

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, May 19, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

WEST BEACH RESERVE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I noticed in the press this morning a report to the effect that the Premier yesterday received a deputation in connection with a project to establish certain facilities on the West Beach recreation reserve. That project seemed to be on all fours with a project which had been referred to the previous Government, but which had been rejected by that Government because it would have required obtaining a liquor licence outside the provisions of the Licensing Act. It would also have necessitated alienating public recreation land for private profit motives. Will the Premier say whether land that has been purchased for public recreation purposes should be alienated for the purpose sought and whether such a project would involve seeking a liquor licence outside the provisions of the State Act?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Three persons, one being Mr. Pollnitz, made submissions to me yesterday for a certain project to be established near the northern end of the West Beach reserve. I did not go into details of the conduct of such project. When I was told that a liquor licence would be desired if the project were to be commenced, I said that the question of a licence could be dealt with only by way of a local option poll. All I can say at the moment is that these people waited on me, and that is as far as it goes. When the matter will be considered by Cabinet is another question.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Will legislation be required?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have not considered that aspect yet.

EXCESS WATER ACCOUNTS.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a matter I raised recently regarding accounts for excess water used by Housing Trust tenants at Port Pirie and other places?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member wrote and asked about people who lived in Housing Trust areas and who were being charged for excess water. I have also heard a suggestion that this matter has arisen since the present Government came into office. I

wish to make it clear that this is not something new: it is part and parcel of an agreement entered into between the Housing Trust and a tenant when a tenant accepts tenancy. That agreement states that the tenant shall pay for excess water. The Engineering and Water Supply Department renders accounts to the Housing Trust, which then renders accounts to tenants. On inquiring further, I have been assured by the trust that if it is only a matter of a few shillings the trust does not submit an account but that, if the excess is considered larger than necessary, an account is rendered.

THEVENARD CHANNEL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Recently navigation lights were placed along the entrance channel to the Thevenard jetty. Can the Minister of Marine say whether those lights have had the desired effect and whether the Government intends to deepen the channel approach at Thevenard as has been approved by the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be glad to obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

BOOK PROSECUTION.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Attorney-General any request for a decision whether, if the book *The Trial of Lady Chatterley* were sold in South Australia, he would give a certificate for its prosecution? I understand that it has been announced that the Tasmanian Attorney-General has refused to prosecute in connection with this matter. If a request has been made to the Attorney-General, has he made a decision on it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had a request to know whether, if the book were sold in South Australia, it would be prosecuted. Such a prosecution has to have a special certificate of the Attorney-General. In consequence, I examined the book, reading it right through. It appears to me to be a perfectly sober account of an important trial. It contains no matter that I consider to be either depraving or salacious. In fact, it contains material that is important and interesting to the public. I believe that the address to the jury of the present Lord Chancellor (who was a counsel in that case) was of great interest and one of the best addresses to the jury that I have ever read. It is a sober and important book and under no circumstances, if it were circulated in South Australia, would I think it proper to grant a certificate for its prosecution.

WATERVALE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yesterday I received a letter from the Clerk of the District Council of Upper Wakefield indicating that the people of Watervale were becoming alarmed at the delay in providing the proposed water scheme for the town. Has the Minister of Works a progress report on the work?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member was good enough to inform me that he would ask this question and I have been able to obtain a report. Investigations regarding a proposed water supply for Watervale from underground sources have been carried out by the Mines Department, which had previously drilled two unsuccessful bores. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief considered that one more attempt should be made to obtain a successful bore and the matter was referred to the Director of Mines, who advised that one site had been selected on section 331 hundred of Upper Wakefield, and an alternative site on section 752. The one preferred was on section 331. Approval was accordingly given in October last for the drilling of a bore on section 331. The honourable member has asked for a progress report, and I have today received the following from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department:

This bore is being sunk by the Department of Mines on section 331, hundred of Upper Wakefield. Initially a 4in. bore was put down to a depth of 267ft. to establish that water was present and to get an indication of its quality. The bore is now being reamed out to take 8in. diameter casing and it has been cased to a present depth of 107ft. This work is progressing slowly in difficult conditions and the Director of Mines estimates that the bore will not be available for pump testing for a further three weeks.

The matter will receive further consideration when I receive the Director and Engineer-in-Chief's report following the testing of this third bore. I will then report to the honourable member.

TEA TREE GULLY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the department has purchased land adjoining the Tea Tree Gully Primary School? If it has not, does it intend to do so?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get that information for the honourable member and let her have a reply as soon as possible.

