is taxed on his winning bets unless he is a professional gambler, but the Playford Government goes one better than that: it not only taxes the punter or bettor on his winnings; it taxes the stake money as well. The Governor also referred to an extension of the Prices Act for a further 12 months.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a shame!

Mr. McKEE: This one really rocked the people. Can you imagine them saying, "The Prices Act—what's that?" They are wondering what this Prices Act is. This rapid rise in the cost of most essential commodities over the past 12 months and since the recent increase of £1 a week in the basic wage gives a good indication of who controls prices in this State. It is certainly not the Government. It is high time that it stopped trying to make the people believe that it does control prices.

Mr. Millhouse: In fact, it is impossible for a Government to control prices.

Mr. McKEE: There you are; I knew the honourable member would come into this! Of course he agrees with it. It can control wages. If it can control wages, it should control prices. The honourable member is agreeing with that. I knew I would get him on my side eventually. He knows that the economists must have given considerable thought to the question before recommending this £1 a week increase in the basic wage; they must have been completely satisfied.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: The economists had very little to do with it. The court was divided.

Mr. McKEE: But they finished up giving £1 a week; and they gave it because they realized that they were quite satisfied that the economy of the country could afford it. We know perfectly well that that is the case, that industry and the economy of the country could well afford to pay the £1 a week increase in the basic wage.

Mr. Lawn: The employers have always protested against any reform—a basic wage increase or the 40-hour week.

Mr. McKEE: No doubt the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) would protest, too; he would probably want a 66-hour week. The increase in the cost of living is completely unjustified and I am sure that honourable members, if they have any consideration at all for old age pensioners, will wonder how they can exist on their miserable pittance. It is beyond me how they will exist, and I am quite sure that they are all greatly concerned. I suggest that the Premier, as the Minister responsible for price control, investigate the matter immediately.

Mr. Lawn: Surely you wouldn't suggest the Government has given him the green light to go ahead and increase prices!

Mr. McKEE: There is possibly something in that interjection. I notice there was no mention made in the Governor's Speech of the Government's plans for decentralization. The honourable member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) spoke at length about that subject this afternoon. The Industries Development Committee had submitted its report on decentralization to the House prior to the Governor's Speech, but His Excellency did not mention this important matter at all. I am wondering whether this means that the Government has not given any consideration to it and, if it has not, it apparently has no future plans to give effect to decentralization.

Mr. Lawn: This speech was copied from one given by Sir Robert George at a previous opening of Parliament.

Mr. McKEE: Well, apparently part of the script was lost. Members opposite have always remained quiet on this question of decentralization. I agree that they are in a precarious position and that for various reasons they do not want to encourage industries into certain districts.

Mr. Clark: You might tell us some of the reasons.

Mr. McKEE: I think they know them, and we on this side certainly do. I have said on several occasions that members opposite are frightened of people with a different political outlook coming into their districts. This, of course, means that those on the other side of the House are a dying race, but it would be a much quicker death if what I have just mentioned occurred. They are on the way out now. On my way to Adelaide today I noticed the extensive development at Para Hills, to which the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) referred. I thought it would only be a matter of time before he was over Para Hills himself—or at least over the hill! Members on this side of the House are doing everything possible to encourage industry to establish in country districts because the Australian Labor Party has the welfare of the whole of the State and its people at heart.

Mr. Millhouse: How touching.

Mr. McKEE: It is not the policy of the Australian Labor Party to herd all the people into the metropolitan area, for political gain.

Mr. Shannon: That is what they are doing in New South Wales.

Mr. McKEE: The honourable member obviously has not been to the northern areas of that State for some time to see what is taking place. I suggest he take his committee over there to see just what development is taking place. I come now to the speech made by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe). Unfortunately he is not now in the Chamber, but I think I should comment on his remarks. He made a weak effort to convince the House that the drift of people to the metropolitan area had been arrested or was declining. But he forgot to mention Elizabeth. For obvious reasons members opposite will not recognize Elizabeth as being an Adelaide suburb. If there is a small decline of the inner city population it is because people have moved to Elizabeth as a result of the availability of trust houses in that area. The honourable member knows that is the case. He also knows that most people living in Elizabeth travel into the city to work. If this is the Government's idea

of decentralization, it falls a long way short of the people's desire and it is of no benefit to the State.

Mr. Heaslip: Can you cite a country where that does not happen?

Mr. McKEE: It does not happen in Booleroo Centre. The member for Torrens also referred to a record mineral output last year, but he conveniently forgot to mention that all the worthwhile mineral deposits in this State are controlled by monopolies. How does the State benefit from all this? Last week I was accused of playing politics and, as the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) gave me some support this afternoon, I shall say something about this matter. I was accused of playing politics, because I asked a question regarding a matter that was causing considerable concern to farmers and motor traders on the West Coast, many of whom incidentally are members of the Australian Labor Party. To be accused of playing politics in this place—

Mr. Corcoran: Not a bad place to play it!

Mr. McKEE: I agree. However, under the present set-up that was a rather unusual accusation to make. I have noticed on several occasions, when members of this side of the House have asked questions concerning their districts, that the Premier has apparently thought, "Well, there is something in this", so he puts us off by promising to obtain a reply. If there is any political value in the issue, we can switch on the television on a Wednesday night and get a reply.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't that playing politics?

Mr. McKEE: No, of course not! Some time ago I asked the Premier a question regarding a concession rate for a parent travelling from the country with a child for treatment to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. Who would members think got the answer? None other than the honourable gentleman from Torrens!

Mr. Clark: How did that happen?

Mr. McKEE: I have forgiven him now, because if he thinks that Elizabeth is in the country he probably believes that Torrens is also in the country. There is no excuse for the honourable gentleman sitting behind him either, namely, the honourable member for Mitcham. I believe—and it would be interesting to know what it cost if my belief is correct—that he went on a Government-sponsored tour of the beef roads in the Far North. I believe he also visited the Gidgealpa gas wells.

Mr. Ryan: On his own?

Mr. McKEE: No, his wife accompanied him.

Mr. Ryan: I wonder who paid for that?

Mr. McKEE: At any rate, we will forget that. What I am concerned about is that this is in the district of the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), and when the honourable member returned from this extensive tour he cashed in on some fairly good press publicity. Yet I can get accused of asking a question which is not of half the import of the issue I am discussing at the moment. The honourable member was representing the Minister of Roads, and, incidentally, I do not think the Minister was very happy about what the honourable member said when he came home. Further, the honourable member asked a question last week about the beaches, but I have not noticed any beaches up around Mitcham.

Mr. Hall: He is a wide-ranging fellow.

Mr. McKEE: I am pleased the member for Gouger spoke up; I nearly forgot him. Now that the honourable member has put himself in the picture, from what I could understand of his speech and his previous speeches in this House I believe that he could be termed a very narrow, one-eyed Liberal who is of the firm belief that because he is a Liberal everybody else should be one, too. But, of course, he obviously has a chip on his shoulder, Sir, and it is no doubt his head. I support the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I respectfully agree with the sentiments expressed in paragraphs 2 to 5 of His Excellency's Speech, and I gratefully adopt what other members have already said on these matters. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as it was originally moved, and I therefore, perhaps not very surprisingly, oppose the amendment moved in such a perfunctory manner by the Leader of the Opposition at the end of his speech.

Mr. Clark: It is nice to think you are going to bother to mention it, anyhow.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I am practically the first member, since the Leader spoke, to mention the amendment. I have noticed that not even the Leader's own members have been quick to come forward in support of his amendment.

Mr. Lawn: What about the member for Port Pirie? Also, two of your members have spoken since.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Port Pirie did, in very oblique fashion, mention it, but so far as I am aware he did not (and I was listening as carefully as I could to his remarks) say very much to try to support the

amendment that was moved. As for the member for Whyalla—

Mr. Loveday: The member for Murray dealt with it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me deal first with the member for Whyalla, who followed his Leader. One would have expected him, a good keen debater, to say quite a lot about the amendment, but, so far as I am aware, he did not say one word about it. He was the number two speaker from the Opposition side of the House, yet he said not a word about the amendment moved by the Opposition, which, of course, is traditionally regarded as a motion of censure on the Government. One would have expected, if they were genuine on this matter, that Opposition members would have concentrated their remarks on the motion of censure, rather than the first speaker after the Leader not mentioning it at all. I must confess that I did not hear all that the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) said, and he may have dealt with it. Then the member for Port Pirie spoke, and he made, at the best, one oblique reference to it.

Mr. Corcoran: There is a lot to come yet.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What is past is past and what is said cannot be unsaid, so we will leave that matter on one side. May I say that I can see no earthly justification at all for censuring the South Australian Government on cost levels in the community, because that is a matter (as every member of this House knows) over which the South Australian Government can have precious little, if any, influence at all.

Mr. Riches: But this Government told the people it could control prices better than could the Commonwealth.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Stuart has a very long memory. Back in the dim dark ages that may have been said, but that was well before my time and I have never said it.

Mr. Riches: That was the Liberal and Country League's propaganda.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope the member for Stuart, whose friendship I value, will take time to explain the whole situation to me; but that is past history, as we all know. South Australia is part of Australia and it is part of the Australian economy. I have argued this question before and, alas, it looks as though in the prices debate we are going to have again this year, according to His Excellency's Speech, I shall be able to argue it again. It is impossible to insulate this State and to enforce in some way significantly different price levels

in South Australia. This amendment assumes that there has been—as the Opposition calls it—an upward spiral of prices and an inflationary cost of living. These are emotive words: they are meant to pack in the emotion rather than the reason, I think. I dispute whether in fact there has been an upward spiral of prices and an inflationary cost of living.

Let us have a look (and I know members have been doing this) at the consumer price index figures, put out by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, for the six capital cities to the end of June, 1964. The Leader made much of the fact that in the last quarter there was a greater increase in prices in South Australia than anywhere else. Well, what do we find if we look at all the six capital cities since the base year of 1953? These are the figures, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps it will help members opposite to see the picture more clearly if I quote them: the index figure in Sydney as at the end of June was 124.5; in Melbourne it was 127.1; in Brisbane, 129; in Adelaide, 123.5; in Perth, 123.8; and in Hobart, 129.4. The weighted average of the six capital cities was 125.7. In other words, South Australia still has the least price increase of any State. Now how on earth members opposite can say that an increase—

Mr. McKee: It is a low-wage State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: — of 1.3 in this State in the last quarter is an upward spiral of prices and an inflationary cost of living, I do not know, and it is a jolly shame that the Leader of the Opposition, when he moved his amendment, did not quote these figures instead of simply using the vague phrase that there had been a considerable increase in the consumer price index. It just is not an accurate statement.

Mr. Lawn: We are the lowest wage State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. McKee: He doesn't want to hear that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Here they all come: all the excuses are coming in now.

Mr. McKee: But that point isn't a bad one, is it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think it invalidates for a moment the point I made. There just has not been this great increase of prices of which the Opposition is trying to complain.

Mr. McKee: Wait until you see the price of beef next week.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let us assume that the Leader of the Opposition was right in what he said, and let me ask the Opposition what the committee, however it might be composed, could do about it. Where would this

committee, which the Opposition would like to set up by its censure motion, begin and where would it end its task?

Let us look at the terms of reference in this sloppily drafted amendment. What has the committee to do? It has to inquire into all aspects of price increases in South Australia. I should like to know precisely what that is supposed to mean. Does it mean the causes of rises? Does it mean the fact that rises have taken place? Does it mean that some action should be taken to reduce prices again? What does the phrase "into all aspects of price increases" mean? The terms of reference of this committee are so vague as to make its suggested task quite impossible. Let us assume (and this is the second assumption we have made in favour of the Opposition) that it could get over that hurdle and discover what it was supposed to do. What is Parliament expected to do about the report the committee is supposed to bring in?

Mr. McKee: We will tell you later.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suggest that it would have been better if the Leader had taken a little more time to explain what he meant and his supporters had backed him up better by giving an explanation instead of riding their favourite hobby horses. What is the fate of most reports tabled in this House? They are forgotten. This is a fatuous amendment, and I suggest that the whole thing is valueless. Let me make it clear that I regret the price increases which have occurred and which will continue to occur as a result of the basic wage judgment given on June 9. I do not know whether the Leader blames the State Government for the basic wage judgment or for not dealing with it specifically in His Excellency's Speech. The judgment was delivered only one day before the Speech was made in another place and printed and laid on the table of this House, so the Government did not have much time to deal with that aspect.

Mr. Riches: But you know costs had gone up before the judgment was delivered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member cares to study the consumer price index he will see that the rises before then are not nearly as significant as he apparently wishes the people of South Australia to believe. While I regret price increases (as all of us do) I do not believe that this Parliament or the South Australian Government can do anything about them. One very disturbing matter to which I should like to refer is the wide

open split in the opinion of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in giving its judgment. In the decision two of the judges, including the Chief Judge, opted for a rise of 20s. and the other two opted for a rise of 10s. In other words, there was almost as complete a split of opinion as one could imagine between men who are judicial officers and who should have a grasp of economics. It is disturbing that in a commission such as this two members can say there should be a 10s. rise, another two members can say there should be a 20s. rise, and the decision can be made simply on the weight of the opinion of the Chief Judge. That is a situation which must weaken the prestige and authority of the commission and which may make inevitable some change in the system of wage fixation in Australia. However, that is not something with which we in this Parliament are competent to deal. If I may say one last word on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, but forgotten by his followers, I do not believe the Opposition's heart is in this job at all.

Mr. Clark: You never do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am nearly always right.

Mr. Clark: In your opinion, and you are a minority of one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe the Opposition's heart is not in this job for three reasons, the first of which is that if it was the amendment would have been properly drafted. The second reason is that the Leader would have been a little less perfunctory in moving the amendment and would not have moved it at the end of a long speech; he would have given a longer explanation of what he wanted. My third reason for saying this is that I think some other members of the Opposition would have taken the trouble to deal with the matter before this. This amendment is an empty gesture made in the hope of getting publicity without much work or effort, and I oppose it.

I should like to raise three or four other matters, the first—and unfortunately this has engendered some heat earlier this afternoon because apparently some members do not think I should take any interest in the matter—concerning a problem in the vast area of the North-East of this State. A few months ago, as the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) was so kind as to point out to this House a few moments ago, I was fortunate enough to be invited by the Minister of Lands to make a trip with him and Mr. J. L. Johnson (Chairman of the

Pastoral Board) to Birdsville along the Birdsville track and south along the Strzelecki track, detouring, as the member for Port Pirie was so careful to point out, to Gidgealpa on the way. I will underline what the honourable member said; my wife came with me, and so did Mrs. Quirke and Mrs. Johnson. Whether the honourable member sees something sinister or immoral in that, I do not know; he is adept at raising these matters and then leaving them in the air, as he did on this occasion. I will not say what I thought, but that is what was said.

I found the trip a very great experience. We travelled over 2,000 miles in about 15 days, but I do not intend to give a travel talk in discussing the trip. I am enthusiastic enough about the country to do so, but this is neither the time nor the place to do that. This was the first time that I had been in a part of this continent that is unique and peculiar to Australia. Everything else I have ever seen in Australia—and I admit that I have not by any means travelled over the whole of the continent—can be matched somewhere else in the world. From what I saw on this memorable trip, it seemed to me that this part of South Australia—the outback with its harshness, its dryness, its vast distances and its peculiar beauty—could not be found anywhere else. I have been told (and I am able to believe it) that this is the driest country in the world where man is attempting to make permanent habitation.

Mr. Hughes: I do not think you would find a more highly respected member anywhere else in the world.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, and I will come to that later. It is wonderful country, and I think the people there are wonderful. I greatly admired them, and after seeing that part of South Australia I was proud to be a South Australian. Like the member for Port Pirie and perhaps other members, such as the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan), I believe every member of the House should go to see that part of the State. I believe every member has a duty to be familiar with every part of the State. When we are elected, our responsibility does not begin and end within the boundaries of our own districts; it extends throughout the whole of the State. That is a principle that is as old as representative government. Although I cannot quote it exactly, I am reminded that that is precisely what Edmund Burke said in 1791 to the Bristol electors. It has been accepted as a fact ever since and it is absolutely childish and absurd

for members to suggest that no other member should ever ask a question that impinges on the district of another member.

Mr. Ryan: Didn't it come from the Premier?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know from whom it has come. I was not here last week when the matter was raised by the member for Port Pirie. However, I was told by someone that I looked fierce when it happened last week.

Mr. Ryan: Why don't you do a little homework?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe I should. Some other member said that I was asleep when it happened, but I do not think I was. Nevertheless this part of the State, because of its vastness and its lack of development, is, I believe, a problem that is the responsibility of all members and not only that of the member for the district concerned, the member for Frome.

Mr. Loveday: Would you favour a trip to Gidgealpa for all members?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, that is an extremely good idea.

Mr. Loveday: Would you favour the Minister's taking the member for Frome on a trip to this area?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would, certainly; however, I thought that the member for Frome had been to the area three weeks earlier.

Mr. Ryan: At his own expense.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I don't know about that. I do not know what arrangements the member for Frome made.

Mr. Loveday: In saying that, I had in mind my own district.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Frome knew that I was going on the trip and he made no objection to my doing so. I do not think he has any objection now to my having taking the trip. I would hope that the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) would be as accommodating because I would very much like to go into his district, too. I am afraid that in the past I have not always asked him for permission to go to Whyalla, and for that I now apologize.

Mr. Loveday: I am always glad to see you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad. Perhaps now the matter can be forgotten. I was greatly surprised and a little disturbed at the attitude of members opposite this afternoon and also to find such resentment because I had asked questions on this matter. However, I am quite unrepentant because, as I have said, this matter concerns the whole State. I am referring to the roads in this area or rather the lack of them. They can be regarded

only as poor if they are existent at all and one must travel on them, not just fly over them, to appreciate this fully. I believe that the state of the roads in the North-East of the State (and I do not presume to speak for any other part of the State) is having a most adverse effect on the development of the area and the economy of the State. The bald fact is that the Birdsville track is so bad as to make it impossible to truck cattle down to the railhead at Marree for the Adelaide market, which is the traditional market not only for the country in the North-East of South Australia, but also for the South-West of Queensland—the channel country. I was told that the best fat cattle in the world came from there, and having eaten the tender and succulent steak in that area I can well believe it. I have never tasted steak like that in Adelaide; it is the most delicious I have ever had, and I envy the member for Frome his district.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Is that one reason why you make such frequent trips up there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. This afternoon, in answer to a question I had asked him, the Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson) supplied information which shows clearly the decline in the cattle numbers that have come south over the years. The figures show a decline from 1955-56 when the figure was 21,173 to the 1963-64 figure of 6,348. Of course, I know that that area is in the grip of a severe drought and that that affects the figures, but it can be seen that there has been a steady decline from 1955-56 to the present time.

Mr. Hall: How much is attributable to drought and how much to other factors?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That I cannot say, but the member for Frome, who I think agrees entirely with the views I am putting forward (I am putting them forward on his behalf really), will probably be able to inform the member for Gouger on this matter. As I was saying, the figures show a continual decline *ex* Marree and are not a third of the sum of nine years earlier, whereas the figures *ex* Alice Springs do not show the same even downward trend.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The pleuro restrictions may have had an effect on that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but I do not think any Minister will deny that the state of the roads—of the Birdsville track in particular—has also been a large factor in this. It should be remembered that it is 200 miles nearer on the average for cattle to come south to the

Adelaide market than it is for them to go east to the Queensland seaboard and yet the figures bear out this decline. In the last few days there have been reports in the press about the shortage of beef in South Australia and its high price and, of course, there have been comments to the effect that that has been largely because of the state of the roads—and I believe that that is so. I can only speak of the problem on the Strzelecki and Birdsville tracks. It is 330 miles from Marree to Birdsville and on the track live, I think, nine families with 27 children between them and, with one exception, they are all resident owners of the properties on which they live. The track is full of senseless and purposeless twists and turns and I have heard it described as being like the track taken by an Aboriginal chasing a snake across the plains. It is graded so that it is lower than its surrounds, and I am told that it is like a canal after rain, as it is the last part of the country to dry up because the water drains into the track, which is graded, rather than out from it. This is what I saw on my trip.

Mr. Loveday: That is a common description of most of the tracks in the area.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am willing to believe that from what I have seen. In fact, I do not see how it could be otherwise when the length of the roadway that has to be controlled by the Engineering & Water Supply Department is considered. The Minister gave me that information *ex gratia*; I did not have to ask for it. The total sum spent in 1963-64 was only about £220,000, so it stands to reason that none of the roads up there can be very good. I believe three things are necessary; first, the Birdsville track should be surveyed so that it takes a more rational course; secondly, a road engineer with experience should be put on it to see what he can do about it; thirdly, and I say this with respect to the Minister of Works, I believe it is now an administrative absurdity for this road and for others in the area to be under the jurisdiction of the Engineer-in-Chief and not under the Highways Department.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You are quite wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable Minister says I am quite wrong but I have noted the explanation he gave in answer to my question. I do not agree with him on that.

Mr. Casey: You agree with me entirely.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I agree with the member for Frome on this matter. It is my considered opinion. These things should have been

done before, but they have not been, and they should be done at once. No doubt, members opposite will say that I am merely a tourist who does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Hutchens: I wouldn't say you were a tourist.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Wouldn't you? Perhaps I can fortify and give some authority for my remarks by quoting briefly from a document entitled *The Economics of the Development of Road Transport of Beef Cattle: Far North of South Australia, 1960*. This is a report prepared by an officer of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and these are some of the points made in the summary with regard to roads in the area. It reads:

1. The success of road transport necessitates that the condition of the roads in the Far North be brought into line with road transport requirements.

2. In their present state, few, if any, of the roads used can be regarded as suitable for the transport of live cattle, particularly fat cattle, especially over long distances.

Mr. Casey: Why?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is trying to harry me again. If he will let me read on, I will lend him this document.

Mr. Casey: I have that; I got that three years ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad to know that. I should have been surprised had it been otherwise.