ROAD TAX.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yesterday in the Legislative Council the Minister of Transport

(Hon. A. F. Kneebone) gave a prepared statement to the effect that Eyre Peninsula would not be exempt from road tax. The Minister of Roads (Hon. S. C. Bevan) subsequently stated, in effect, that the Transport Control Board would be reinstated. As such a move would greatly affect my district and many members of the organization of which I have the honour to be secretary, could the Premier explain Government policy in this matter? Would such reinstatement of the board mean that all permits would have to be issued under the old regulations and that primary producers would have to get a permit from the board to carry their stock? I ask these questions because the Minister has stated that insufficient revenue is being received from road tax to offset the wear and tear of roads caused by transport vehicles. Can the Premier indicate the policy of his Government on this very important question?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I will obtain a report from my colleague. I point out that the policy referred to is not new: it has been enunciated and brought before the people in the two election campaigns during which I have been the Leader of my Party. The details of that policy will be explained when I have obtained the report from my colleague.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Premier say whether Kangaroo Island is in the same position as Eyre Peninsula and that no remission of road tax will be made for Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

CAMBRAI-SEDAN WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Works say what further progress, if any, has been made on the provision of a reticulated water supply for Cambrai and Sedan in my district?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Previous schemes to serve this area were considered too costly and arrangements were made that Messrs. Campbell and Bates of the Engineering and Water Supply Department should meet representatives of the District Councils of Mannum, Marne, and Sedan. At this conference and inspection, which took place in July last, general agreement (except for certain proposed mains) was reached regarding the scope of the scheme. Details in regard to the mains in question were subsequently forwarded by the Chairman of the District Council of Marne (Mr. Groth). It was then decided that the department's design branch should prepare

a revised scheme and when this had been completed a fresh revenue statement would be compiled. I understand that the design branch has completed its part of the work and, as soon as the whole of the details can be gathered together, the Engineer-in-Chief will complete a comprehensive report on the revised scheme. The district councils concerned have asked me to receive a combined deputation, but I have deferred their request until the matter is further advanced.

RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES.

Mr. RYAN: In this morning's *Advertiser* an article appeared stating that the Commonwealth Attorney-General would introduce in the House of Representatives this week a Bill on restrictive trade practices. As this legislation will be modified compared with the legislation that was to be introduced by the previous Commonwealth Attorney-General, can the Attorney-General say whether the matter has been discussed with the appropriate State Ministers, and whether, if the Bill is ultimately passed after remaining for six months on the table of the Commonwealth Parliament, it will take away from the States their sovereign rights in this important matter? Also, would it require a recommendation from the States for an amendment to the Commonwealth Act, if such were considered necessary, or would the States have the right to introduce their own Restrictive Trade Practices Bill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although the Commonwealth Government's restrictive trade practices legislation has been the subject of discussions at the standing conferences of Attorneys-General, these have not been the means of the States' persuading the Commonwealth Government to adopt certain courses in this matter. The Commonwealth Attorney-General has merely informed the State Attorneys-General of what he purposes to do. The proposal will not take away the sovereign rights of the States in relation to restrictive trade practices, but it will be necessary that complementary legislation be introduced in State Parliaments to supplement the Commonwealth proposals, and the Commonwealth Government desires that this be done. However, the precise form of the legislation will have to be determined when the ultimate fate of the Commonwealth legislation is known. Suffice to say that the proposals in the Commonwealth legislation are considerably watered down from the original proposals of

Sir Garfield Barwick, and this will leave several matters to be dealt with by the States. It will be necessary to try to fit the States' administration of restrictive trade practices legislation into the framework of the Commonwealth administration and arrive at joint proposals in this matter.

STIRLING HIGHWAY.

Mr. SHANNON: People living on the highway from Crafers to Aldgate are perturbed at the slowness in providing more accessibility on that portion of the highway. At present it seems to be a bottleneck. A number of departmental officers have been surveying the area concerned, but no definite statement has been made whether this work will precede the work on the new freeway now in the course of construction. The bottleneck is worsening because of the increasing volume of traffic on the road, and residents in the area firmly believe that this project should take priority over work on the new freeway. Will the Minister of Education secure a report from his colleague and let me know the Government's policy on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

VITICULTURAL RESEARCH.

Mr. CURREN: It has been brought to my notice that Mr. Tulloch, a viticultural research officer, has tendered, or is about to tender, his resignation from the Department of Agriculture to take up research work with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. Will the Minister of Agriculture have this matter investigated, and if possible take steps to retain the services of this officer, in the interests of the South Australian viticultural industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, I shall take this matter up with departmental officers. This case is unknown to me, but I am conscious of the definite shortage of technical staff in the department, and this is a matter I intend to take up with the Director of Agriculture as well as with the Public Service Commissioner soon to see whether the problem can be overcome.

SILOS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked yesterday about a statement in the press regarding the Appila silo?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: On May 13 my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, wrote

to the Secretary of the Appila Silo Committee, and the letter states:

. . . I wish to advise you that Government policy is not to approve of silos on sites not served by rail. In accordance with this policy, the Government is not prepared to approve of the erection of a silo at Appila.