Mr. Casey: You are only reading from a book; you are not speaking from your own experience.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am now fortified in the views I am expressing by some outside authority so naturally I am reading from a book. The report continues:

3. Because of the length of the road system involved and under past financial allocations, maintenance on the beef roads of the Far North was deficient.

4. Present productivity and developmental potential for cattle in the Far North determines the standard of road which can be economically justified. It is likely that dry-weather roads, cleared for 40 feet with a 26 foot formation, gravelled where necessary and with concrete or stoned crossings, will represent the ultimate class of road at any envisaged stage of present resource use in the Far North.

5. Key roads for the transport of cattle are:

- (a) Kenmore Park via Granite Downs to Oodnadatta.
- (b) Birdsville to Marree.
- (c) Patchawara Creek via Innamincka to Copley.
- (d) Frome Downs to Yunta.

Mr. Casey: Is that the first time you have read that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You mean just now?

Mr. Casey: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No; I have read it before, in the last few days.

Mr. Casey: You agree with that statement?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am saying that it gives some authority of an expert nature for the views that I expressed after my trip up there.

Mr. Casey: As you knew that that was the case, it is a wonder you didn't come to my side when I advocated this course some time ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should say that the member for Frome has now unfortunately missed the whole point of my remarks—that it is only since my trip that I have become aware of the problem and what should be done about it. What I have omitted to do in the past I am sorry for; I am trying to make it up now. I cannot say any more than that.

This would not necessarily be a very expensive procedure because the estimate given in 1960, when these figures were prepared, was (and this is set out in paragraph 6 of the summary I was reading) as follows:

6. A tentative capital estimate for the improvement of these four roads to the standard described above was about £450,000 with an annual maintenance cost of approximately £99,000.

When we remember that we are spending in this financial year on roads in South Australia £13,000,000, that is not a very large sum for the return that would be involved for this part of the State.

Mr. Casey: Especially if we get a Commonwealth grant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but let me conclude on this matter by quoting the last paragraph of the report, which reads:

It is however stressed that the development of road transport of beef cattle is entirely dependent on the development of roads, and that without the provision of roads and facilities adequate for the movement of cattle by road transport, then it is likely that beef cattle production in the Far North of South Australia will not increase greatly beyond the present stage.

That was in 1960. I suggest (and the member for Frome can tell the House whether or not this is correct) that in fact the reverse has occurred in the meantime. The honourable member has mentioned the question of a Commonwealth grant. I believe (and I think every honourable member here will agree) that there has been discrimination against South Australia by the Commonwealth Government in grants given under the States Grants (Encouragement of Meat Production) Act, 1949-54.

Mr. Casey: But have we ever asked directly for a grant?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know. I hope we have but I cannot say definitely whether or not we have.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Yes.

Mr. Casey: We have now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That Act helps only Queensland and Western Australia, and I believe that those States have been helped to the tune of many millions of pounds as a result. But South Australia will, I am afraid, have to stand on its own feet for some time to come. I hope I am wrong here. I do not get very much comfort from the answer that Senator Paltridge gave to Senator Laught in the Senate on May 7 of this year, when Senator Laught asked:

What moneys will be available for use in South Australia in the current and next financial year for the reconstruction and maintenance of roads in the north of South Australia used mainly for the transport of beef cattle?

He asked a second question but, as no answer was given to that, I will not quote it. This is the answer he got to his first question:

The South Australian Government does not inform the Commonwealth of the amount which it intends to spend on roads in any part of the State, and in consequence I do not have information concerning this matter. It is proposed that, under the new Commonwealth Aid Roads legislation covering the 5-year period 1964-69, the grants made to the States by the Commonwealth will be increased by 50 per cent so that South Australia during this period is expected to receive about £42,750,000. The South Australian Government may spend any part of this grant on roads in the northern part of the State. In addition, the State has resources of its own which it may devote to roads. The amount of these resources devoted to roads, and in turn the proportion devoted to roads in the north of the State, is a matter for determination by the South Australian Government.

To me, that does not look a particularly hopeful answer.

Mr. Casey: I think you will find that questions I have asked of the Premier on this matter deal with the Premier and the Prime Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so, but what makes me feel gloomy is that that was apparently an answer to a question on notice, and therefore a considered answer. I hope it is wrong and that the Premier since May 7 has been able to change the picture even if it was right at that time, but that is what was

said by the Commonwealth Government on May 7. I do not much like the tone of it, I must say.

Let me finish on this vexed matter in support of the member for Frome by saying that, if we cannot get additional money out of the Commonwealth, I believe we should re-arrange our own priorities and spend some money at least ourselves on these roadways. I do not believe we should use the refusal of the Commonwealth Government, however niggardly we may feel it is, as an excuse not to do more from our own resources than we are doing at present, as disclosed by the answer given to me by the Minister of Works this afternoon: 6,132 miles and a peak expenditure in 1963-64 of under £220,000 all told. That is all I have to say on the matter. I repeat that I hope that I have not offended any members of this House by making these remarks. That was not my intention. I believe that this is a matter that affects the whole State. It certainly affects my constituents as consumers of the products that would come south if the cattle were to come south. That is a good reason for mentioning it.

Mr. Casey: I presume your constituents are prodigious beef eaters?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the beef were as good as the beef I had in the north and it were available, I am sure they would be. I do not know how many members have read the report of the Commissioner of Police for the year ended June 30, 1963. Unfortunately, it was not on members' files at the end of last session and, therefore, members had to seek out copies if they wanted to see it. The first paragraph of the introduction reads:

Two hundred and one people were killed and 8,216 injured in road accidents in South Australia during the year.

Mr. Loveday: That sounds like a battlefield.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Whyalla could not say truer words or give a more apt description. These people were killed and injured on our roads; we see it every day in the newspaper. What did we see yesterday morning? Four people killed during the week-end on South Australian roads. And yet, how often do these statistics and news items in the *Advertiser* and the *News* pass us by unless we have some personal interest in the people involved in an accident? I am afraid, and I speak only for myself, that most of us take it very much as a matter of course. We put out of our minds the human tragedy that is involved in any accident—the grief, the anguish and the suffering of those involved,

of their parents, the fathers and mothers, the children and the relatives—quite apart from the financial loss involved by the State and the community. Even if we did think of these things and even if they affected us every time we read a report of an accident, we would not do much good standing by and wringing our hands. As members of Parliament it is our duty to take definite action to try to reduce the number of accidents and to reduce the injury caused by them. I believe that there have been in Australia in the last few years enough reports with sufficient recommendations for us to act upon. I do not have much faith in the various campaigns organized by the National Safety Council and other organizations—although they are good things—because they do not reduce significantly the road toll.

Mr. Shannon: They helped you with seat belts!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not criticizing the National Safety Council, but the various campaigns (to reduce speed and many others) have not had a significant effect upon the accident statistics that we can study. In 1960 a report was tabled from the Senate Select Committee appointed to inquire into and report on road safety. This report contains much valuable information, but I am afraid that precious little of it has been acted upon. It is all very well to say that we have to do something: what are we going to do? The causes of accidents are legion and there is no one way in which they can be eliminated. In this Parliament we made an advance by introducing legislation for seat belts. I appreciate the magnificent support that I received from back benchers on both sides of the House when I introduced the Bill. I was disappointed that the Bill failed by a whisker (that is all it was) on the casting vote in another place to pass in its original form. However, I have been pleased since to note that the Government is becoming converted to the principle enunciated in the Bill, and that the Hon. C. D. Rowe (Attorney-General)—

Mr. Loveday: Did you say conversion was difficult?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was not easy in this case. The Attorney-General spoke at the opening of Seat Belt Week at the National Safety Council headquarters, and the member for Burnside (who was good enough to second the motion for the introduction of the Bill) and I were there, and from the way the Attorney-General spoke one would

think that it had been a Government Bill that had been introduced. The way he praised it up—

Mr. Shannon: How many Government cars have seat belts?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that would be an embarrassing question to answer.

Mr. Bywaters: All police cars have them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The conversion of the Attorney-General was complete by the time he opened Seat Belt Week and one would have thought it was a Government Bill.

Mrs. Steele: He came in a car that had a seat belt.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The Minister of Education has asked if it were his own. I do not want to embarrass anyone.

Mr. Loveday: Why are you so surprised?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You don't want to tie anyone down do you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not on the front bench. I make the point of the conversion. The answer the Premier gave to the member for Adelaide last week left nothing to be desired. I think it means that the Government will soon proclaim the provision in the Act making the fitting of seat belts compulsory. I appreciate the support given to the legislation by all back benchers in this House and those in another place. In the report of the Commissioner of Police three pages of statistics deal with accidents. One table is headed "Features of Roadways on which Accidents Occurred". It is amazing to read the statistics: at uncontrolled intersections 8,653 accidents caused 37 deaths. Under the sub-heading "At other than Intersections", the first item is "Straight road" showing that 9,352 accidents occurred in which 107 people were killed. In other words, by far the heaviest fatalities occurred in accidents that occurred on straight roads. The same trend is true of those who are injured. Another table is headed, "Ages and Sex of Persons Injured and Killed" and this is divided into each group. One age group is 17 and under 21 years, and 19 boys and two girls were killed in that group with 1,133 boys and 416 girls injured. In the age group 21 and under 30 years, 21 men and eight women were killed and 1,080 men and 319 girls were injured. Those age groups contain the greatest numbers of killed and injured, and that is a significant thing.

(Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Before dinner I had drawn attention to Appendix A in the Commissioner of Police's report and in particular to the fact that the highest proportion of accidents and deaths occurs on straight roads. I had then gone on to refer—and this is particularly relevant to the suggestion I intend to make—to the fact that the age groups that are most vulnerable to death and injury on the roads are those between 17 and under 21 and between 21 and under 30. In other words, the group 17 to 30 has the highest death rate and the highest casualty rate through accidents in the last year covered by the Commissioner's report. That is typical of the experience in this State and throughout the Commonwealth in years gone by. I shall now refer to the report of the Senate Select Committee on Road Safety, although the statistics are unsatisfactory because the same age groups are not tabbed in each State. Paragraph 144 states:

Paragraph (d) of the committee's terms of reference refers specifically to the problem of the high accident rate amongst the 17 to 23 years age group in the community.

Paragraph 145 continues:

Statistics are not compiled in any State for the age group 17 to 23 years, the groups being 17 to 20 and 21 to 29, so that the basis for comparison and consideration has been the age group 17 to 20. That age group comprises approximately 5½ per cent of Australia's population but is involved in approximately 15 per cent of total road casualties and 12 per cent of road fatalities.

In other words, the proportion of accidents and fatalities in that age group, 17 to 20, is nearly twice as high as one would expect it to be in relation to its proportion of the total population.

Mr. Shannon: Some of the other age group casualties must drop below the normal.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, they must. The point that I am coming to is this: here is an age group in the later teens and early twenties which is particularly vulnerable to accident and death on the road. Therefore this is an appropriate place to concentrate our attention for a while to see whether there is anything to do in that age group to bring down this appalling proportion. Although I am now making a suggestion, I must tell the House that it was made to me by a friend who, a couple of months ago, was involved in a tragic accident and who has had plenty of time in hospital to meditate on this matter and to make suggestions for improving this state of affairs. I now make the suggestion as my own to the House. In South Australia the age at which

a person can obtain a driving licence is 16. In every other State it is 17, except in Victoria where it is 18. I believe I am right; I have not checked this recently, but I do not think any alteration has been made. This means that South Australia permits the lowest age at which a person can be licensed to drive a motor vehicle. The definite suggestion that I now make for the consideration of members and of the Government is that the age here be raised to 17 and that licences for these people under 21 be of a probationary nature, subject to automatic cancellation by a court until the age of 21 years upon conviction for any traffic offence unless the court certifies that that offence is trivial. That is the suggestion I make: to raise the minimum age to 17 years, with a probationary period and automatic cancellation of the licence until 21 years of age unless the court that hears the charge against the offender certifies that the offence is trivial. That suggestion is in addition to any existing penalties under the Road Traffic Act.

Mr. Shannon: Would that work with the present penalties that the court has a right to impose for suspending a licence in the event of an accident, depending on the circumstances, no matter what the age?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, that is why I suggest that this should be in addition to any existing penalties. In other words, if a man of 20 years committed an offence that warranted suspension of his licence for 18 months that would still be done, but if it were an offence that would warrant in another age group a shorter suspension, nevertheless there should be a suspension of the licence of that person until the age of 21 years.

Mr. Shannon: I must admit that the courts are best able to assess the period of suspension rather than that it should be made arbitrary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is a drastic suggestion, but I believe that, in view of the statistics I have quoted, drastic action is required. This would give the court a discretion, if it regarded the offence as trivial, not to impose the cancellation I am suggesting.

Mr. Shannon: They already have that; you are not doing anything there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. I agree that in certain cases they have it, but not in every case. This would refer to the people under the age of 21 years, and would do something to make people in that age group much more careful than they are now. In other words, this would be a powerful deterrent to the commission of offences on the roads by persons in this age group.

Mr. Hall: What is your point about the difference between 16 and 17 years? Can you support that with figures?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot support it with figures: I can only appeal to the common-sense of the member for Gouger. If you reduce the age group of persons permitted to drive on the roads, it follows that the chances of people in that age group having accidents will be reduced.

Mr. Hall: It is a probationary period whether it starts at 16 or 17 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am pleased that the honourable member has taken my point on this, because experience shows that those who are licensed in their first few months are pretty careful and that, as a rule, they are not the ones who have accidents. The people who have accidents are generally those who have driven for a period of from 12 to 18 months and who tend to become careless.

Mr. Shannon: "Confident" is the word.

Mr. Hall: That means that there is no need to raise the age limit.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, there is. It simply means that instead of a person of 17 or 17½ years becoming over-confident, if the age limit is raised, he will get that confidence only at 18 or 18½ years. It therefore follows that the number of people who are open to this danger will be reduced.

Mr. Shannon: By raising the age from 16 to 17 years you have reduced by 25 per cent the number of drivers between 16 and 20 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. Hall: Why not make your minimum age higher, if you take your argument to its logical conclusion?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry that the honourable member apparently was not listening earlier.

Mr. Ryan: He just likes to be difficult, doesn't he?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It sounds like it. I pointed out that the age for granting licences in other States is 17 years, except in Victoria where it is 18.

Mr. Nankivell: Is their accident rate any lower than ours?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not the precise statistics so I cannot answer that question. All I am saying (and I hope members will accept what I have said on this basis) is that we have an appalling record in South Australia.

Mr. McKee: If you are talking about the Government, you certainly have.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe we should try to take some definite action, drastic though it may be, to reduce this toll on the roads.

Mr. Nankivell: What about comparative figures for accidents involving people between one ages of 16 and 20 years and 20 and 26 years?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is obvious that the member for Albert has not read the appendix to the Police Commissioner's report, where those figures are set out, nor was he listening to me when I gave them a little while ago. There is, however, one other reason, not directly connected with road traffic, which impels me to make this suggestion, and that is (and I hope members will take this seriously, because I say it seriously) that 16 is pretty young to allow boys and girls out on their own in motor cars; I believe it leads to all sorts of undesirable social consequences, and it would be no bad thing if the evil day were put off for another 12 months. The member for Albert has a son who will soon be 16; I do not know whether the honourable member agrees with me, but I make my comment as a considered assertion: there may be certain undesirable consequences which could well be avoided. Other members may not agree with me in what I have said.

Mr. Shannon: I think you have a point there. Another thing is that whatever you fix the age at and they get a licence at 20 or before—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Most people at 17 years of age are not unskilful when they are concentrating on handling a car; it is over-confidence that leads to trouble.

I come now to another matter which I think will be of interest to members and certainly to the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) because this was his "baby". Last year we passed the Book Purchasers Protection Act at his sponsorship. After he introduced it into this House it was amended and then it was subjected to the closest scrutiny and further amendment by our friends in the other place. What has happened since is a very good and simple illustration of the well-known fact that it is difficult to legislate for every eventuality and that ways around legislation can nearly always be found. I will illustrate this with a case that was brought to my notice in the last 10 days or so: a constituent of mine and his wife called to see me last Saturday week and brought with them a purported contract between themselves and P. F. Collier Incorporated for the purchase, at a total cost of £185, of a set of *Collier's Encyclopaedia*. This document, which I had seen on one occasion before, is a reasonably clever attempt (and

I think a partially successful attempt) to circumvent the Act which we framed with such care last year and which we hoped would prevent the evils of certain door-to-door book salesmen. I wish to draw the attention of the House to two points in particular. Members will recall that under section 4 (c) of the Act we laid it down that there should be printed on every contract coming within the purview of the Act these words:

This contract is unenforceable against the purchaser unless and until the purchaser notifies the vendor in writing not less than five nor more than 14 days after the date hereof that he confirms it.

That seemed a pretty definite statement and a fairly good warning to the intending purchaser on what he should do and what his rights were, but on the contract I have here the words of that endorsement can hardly be read because they have been printed in a pale blue tint using an outlined letter and they are not set at the same angle as the rest of the print.

Mr. Hall: That is deceptive.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and the whole aim is to comply with that provision of the Act and yet to do so in such a way as to make it almost certain that the purchaser, at the time, will not even notice that the writing is there. It can just be read by someone who is looking for it and has been printed on the paper before the black print was put on. It is an attempt to get around the Act and I think it succeeds in doing that because we forgot last year to lay down in the Bill the type of printing that should be used or, alternatively, we should have laid down that the words should be easily readable.

Mr. Hall: But the provisions to be complied with are stated there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The member for Gouger was keen to ensure in the Bill that these words should actually appear on the contract as a warning to people. Well, they appear on this contract but in such a way as to be almost illegible. Section 4 (c) of the Act reads:

The purchaser under such contract not less than five nor more than fourteen days after the date thereof has notified the vendor in writing that the purchaser confirms such contract.

In other words, the Act provided purchasers with a breathing space between five and 14 days during which it was necessary for them to do something more to confirm the contract. P. F. Collier Inc. has got around this fairly carefully by getting the would-be purchaser

to sign, at the time the salesman first calls, what is called an authority to confirm the contract and this is addressed to the branch manager, P. F. Collier Incorporated, 15 Franklin Street, Adelaide. The document reads:

I hereby request and authorize you to act as my agent for the purpose of giving, at your discretion, the notice in accordance with the Book Purchasers Protection Act, 1963, confirming the contract I have signed this day, for the purchase of books from P. F. Collier, Inc.

Then there is the date, purchaser's signature, purchaser's address and it is addressed to the branch manager, P. F. Collier, Inc. In other words the would-be purchaser is invited, on the first call of the salesman, when he says he will have the books, to sign this confirmation purporting to be in compliance with section 4 (e) of the Act.

Mr. Shannon: Is not that an avoidance of the five day limitation provided in the Act?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think it is arguable that this is a breach of the Act, but of course it is not regarded in that way by many of the would-be purchasers. They do not know about that and this is a way around it. I have some correspondence here and my constituents were wise enough, when they realized that they did not want the encyclopaedias, to write and point out the provisions of the Book Purchasers Protection Act to Colliers and Colliers replied regarding this. The letter is signed by the branch manager. It reads:

When you and your wife signed the authority to confirm you gave me the power of attorney to confirm the order on your behalf. This I did. We do this in order to speed up delivery. Had you stated, even on the phone, within the period of 14 days that you did not wish to proceed with the contract I would have cancelled the order with no harm or expense to either party.

That is the answer that was given.

Mr. Clark: They must have had legal advice on it, mustn't they?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think there is no doubt about it. They say in the body of the contract, "It is further understood this contract is not subject to cancellation", and then appears an asterisk that refers to a little note at the bottom stating "Subject to statutory provisions"; the wording continuing "nor is this contract affected by any term not stated therein".

They say it is not subject to cancellation and then put the little reference at the bottom, which nobody understands, that it is subject to statutory provisions. This is a naked attempt

to get around the Act passed last year. That is bad for two reasons; first, because it is an attempt to defeat the intention of Parliament, and secondly, because it is grossly unfair on those more reputable bookselling companies that are attempting to observe the provisions we laid down last year. I do not know whether this has previously been brought to the attention of the Government; if it has not, I do so now. I hope that something will be done to remedy this by an amendment to the Act during this session and, if nobody else is prepared to do this, I shall certainly be prepared to make an attempt to stop up these gaps in this legislation.

There are many other things I should like to say, but I hope I shall have other opportunities during this session to say them. I therefore conclude my remarks by reiterating that I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as originally moved and by indicating that I intend to vote against the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply with the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, whom I commend for moving the amendment. I do not intend to speak in general terms about the Governor's Speech, but will confine my remarks to various matters relating to the Chaffey district. Last year legislation was passed in this House to ratify an agreement to build the Chowilla dam. With the greatly expanded water storage capacity that will become available when this proposed dam is constructed, the thoughts of many Upper Murray residents are turning to the best way to utilize the extra water. The great expansion of plantings of citrus, apricots, clingstone peaches and vines in recent years raises the question of over-production. The recently implemented stabilization scheme for canned fruits has had extremely beneficial results, but I point to the difficulties being experienced in disposing of all the wine-grape and citrus production which, with young plantings coming into bearing, is showing a consistently large annual increase.

A convention held last week of wine grape-growers to discuss the problem of disposal at economic prices of the surplus production came up with the very useful suggestion that the Wine Export Marketing Board concentrate on expanding exports of wine under a single brand. I fully support this proposal, which should make possible a concentrated promotion and publicity campaign on existing export

markets. The Japanese market, which is ripe for development, could be penetrated and expanded to take significant quantities of our surplus production and thus ease the pressure on present stocks and storage capacity.

The proposal for the Export Marketing Board to handle all exports under a single label received the full support of delegates from each State represented at the convention last week. With such strong support from the grower organization I have not a doubt that the Australian Wine Board, although at present dominated by proprietary winemakers' representatives, will give serious consideration to the proposal. I know it will not be popular with them as individual winemakers, with their own particular brands to promote, but with the ever-increasing production—and the indication of big increases in plantings of winegrapes in New South Wales (particularly in the area of Collarenebri, which, from reports, will make a 50 per cent increase in the irrigated areas of Australia)—a scheme of this nature presents the only feasible solution to the problem.

The Wine Board report for 1962-63 shows that in the United Kingdom between 1957 and 1963 there was an increase in wine consumption from 13,168,210 gallons to 21,151,050—in round figures, an increase of 8,000,000 gallons. Of this increase over that period Australia gained 65,000 and South Africa, under a single brand export scheme, gained 942,129, which is clear proof of the great benefits of the system of single brand export sales. Should the Wine Board be apathetic about the single brand export proposal, I feel that the Upper Murray co-operative wineries should band together and do the exporting as a group. Excellent wines of all types are produced at these co-operative wineries and with a central blending point a good export line could be obtained.

It is interesting to refer to the report of the Australian Wine Board for the year 1962-63. In the section dealing with overseas trade I should like to bring one paragraph to the notice of honourable members. It reads:

Exports to the United Kingdom fell from 1,163,174 gallons in 1961-62 to 1,103,529 gallons in 1962-63. The U.K. is still by far the best market for Australian wine and it is disappointing to see exports falling at a time when the total consumption of wine in the U.K. is increasing. Canada is the second-best market for Australian wines, but exports to this country were also lower in 1961-62. So it would appear that the Australian Wine Board will have to do a great deal to increase the sales of Australian wines.

While on the subject of exports, I should like to quote another report from the section dealing with export licences:

All persons wishing to export wine must be licensed, and the licences are issued on an annual basis. During the past year licences were granted to 86 exporters.

They are all competing on oversea markets, brand against brand.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What is the reason for that?

Mr. CURREN: I should say it would be lack of publicity and promotion. There was a move in this House some years ago for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into all aspects of the grapegrowing and winemaking industry. I feel that, if the Royal Commission had been appointed, many problems now facing growers and the industry as a whole could have been investigated and some proposal put forward to overcome them.

The major cause of increased production of wine can be attributed to the War Service Land Settlement Scheme. As this scheme is part and parcel of the repatriation of ex-servicemen of the Second World War, a Commonwealth responsibility, it is only reasonable to expect the Commonwealth Government to provide some assistance in disposing of the increased production in the form of an export bounty, as was done to overcome a similar problem after the First World War, when land settlement came into production.

Although I am not opposed to the expansion of any primary producing industry, I view with some concern the expansion that has taken place, and the threat this poses to the already established areas. It is of no benefit to anyone to have expansion just for the sake of expansion: there must be an economic outlet for the goods produced. To put the Upper Murray area on a sounder economic basis an urgent need exists for greater diversification of production. A major step in this direction has been made by the successful trial plantings of cotton, hybrid maize, hybrid grain sorghum and forage sorghum which were conducted at Markaranka last year by Mr. Jettner & Sons. The trial plantings were made on lignum flats adjacent to the river, and most river people know that lignum flats have already been regarded as useless and not capable of growing any useful crop.

Mr. Riches: Was cotton planting successful?

Mr. CURREN: Cotton planting experiments were successful particularly with one variety of trial plantings on a small scale. Adjacent to the river above Renmark and extending to the New South Wales border are large areas of river flats of about 8,000 acres capable of

being developed for the production of the cereals and other crops I have mentioned as well as lucerne and other pasture crops. The area is of low elevation and could be irrigated by gravitation from Chowilla or by low-lift pumping and gravitation to the individual properties by a system of channels. I have been interested in the trials conducted last summer at Markaranka, and the results obtained indicate definitely that with the markets available a useful addition could be made to the productive capacity of the river districts.

Mr. RICHES: How is the land held?

Mr. CURREN: At present it is held mostly on pastoral leases. This type of production could eventually lead to the establishment of a cattle fattening industry in the area. I have read many articles on the subject of feed-lot fattening which has been so successful in the United States of America. With the decreasing supply of good quality cattle for the metropolitan markets I predict that a scheme of this nature would become a major source of supply for the city. I remind members of the discussion this afternoon and the answers to the question by the member for Mitcham on the Notice Paper, both of which emphasize that the supply of cattle to the metropolitan markets is dwindling, with little possibility of it being increased. I suggest that feed-lot fattening could become a major source of supply for metropolitan markets. I know that much research and planning will be necessary before such a scheme can be implemented, and I strongly urge that preliminary investigations be carried out immediately.

The development of large areas that has taken place in the mid-Murray areas in recent years is viewed with some alarm by settlers in established areas who are having great difficulty at present in disposing of their production at payable prices. These large areas have been developed by an extension committee in the area and, in the main, land has been taken up by absentee owners who are not primarily concerned with making a living from the area but are merely looking for a project into which to pour surplus income, with the object of avoiding income tax and, at a later date, after the property comes into production, of selling it and claiming the profit as a capital gain and thus tax free. I believe this to be an unhealthy type of development which could seriously jeopardize the economic welfare and stability of settlers on existing areas, who depend entirely on fruit production for

their living. Most people in my district are vitally interested in the education facilities that are provided. In most instances the facilities and the teaching staffs are of a high standard, but I wish to bring several points to the notice of the Minister of Education.

Some time ago I had the pleasure of introducing a deputation from the Renmark Primary School Committee which pointed out most convincingly to the Minister the urgent need for a new primary school at Renmark. Some of the present buildings have been in use since the 1890's and are badly lit and poorly ventilated. Others are of the wood and iron temporary type, strewn around the schoolgrounds, and are most unsuitable for our Upper Murray climate, being cold in winter and like ovens in summer time. I strongly urge the Minister to include this school in the list of new buildings for this year's construction programme. At the Berri primary school, with an enrolment of about 600 children, there is an urgent need for an infants school to be built to cater for the needs of the very young pupils. Present solid classrooms have been added to by erecting wooden prefabricated buildings. As a member of the local school committee I suggested some years ago that land in a new housing subdivision adjacent to the present school grounds be reserved for future extensions, and I am happy to say that about 2½ acres of land was acquired by the department for this purpose. Recently tenders were called for fencing the area and I hope that shortly a start will be made on new solid construction buildings for an infants school at Berri.

The opportunity and remedial classes which started at Berri last year to serve the Upper Murray districts are operating quite satisfactorily and serving a useful purpose in helping retarded and slow-learning children to obtain a reasonable education. Recently I attended a meeting of interested parents and others to form a parents and friends association for the special classes. This body should be of great assistance to the teachers, who are doing a wonderful job at present. That was the occasion when the Minister finally gave his approval to the formation of that parents and friends association. I have been kept informed of the activities and investigations of a committee working for the establishment of a technical high school to serve the Upper Murray area. With increasing industrial growth in the area a technical high school is a necessity if our youngsters are to

be taught useful trades to enable them to take the skilled work offering in the fruit processing and other allied industries. This problem is similar to the one mentioned by the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) last week when he asked a question and received a reply from the Minister of Education regarding the facilities to be made available at Mannum for technical training. I hope the answer given will not apply to the Upper Murray areas.

On several occasions last session and again this year I have asked questions regarding new buildings for the Upper Murray Adult Education Centre at Renmark. I hope that the difficulties regarding the acquisition of suitable land for the project will soon be resolved and that a start will be made with the new buildings. This project could very well fit in with a technical high school in the Upper Murray, with the facilities provided at the technical high school being used for the Adult Education Centre.

Regarding transport and the recently proclaimed Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, there has been much unrest amongst certain people in the Upper Murray area following the rulings given by Mr. Adams, the collector of road maintenance funds. At a recent meeting in the area it was suggested that when the Act comes up for amendment (it has been suggested in the press that it will), the anomalies and other undesirable features of the Act should be tidied up.

A great deal of investigation has taken place into the possibility of building a bridge at Kingston. Some years ago a very active committee, consisting of local government bodies and the chambers of commerce in the Upper Murray area, was appointed to examine the matter. Those bodies gathered a great deal of evidence, and recently a petition was presented to the Minister of Roads asking that investigation work be carried out by officers of his department. That petition was presented following the remarks made by the Premier when he opened the Blanchetown bridge in April last. The Premier said then that, as the Highways Department had finished the planning for the long-delayed bridge at Port Adelaide, officers of that department should be available for investigation and planning for another bridge in the Upper Murray area. A report in the *Advertiser* some months ago, dealing with likely sites for further bridges in the Upper Murray area, quoted very rough estimates of the cost of building bridges and

causeways at various sites. The cost of building a causeway to serve a bridge at Kingston was estimated to be over £400,000.

The Paringa bridge was built in 1927 and it has been used practically continuously ever since. The causeway, as most members know, was completed in 1962, about 35 years later, and during that time the road across the Paringa flats was subject to inundation. However, on only about three occasions was the road not usable because of floodwaters, and the only lengthy period in which it was not usable was during the record flood of 1956. Each week as I travel back and forth from Adelaide, I normally use the Sturt Highway going over the bridge at Blanchetown and through to Kingston. With the increased traffic, particularly heavy traffic, that the Sturt Highway is now carrying, the highway is starting to deteriorate rapidly. It has many potholes and there is continual rebuilding.

Mr. Ryan: You're lucky; our bridge is falling down.

Mr. CURREN: Then I suggest that the honourable member build another one. The following may give the member for Port Adelaide comfort. The Premier once said that two major bridges could not be built at the same time in this State. The Government has just completed the Blanchetown bridge, so that the Jervois bridge could be next on the list. I now refer to a subject I have often raised: the duplication of ferry services at Kingston and at Berri. On November 1, 1962 I asked the following question of the Premier, who at that time was acting as Minister of Roads during the absence overseas of that Minister:

On August 14 the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, in reply to a question regarding bridges across the River Murray at Berri and Kingston, said that bridges were not being considered but that the question of improving the ferry service at Berri was receiving careful attention. As there is considerable congestion at both the Berri and Kingston ferries, will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, ensure that the approaches for a second ferry at Berri will be constructed so that when a ferry is available from Blanchetown the service can be initiated without delay?

The Premier replied:

I do not have any information for the honourable member, but I will examine the matter and see if I can help.

After examining that matter for a long time, it was 12 months before any work was started on either the Kingston or Berri ferry. The second ferry at Kingston has been provided

and is operating satisfactorily, but the problem still exists at Berri. That ferry is used as much as the one at Kingston and I would like to know what progress is being made on the duplication of that service.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That one has been started.

Mr. CURREN: It was started two months ago, but the contractor is apparently just meandering along. The Minister informed me some time ago that the work was expected to be completed in August. I read in *Hansard* that, in reply to a question asked by a member in another place, the Minister said it was now expected that this would be completed in September. He said specifically that it would be September of this year. However, it is hoped that eventually the problem of ferries will be overcome and everybody will be happy again.

Another matter I have raised on numerous occasions is the subject of game reserves. This is a new departure in the wild life work in the Department of Fisheries and Game. At present no provision exists in the Acts of Parliament in relation to wild life, but there was an announcement recently in the press to the effect that the Acts relating to the management of wild life were to be remodelled. On a recent visit to the Upper Murray, the Minister in charge inspected two areas that were proposed by the South Australian Field Sportsmen's Association to be established under the control of the wild life section of the department as game reserves. Much misunderstanding exists on what are the aims and objects of this association in respect to the establishment of game reserves. It does not, as I have heard said in some places, want to establish a private reserve for its own pleasure. The main idea of the association is to propagate the water fowl. The establishment of these game reserves with the assistance of the South Australian Field Sportsmen's Association, which is now a State-wide body, will not develop into merely the breeding of birds for slaughter but will be properly managed. Only a small section of the department is concerned with wild life and the three or four officers doing the work are doing a good job.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What you are proposing is a straight-out duplication of what has already happened in Victoria.

Mr. CURREN: That is correct. In the last 12 months I have obtained much literature from the Victorian Department of Fisheries and Game which has been of assistance to at least two Ministers and various other

interested people in helping them to know just what has been done in Victoria in respect of game reserves. I commend the proposal to honourable members.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Are these organizations in Victoria under an Act?

Mr. CURREN: Yes, they are definitely under the Wild Life Section of the Victorian Fisheries and Game Department. The members of the association are willing to act as honorary game wardens, and they hope that, following his visit to the Upper Murray and his inspection of the area that they desire to have made into a game reserve, the Minister of Lands will see fit when altering the Act to provide for the establishment of game reserves, which will be breeding places for wild fowl, swans, pelicans and other types of water fowl. I inspected the Woolenoke Bend area just north of Renmark where thousands of birds were to be seen. With a little assistance, such as providing nest boxes, breeding would be increased. These people would like the area to be fenced, grazing rights to be discontinued, and where necessary grain to be planted to provide the birds with feed. This is a worthy objective, and I fully support it. Not only will it build up a great natural asset by doing something to propagate the bird life of our State but it will help towards providing a tourist attraction. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) dealt fully with the report of the Industries Development Special Committee, and I fully support his remarks. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply as moved by the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) and seconded by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). As a metropolitan member, I should like to say how much I always enjoy listening to country members, because I could not agree more with the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) that it is the responsibility of members of Parliament to know not only their own districts, which they know or should know particularly well, but to know the whole of the State. In fact, they should travel through the whole of Australia so that they can apply what they know in a general sense to South Australia. I was very happy to listen to the member for Mitcham tell us his experience when for the first time he went north into the back country of this State. I must admit that this is what I try to do when the House is not in session and, in reply to previous comments

from members opposite, I should like to say that I frequently do this under my own steam, at my own expense and without the use of a Government car. I commend this practice to honourable members because I think that this is definitely a duty that we as their representatives owe to the people of South Australia. I know the back country fairly well, having spent much of my life living in the northern parts of Australia, and I have extended my knowledge since I have been in this House.

I should like to add to the sentiments already expressed by other members of this House in their references to His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan. In the Governor we have probably the most versatile Vice-Regal representative that we have ever had in South Australia, because it does not matter to what place, to what institution or to what factory he goes, he always shows the greatest interest. Obviously, as we say here, he "does his homework" on the places he intends to visit. I should like particularly to pay a tribute to Lady Bastyan because in her own right she is a very great person. She is not only interested, as so many Governors' wives seem to be in this role that is relegated to them, purely in women's affairs but Lady Bastyan accompanies her husband on many occasions when he visits educational, manufacturing or commercial institutions. I should say, having heard her many times, that Lady Bastyan is a most forceful and interesting speaker to whom to listen. So I take this opportunity of paying this special tribute to our Governor's lady.

I, too, regret the death of sitting members of this House who have passed on during this Parliament. I should particularly like to mention Sir Shirley Jeffries because he once occupied the seat that I now have the honour to hold. He was, of course, a most distinguished Minister of Education. He played no small part, if I may say so, in the advent of women into this Parliament, because he was a strong supporter and a keen and wise adviser of both the Hon. Jessie Cooper and myself when we entered this House. He, in fact, sponsored and supported our campaigns. To him we both owe a great debt.

Turning to the Governor's Speech, I want to refer in passing, as some other honourable members have done, to the paragraph dealing with the advance that has been made in the proclamation and preservation of wild life reserves. At a time when great progress is taking place within South Australia and many things (rather unhappily, I must admit) have

to be sacrificed in the interest of progress, it is good to see more and bigger areas of this State being set aside for the preservation and propagation of fauna and flora. Much as I deprecate (as I know other honourable members do) the necessary chopping down (for want of a better word) of many of our beautiful trees because progress makes it necessary in the interests of housing, roads, the spreading of power and electric light, etc., I think it is a good thing that there are other areas, perhaps a little more remote from the city, to which people can go and enjoy the pleasures of natural life. So I was pleased and I do commend the Minister in charge of this part of Government, and the Government itself, for their moves in this direction.

The Governor's Speech gives me the opportunity to speak about employment and particularly the employment of women, because in South Australia at present many hundreds of women are unemployed. We know that the employment situation is now good and that the number of unemployed persons has decreased recently to a great extent. To be sure of my facts I rang and obtained the figures from the Commonwealth Employment Service. At present 4,339 people are registered as unemployed persons in this State: of these, 1,273 are receiving social service benefits, of whom 462 are males and 811 females. I have had, as no doubt other members have had, representations from women constituents unable to find employment of any kind, and it was because I was trying to find jobs for several women who saw me recently that I was able to get the figures from the Commonwealth Employment Service.

Of the 4,339 who are unemployed, 1,767 males are registered to fill 3,101 jobs, and to fill 324 jobs there are 2,572 females out of work. We realize, of course, that many women seeking employment in this State are from countries where other than the English tongue is spoken, and therefore they have language difficulties.

A similar situation obtains in Victoria but there the number of women out of work is small indeed, so that it is obvious that many more women are being employed in jobs suitable to them in Victoria than in South Australia. One difficulty is that employers here are looking for males to fill jobs that could quite easily (seeing that there are not enough males to fill the jobs offering) be filled by women, such as production line or processing jobs. It is probably a change in attitude that is wanted here more than anything else.

On behalf of women who are seeking employment, I plead with people who have employment offering to see whether there is not some way in which the vast number of unemployed women in this State could be profitably employed.

Mr. Hughes: Do you know whether they are married or single?

Mrs. STEELE: No. I think they are all lumped together in the figure I gave.

Mr. Bockelberg: Would these people take any jobs that are offering?

Mrs. STEELE: The women who have come to me would take anything that is offering. It has been suggested that jobs are available in domestic work, but there are not many jobs offering there. Not many people are able to employ domestics on a permanent basis, because I think at present they are paid 5s. or 6s. an hour and people who take these jobs expect to be paid fares. Many people are not able to afford to employ domestic labour. There is little offering at all in the line of domestic work, from the inquiries I made when these people came to see me.

Mr. Hutchens: I think the honourable member would agree that it would be a waste of good manpower—or womanpower—to put an academic person into such a position.

Mrs. STEELE: That is true; I was coming to that point. From the figures supplied to me it is obvious that in the category of professional, semi-professional, and clerical work the greatest number of women are seeking employment. There were in the figures released on June 30, 1964, 1,102 females wanting work of this nature for which only 110 jobs were available. In the skilled and semi-skilled categories there were only 87 jobs offering, and there were 721 women registered. In the last group, under the heading of "All Other Occupations" (and this would, I presume, include domestic work), there were 730 females registered for whom only 122 jobs were offering. Hundreds of women could be engaged on process and production line work in the various industries in South Australia because of the great shortage of males to fill such jobs. In addition, there are not enough men at present to fill the various categories, such as skilled building and construction jobs and skilled electrical and metal jobs, in which only limited openings exist for women. Then there is skilled and semi-skilled work in which 996 jobs are offering but for which there are only 559 males to fill them.

Many employers are complaining that they cannot maintain full production because they

have not the labour available but if they would only commence to employ women their production figures would probably rise. Of course, we do not quite know—and members opposite may be able to tell me—how the trade unions would regard the employment of women in jobs that are traditionally regarded as jobs for men. The belief that women might displace men as the wage earners might act as a deterrent, but against that at the moment there are not enough men to go around, anyway.

Mr. Hutchens: I do not think the unions would object to equal pay for equal work.

Mrs. STEELE: Of course, the award for women at the moment is only 75 per cent of the male rate. There is a real issue at present, and, not only as a woman member because I am sure this happens to other members of Parliament, I receive inquiries from women for jobs but we simply cannot find the jobs for which I think they have the talent to fill. I think women really only desire to use the talents that they have to the best possible advantage. We must never lose sight of the fact that many women are the breadwinners for their families. My remarks are really in the form of an appeal to employers in industry to look again at the question of employment, and to employ females while we have this great shortage of male labour.

The next point to which I should like to refer has a local aspect as far as I am concerned but it is obvious also to other members. I was interested in the question recently directed by the honourable member for Gawler to the Minister of Education concerning school playgrounds. Like the member for Gawler I have an area in my district which is rapidly developing, so much so that one huge school has recently been erected and another is in the drawing board stage and will be ready for construction as soon as it has been referred to the Public Works Committee, provided, of course, that the committee recommends its construction. I have at present one entirely new school in my district, quite apart from the schools which have been in existence for some time and which have all been added to or reconstructed in the time that I have been the member for Burnside. I refer to the entirely new Stradbroke school. This school, like so many others in other members' districts, has the problem of building up from scratch. It is in a district which is swept by gully winds. It is a beautiful school; the oval area has been levelled, and there it is. It has not been grassed, and it is a nuisance to the nearby neighbours

because when the gully winds blow dust is blown over their houses.

I was interested in the reply given by the Minister of Education to a question asked recently on this matter by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark). The Minister said that the Government provides the land for the oval and meets the cost of the ground formation and grading as may be necessary and approved; it agrees to meet half the cost of such installations for water reticulation and watering as may be necessary and approved; and it agrees to meet half the cost of such grassing of lawns and soiling of flower beds as may be approved. In the case of this particular school (as I imagine is the position in other schools) the school committee is starting off from scratch; it gets an advance from the Education Department for the essential equipment that is to go into the school. We all know of the magnificent job the school committees and welfare committees do in raising funds to buy essential equipment. For instance, in the high schools typewriters and all commercial equipment have to be bought. The school committees have to provide money for libraries (which, of course, are subsidized), and they have to buy all sorts of extra equipment over and above what is provided by the Education Department. Their first concern, of course, is with these essential things. At the same time, they have to provide appropriate and suitable playgrounds for their children, and it so often happens that they are not in a position to do anything about the grassing and the reticulation of ovals until they have provided all these other things.

In the particular case which I quote (and I am glad to see that the Minister is here at present) the school committee has absolutely no funds at all with which to meet this problem of reticulation and sowing of a school oval, and in the meantime the people round about are unhappy and annoyed with the school committee because they feel that the committee is not doing anything to allay this dust menace. I have had representations from this committee, and I know the Minister has, too, to see if perhaps some advance could be made in order to meet the difficulties in this area—whether money could be made available on loan so that the committee could get on with the sowing and the reticulation of this oval.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Can the honourable member suggest where I can find the money?

Mrs. STEELE: I know that that is the Minister's problem. Of course, the Minister will be aware that it is the local member who is always come to and asked to make representations to the Minister; and because I know this is not an isolated instance, and that it happens to other members, I thought that perhaps I could substantiate the concern that other members feel in this regard.

Mr. Clark: I have a dozen schools like the one you refer to, and I am not exaggerating.

Mrs. STEELE: I am sorry for the school committees, of course. As the Minister knows, I have made representations to him on this matter. I know, too, of the problem that faces the department in finding enough funds to do these things. In this case not only the school committee but the people who live around the area are on the local member's back, because the prevailing winds blow the dust in their direction and this constitutes a very real nuisance.

I was interested to hear earlier in the Address in Reply debate the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) speaking about what will happen to the Islington sewage farm when the Bolivar sewerage scheme comes into operation. I know, as do many others, that many people have their eyes on this particular area of land that is so admirably suited for many different projects, all of which are important and very dear to the hearts of those making pleas to have the land set aside for their purpose. Like the member for Torrens, I am a member of the Council of the Institute of Technology and, although at present we are occupied with the planning of a new building that is to be established on Frome Road for the Institute of Technology, we are even now looking further ahead for future sites on which to build other institutes of technology. This shows the extent of the industrial development taking place in South Australia and the great need for technical training. The Minister of Lands has probably been asked to look at the claims of the Institute of Technology for some part of this land, because it is most admirably suited from the point of view of a technical institute. It is in the heart of or very close to an area that has rapidly developed industrially. It is well situated for transport, is fairly central and would be ideal for a second institute of technology. Therefore, I wish to show my interest and make my plea to those who will be considering the allotment

of this area, for some consideration to be given to the claims of the Institute of Technology. I repeat that this is a most suitable area for a second institute.

Finally, I wish to comment on decentralization, which was mentioned earlier today by the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee). This is a subject with which every member of Parliament has had the opportunity to become conversant since the Industries Development Committee brought down its report earlier this session of its detailed investigation on this subject. The report contains about 70 pages dealing with people who were interviewed not only from country areas but also from the city. These people had a real contribution to make on decentralization. I believe that when members opposite speak of the lack of decentralization in South Australia they are speaking with their tongues in their cheeks, because in some places in South Australia there has been much decentralization. We have seen this in Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Leigh Creek, Mount Gambier and Millicent, and I do not need to point out to members opposite that, in every instance when industries have been established in these areas, and when the Government has given every assistance possible for the establishment and development of those industries, the political climate has changed. I consider that this is an issue that they should investigate further. I have examined the matter of decentralization carefully during my extensive journeys around this State as a member. Many factors go to make up a suitable site for decentralization of an industry, or for the establishment of industry in a particular area. First, there must be the willingness of the people in the area to participate in any industry established in a country town. What is more important, the resources for the development of an industry must be fairly close at hand. Further, there must be accessibility to markets and the provision of the necessary transport.

Another important consideration is the desire of young people to remain in their own district and to be satisfied with the kind of employment they are given. We all know that the trend at the moment is for young people to go to the city because there they are given greater opportunities for education. They are anxious to avail themselves of this higher education and to attend the university or the Institute of Technology. I am aware of this, as I am associated with the Institute of Technology, for which a big institution has been built at

Whyalla so that the young people employed in industry in that area may obtain a higher technical education. Where an opportunity exists to develop industry in South Australia and where the local resources and all these other essential features exist, the Government has not hesitated to supply the services necessary to develop it: water, power, housing and transport, including special spur railway lines to serve special projects.

This has been done in the interest of the people of South Australia and in the interest of its total development. No question of politics has come into this at all: it is being done purely in the interest of the people of South Australia, certainly not in the interest of the Liberal Party that governs South Australia. With those few remarks I have much pleasure in supporting the motion as originally moved.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I again have the privilege of speaking on the Address in Reply, and I support the Leader's amendment. I also express my regret at the passing of former members of the old Parliament. I did not have the pleasure of meeting either the late Sir Walter Duncan or the late Sir Shirley Jeffries. However, I did meet the former member for Stirling (the late Mr. W. W. Jenkins) and Senator John Critchley. It was my pleasure to know Mr. Jenkins for only a very short period, but I knew Jack Critchley for a number of years. I also regret that our old friends Harold Tapping and Fred Walsh, both in their last session of Parliament, are not with us today because of ill health. I trust that they will soon be restored to good health and that I shall again have the pleasure of their company and be able to seek the advice they are able to give as a result of their many years of experience.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on their speeches. As I have not had the pleasure of visiting the West Coast area, I thank the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) for the information he gave in his speech. Unlike the district of Eyre, which is a large scattered area, the district of Mount Gambier, which I am proud to represent, is not a large area but is an important part of this State that has expanded rapidly over the past 16 years. This rapid growth is evident when one compares the population figure of 6,771 on June 30, 1947, with 15,388 on June 30, 1961. The Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics estimated that the population at December 31, 1963, was 16,350.

Mr. Shannon: We haven't got decentralization, have we?

Mr. BURDON: It is very good, but there should be more. This rapid growth has been due to the foresight of Governments of earlier days through the forestry officers in establishing large areas of plantations in the lower South-East, which now cover about 150,000 acres. About 300,000,000 super feet of log production comes from Government and private forests annually. It is recorded that on June 30, 1962, the production of sawn timber in South Australia amounted to a little over 75 per cent of the State's consumption and that private forests supplied between one-quarter and one-third of the total amount produced. As reported in the 1961-62 annual report of the Woods and Forests Department, the adaptability of our major softwood, *pinus radiata*, to all forms of paper and board production is certain to prove of great economic importance in the fuller utilization of thinnings down to a 3in. diameter.

I congratulate the officers of the Woods and Forests Department on their decision to modernize the Nangwarry board line. This will make greater use of the more mature timber now available. The installation of this machinery is now taking place. The modern sawmilling equipment in the Mount Gambier sawmills has proved beyond doubt the economic advantage of using such machinery. The proposed installation of a modern bandmill at Mount Burr will enable the department to use more selective methods in the production of high-class timber. The modernizing of the plant at both Mount Burr and Nangwarry will follow a similar pattern. As South Australia was not endowed by nature with forests, it can readily be seen that the establishment of these softwood forests has been of great economic advantage. For the year ended June 30, 1962, the net return from forest production was £889,844 and, after recouping the expenditure of £561,676 for establishment, maintenance and protection of the forest areas, etc., a surplus of £328,168 was achieved.

The discovery in Victoria late in 1961 of the Sirex wood wasp caused serious concern to all associated with forestry work. Fortunately, prompt action was taken by various State Governments and the Commonwealth Government on an eradication programme in Victoria. The National Sirex Fund, designed to finance both the research programme and the eradication programme to eliminate this pest as soon as possible, was established. The high level of production from our South-Eastern forests in all forms of building timber and cases from our private and Government sawmills, the pulping plants and build-

ing board factories and the preservation plants of large quantities of creosoted and multi-salt-treated posts, poles and building timbers prove conclusively that we have in our softwood forests a mighty economic asset, an asset which we hope will ensure further growth at Millicent, through the expansion of the pulping plants in that area. I, like many others in Mount Gambier, earnestly hope that the Government and private enterprise will in the not too distant future be able to announce a further expansion in the pulping industry in my electoral district.

Mr. Speaker, in contrast to some other areas in South Australia, the South-East has had an abundance of rain in the past couple of months with large areas temporarily being flooded. Unfortunately, some lamb losses have occurred, but I believe this very wet winter could have the effect of destroying some of the ground pests that have caused farmers much expense and concern during the past few years. The four milk and cheese factories operating in my district are already reporting heavy increases in milk intake, and it is hoped that good seasonal conditions will continue. All other areas throughout the State will, I hope, be favoured with better conditions for the latter part of this year than they had for the first half. Although South Australia has, in the past 20 years, become a fairly heavily industrialized State, we are greatly dependent on the prosperity of the man on the land. While great importance is attached to the further growth of secondary industry, due recognition must always be given to those engaged in our primary industries. The continued good demand on the overseas market for our wool and wheat is something we must all be thankful for.

I hope that the vigorous efforts of my colleague the member for Frome, on behalf of the beef industry, for the provision of better roads in the north of this State will soon bear fruit. I also hope that the problem facing housewives at the present time in relation to poor quality beef will be lessened, that the Commonwealth Government will come to the party and that South Australia will receive its rightful share of cattle. The honourable member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) during his address expressed the hope that the gas finds at Gidgealpa would be of some benefit to the State. This I think we can all agree to and hope that these findings will prove to be a field of sufficient magnitude to have a big economic effect in this State on future fuel supplies.

Like many other country members, I am continually looking and hoping for further expansion of industry in our country areas. The provision of essential services, such as water and electricity, is no problem in my electoral district. In fact, in some South-Eastern areas there is a little surplus of water at present. The problem now facing some country centres is where to place the young people who will soon be leaving our schools. The development of further industry in the country is something that requires top-level investigation to overcome the continued industrialization of the metropolitan areas. Country people are proud people and the vast majority wish to remain there but, when industry reaches a certain level and then eases off, some families for the benefit of their children return to the city; otherwise, children are forced to leave home in their formative years to seek employment in the cities. When this happens very few return. In my district I am pinning my hopes on further development of the forestry industry, which I hope Governmental and private interests will soon bring about.

During my Address in Reply speech last year, I appealed to the Government to do something about decentralizing the office of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, and urged that provision be made for such an office in the proposed new Government offices in Mount Gambier. I hope I shall soon have a reply to a recent question as to what progress is being made in providing these offices. After making inquiries concerning the feasibility of country motor vehicles registration offices, I am convinced this can be brought about efficiently and expeditiously. I call on this Government to take the initiative to bring this about. From figures that I have obtained and believe to be authentic, it appears that 3,180 10-day permits were issued at the Mt. Gambier police station for the year ended June 30, 1963. This illustrates what benefits could be brought to country people by establishing country regional offices. A recent announcement by the Minister of Works that the Government was considering the possibility of paying for water by measure, might be a means of equalizing, to a degree, the present inequality of charges between country and metropolitan areas, and it is a measure that I hope will be fully investigated. I believe that the Government is fully aware of my previous remarks on this subject, when I endeavoured to point out the difference between rates for domestic water applying in the metropolitan area and for the city of Mount

Gambier, and the high sewerage rate that will severely effect the general public in areas now being sewered. I do not want this House to think that I believe these services can be provided for nothing. I am fully aware of the economic problems, and that before money can be spent it must first be collected. I do not accept the suggestion that it is cheaper to live in the country than in the city. In this respect I believe I am fully supported by the member for Albert who said, speaking on the Loan Estimates last year, that a Housing Trust house at Bordertown costs 7s. 6d. a week more and had a further cost of 2s. a week on lighting tariff.

It is noted in His Excellency's Speech that the Electricity Trust has had a record year, and this indicates that the Government's previous strenuous opposition to the equalization of tariffs throughout the State was not justified. For domestic use, country people pay 10% above metropolitan rates. In view of the trust's record year, would the Government now consider introducing a uniform rate throughout the State without increasing the rate in the metropolitan area? We now have in South Australia, a complete connection of powerlines from Pt. Augusta in the north to Mt. Gambier in the south, and I hope the day is not too far distant when people in the western areas of the State will also enjoy the benefits of the State electricity system. The Mt. Gambier power station is operated entirely on sawmill waste. The Party of which I am proud to be a member has in the past pressed for equalization of electricity charges for domestic use, and I now further appeal to the Government to implement an equalized charge throughout the State.

I have previously spoken about the night passenger rail service from Adelaide to Mount Gambier and *vice-versa*, and have been supported by the members for Millicent and Victoria. No complaint is voiced about the hours of departure or arrival between the two points. However, I appeal to the Government and to the railway authorities, to place on this run an air-conditioned carriage or carriages for those people who, for various reasons, must travel in sitting-up carriages. The Government of the day 10 years ago, at the opening of the broad gauge line to Mount Gambier, promised modern facilities, and I suggest that first and second class carriages now used should be heated in winter by electric radiators, or some form of air-conditioning installed, until such time as modern air-conditioned rail coaches can be provided. I also suggest that, instead of half-empty first and second class

carriages, one first class air-conditioned carriage should be provided on this night service. I believe modern carriages with modern facilities would greatly increase the patronage by the public. I do complain about the policy of requiring six bookings above one sleeping car before another sleeping car is provided. On Monday evening, July 27, complaints were made to me on the train in this connection, by a lady and gentleman passenger and, upon questioning these two passengers, one informed me that when making a booking they were informed that unless six bookings were made the second sleeper would not be provided. This passenger was informed that her booking was number 5. Naturally she arrived hoping there would be another booking and that the second sleeper would be provided. This lady arrived in Adelaide last Tuesday morning in a similar state to other sitting-up passengers—frozen. The gentleman was more fortunate. The honourable member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) came to Adelaide on Monday morning, so that at Naracoorte the gentleman obtained a sleeping berth. I was not able to find the other three passengers who allegedly booked on this train, although I questioned every other passenger at the time. I can only conclude that these people found other ways of travelling to Adelaide. This sort of service creates a bad image in the public's mind and, on behalf of the South-East train travellers, I appeal for a better deal in the railways service.

Recently the Minister of Education favoured my district with a two-day visit, during which time visits were made to seven schools and discussions held with the various school committees, ranging over a wide field, and some decisions were even made on the spot. These personal visits by the Minister have many benefits. He was able to personally examine local problems and discuss them with the people who devote a considerable amount of their time and energy on behalf of the various schools and their students. However, once again I remind the Minister of the urgency for a new infants school at Reedy Park, as well as a new high school at Mount Gambier. His Excellency the Governor in his Speech stated that about 193,500 students were at present enrolled with a further 5,000 to enter the schools early in July. Our rapid expansion in population, which we hope will continue for a long time, calls for a vigorous school-building programme, and a corresponding recruitment programme for student teachers. Education in this technical and scientific age

calls for all the energy and resources it is possible to marshal. Pressure must continually be brought to bear on the Commonwealth Government to loosen its purse strings in the cause of education. Every day wasted in not adequately educating our youth is a crime for which we may yet pay dearly.

One of the features of education is the great interest being taken by country people in adult education classes. The adult education centre in Mount Gambier lost 500 students this year when a centre was established in Naracoorte. However, the new enrolments were such that the present enrolments are only about 100 below last year's figures. As the Minister has just visited all city schools in my district, I shall not refer further to educational matters, except to say that I hope that the Minister will soon be in a position to inform me of further plans for education buildings in Mount Gambier, and in that respect I shall be a continual reminder to him of our school problems. Before closing on this subject, I suggest that the Education Department or Public Buildings Department examine the quality of work that has been carried out in asphaltting and levelling school-grounds. Some recent work that I have seen in Mount Gambier schools was so poor as to be a public waste of money. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, may I appeal through the Government to the South Australian Housing Trust to try to eliminate the construction of double-unit homes in our wide open spaces. Single-units have a greater appeal to all concerned. The workers of this country were given an increase in the basic wage to compensate for past cost of living rises, because the court believed that through general prosperity industry was well able to afford the increase. However, immediately such an increase is granted, any benefit received by the workers is nullified by price increases.

As I indicated earlier, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply in its amended form.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the Address in Reply as amended by the Leader of the Opposition. I suppose that having said that, according to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), I should proceed immediately to deal with the amendment. I assure the honourable member that I will deal with the matter at some length and also with his remarks later on. I think that in a speech of this nature one or two things must be done. These things have been done

by each member who has spoken, and I would be failing in my duty as a member of Her Majesty's Opposition if I did not also do these things before dealing with the amendment.

First, I join with those members who have offered congratulations to the Royal Family on the Royal births during recent months. I also join with other members in expressing regret at the inability of Her Majesty the Queen Mother to come to South Australia to attend and open the Festival of Arts. I think everybody in South Australia would join me in expressing regret at the inability of Her Majesty to attend that function. At the same time, I think every member of this House would want to pay a compliment to those who were responsible for the arrangements of the festival. I believe that the committee responsible for the arrangements has done much to put South Australia on the map, and I consider that those people are worthy of every ounce of encouragement that we can give them. The festival is recognized as being entirely South Australian, and I believe there are few places in the world where any function of a similar nature is held.

I also join with members who have expressed their sympathy at the passing of former members of this House. Kind remarks have been made concerning those members, and I could add little to the remarks that have been made. However, I should like to say that I had a very sincere respect for Sir Walter Duncan, whose political thinking was quite contrary to mine. I served with Sir Walter for many years on the Joint House Committee, and I deeply appreciated his wisdom and his absolute fairness in dealing with matters that came before the committee. He was always considerate to persons who were employees, and he was always fair and always gave very wise counsel regarding the matters we had to consider.

My knowledge of the late Sir Shirley Jeffries goes back much further even than my knowledge of Sir Walter Duncan. I remember Sir Shirley Jeffries when he was Minister of Education, and that was a long time prior to my coming into this House. On a number of occasions I waited on the late gentleman on deputations from school committees. I have heard it said many times by the immediate past President of the Croydon Boys Technical School Council that it was Sir Shirley who made the move that provided the ground on which the boys' and girls' technical

high schools are now constructed, and the honourable gentleman will ever be remembered for that. In addition, he will be remembered for sacrificial services he rendered to this State.

I served with the late Mr. Jenkins on the Land Settlement Committee, and I learned to respect him not only for his wise counsel but for what he achieved in his life-time. Mr. Jenkins had a humble beginning; he came to this country as a young man with (as he said himself so many times) very little money. He worked in the Postmaster-General's Department, and from there he took up virgin land on Eyre Peninsula (an area that was so well spoken of by the mover in this debate), where he toiled and experienced great difficulties when prices for his products were very low. Later he settled in Victor Harbour. He was a man of great courage and ability and was fair in all his dealings; I had the highest admiration for him. My memory of the late Mr. Critchley goes back to the days when I knew him with the late Leader of the Opposition, Mr. O'Halloran. I had the greatest admiration for him. Many times I have visited the place where the late John Critchley was born and the respect that is felt for him in that area is evidence of the great man that he was.

Whilst speaking of departed members, I feel that all members of this Parliament would like to join me in expressing my regret at the passing of Mrs. Condon, the wife of the late Mr. Frank Condon. I do this with great feeling because it was the late Frank Condon who so often referred to the great sacrifices that were made by the wives of members of Parliament. I believe that few people have made greater sacrifices for the State as a wife of a member of Parliament than the late Mrs. Condon. I express my sincere sympathy to her family, whom I know so well. Kind remarks have been made about His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edrie Bastyan, and Lady Bastyan and I wish to add to those remarks because I believe His Excellency and Lady Bastyan have endeared themselves to the people of South Australia by the sincerity with which they have carried out their duties. They have endeavoured to become familiar with the problems of the people of South Australia, and have already proved themselves great ambassadors for the State.

We have now reached the last session of the thirty-seventh Parliament and we know that at the end of this session we shall not all return.

Although most of us will face the electors who will decide whether or not we return we must be conscious of the fact that three members will be leaving of their own choice. I believe that this is an appropriate time to make some reference to those members and to wish them well for the future. First, I shall refer to the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding). He will be leaving this house and I regret that that time has come. I have appreciated his company and his friendship. I acknowledge him as a political opponent and a very good opponent he has been. I wish him and his good lady well for the future. I now wish to refer to the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) and I join with the member for Mt. Gambier (Mr. Burdon) in expressing regret that he is not with us just now. He has been away for a long time, and I regret to say that I fear he will not be able to return this session. I now know that he is a very sick man. I do not want to go into details, but I assure members that he would be present if it were physically possible. Mr. Tapping has only friends in this House, and I am sure every member regrets his illness and extends to him good wishes for his return.

At the end of this session we shall be losing Mr. Fred Walsh, the member for West Torrens, from this side of the House, and I am sure I have the support of the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), who is a close friend of Mr. Walsh, in what I am about to say. South Australia has been particularly fortunate in having had a son in the person of Mr. Walsh, who has served on the executives of the Trades and Labor Council and the Parliamentary Labor Party for, I think, 30 consecutive years. Only a man of honour could continually top a ballot in such contests, and Mr. Walsh has done this year after year. I think his great quality is that he can be depended on at any time; if he has given his word, that is his bond, and everyone knows that that is his great strength. I have always admired the honourable member because, when there have been difficulties and someone has been trying to find a way out, he has found a way, and has done so with the greatest kindness. I am sure every member joins with me in wishing Mr. Walsh and his good wife every good wish for the future. I appreciate the kind remarks made by the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) about my colleague.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) and the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele)

spoke about the interest members should show in districts apart from their own, and their remarks encouraged and relieved me. I have been a member of this House for 15 years and have always thought that there has been an agreement between members not to enter in the affairs of another member's district. I am sure every member opposite will agree that I have been most careful when going into their districts that I have not trespassed upon their affairs. I have been rather reluctant to deal with things having a broad aspect when those things have related to other members' districts, but, as a result of the remarks made by the two members I have mentioned, I believe every member has a responsibility for matters that affect the whole of the State. This will be my future attitude. However, when something of a district nature is involved, I will not deal with it, and I hope other members will follow this course.

The honourable member for Burnside challenged the members on this side on their attitude on decentralization, but I make no apologies for the attitude of members on this side of the House on that subject. I acknowledge (and nobody other than a fool would refuse so to acknowledge) that there has been great development in certain country areas. The honourable member quoted Whyalla and Mount Gambier, but most of the major towns in South Australia have had their population substantially reduced during the régime of this Government. There are, therefore, very good reasons to be concerned about decentralization. We on this side do not consider that decentralization is any easy problem to solve. The member for Burnside brought out the great problems that exist in carrying out a policy of decentralization. She said (quite correctly) that there was a tendency for young people to drift to the metropolitan area because of education facilities there. That is agreed, and there is a great drift in employment in that direction. For that reason the population percentage of the metropolitan area has increased while that of the country areas has decreased in spite of the development of those major country towns already referred to. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 5, at 2 p.m.