Section 14 of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act requires the approval of the Minister of Agriculture before any silo can be erected. Further, I understand that the previous Government's policy was similar to our stand on this matter.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Premier referred to section 14 of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act under which the Minister had to approve recommendations, and he said, in effect, that the Government's policy was that it would not approve of a silo being erected at a site where there was no railway. The previous Minister, under section 14, approved the erection of silos at Witera, Cowell, Mangalo, Streaky Bay and Arno Bay, and none of these places is served by railways. In view of this, how does the present Government reconcile its policy of refusing to grant requests for silos at Appila and possibly Booborowie?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am not really acquainted with all these places that have been mentioned, but I understand that there are places on Eyre Peninsula that are far removed from railway services. I am also aware that in a certain area a silo was erected because of the desire of certain people in the area, and as a consequence a nearby railway system has become almost redundant. It could be a proposal to consider the advisability of erecting a silo that would serve the railway system in that area. The answer that I gave earlier this afternoon is deliberately in line with policy. For some years now this State has had an annual railway deficit of about £4,250,000, and if this State is to make any progress from the point of view of easing the burden on the taxpayers (and taking into account the importance of silos to the industry concerned) I can say that honourable members can take it for granted that silos will be erected on railways if the area in which they are required is within reasonable distance of any railway system, in order that they can be served by the railways. On the other hand, if there is no railway service in the area and a silo has to be serviced by road transport, common sense will prevail. In all fairness to the bulk handling co-operative, I think that in most cases (unless it has been under some pressure unknown to me, which is quite possible) common sense has

prevailed. The Government's attitude will coincide with commonsense approaches on any occasion where responsible people are involved.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I appreciate the Premier's announcement of Government policy regarding this matter, but he appears to me to be debating a policy on behalf of his Government of road transport versus railway transport. At one or two of the places I have mentioned where silos have been erected and approved under section 14 of the Act, particularly Witera, some road transport is involved eventually in carting wheat to the railway line, I think the nearest place being Poochera. The wheat eventually reaches the railways and brings revenue to the railways by that means. The reason a silo is at a place like Witera is that it is too far from the railway point for the purpose of serving all the farmers in that area. Practically the same thing applies at Appila, and it would probably apply at Booborowie. Instead of the Government being so adamant at this stage in adopting a policy in that regard, would the Premier be prepared to have another look at this matter in the interests of all the wheatgrowers concerned?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: We will examine each proposal as it is submitted, and if it is possible in the interests of the people concerned to retain the policy that I have already given and made known to the people, we shall still be in harmony with our policy in this matter. The honourable member mentioned two other places. I can say that this Government will not agree to wheat silos being erected at Booborowie or Appila: those two places are out.

Mr. HEASLIP: Will the Premier examine his and the Government's legal position under section 14 of the Act?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: In the interests of this Parliament and this State, I can obtain a report through my colleague on all necessary matters. However, I think probably the honourable member would be better advised to consult his own solicitor on these matters.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was interested in the framing of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act and took an active part in administering it for some two years. So far as I know (and I have consulted the Act), under section 14 the only matters in connection with the erection of a grain silo to be referred to the Government or the Minister of Agriculture are the design and materials with which the silo is to be constructed. No reference is made

in the Act to the Minister or the Government in relation to the site where it is proposed to erect a silo. I ask the Premier whether he will consult the section again? So far as I can see (and I believe so far as the honourable members for Rocky River and Ridley can see), the Government has not acted within the provisions of the Act in refusing the erection of a silo at Appila.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am prepared to consult my colleague the Attorney-General, and to request that he obtain, if necessary, a report from the Crown Solicitor on this matter, because of the pressure from members of the Opposition concerning wheat silos. I shall request the bulk handling co-operative to give me a complete and detailed report about the time the applications have been lodged—

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: And the voting, and whether they wanted a silo at Appila.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: That is the point. I accept that interjection.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Have you acted legally or not?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I accept the interjection from my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, and shall give Parliament a complete report on the matter.

Mr. Hall: This is now a Government co-operative: it is no longer a growers' co-operative.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am not prepared to accept the interjections and innuendos all around the House. I do not desire to proceed further than I have indicated. I assure the House that I accept the interjection of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I wish to direct a question to the Premier on this matter, and ask leave to make a statement.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member want leave to explain his question or to make a statement?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have asked your permission to make a statement apropos a question.

The SPEAKER: That the honourable member have leave to make a statement.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: If the honourable member wants to explain the question, that is all right.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: All I ask is your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the indulgence of the House to make a statement in order that the question may be clear.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: If it is an explanatory statement, that is all right.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has leave to explain the question, but leave to make a statement is not granted.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I wish to explain to the Premier, first, that I appreciate his last reply that he will consult with other Ministers before making a decision regarding the site of new silos. I quote—

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did not say that I was going to consult with my colleagues on where the silos would be. I want the honourable member for Ridley to understand that and to quote me correctly. The honourable member should sit down. Who has the floor, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order?

The SPEAKER: I am hearing the Premier on a point of order. The honourable member for Ridley will be seated.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am not getting excited, but what I am concerned about is that on all occasions I should be quoted correctly. In this case I said that I would obtain a report from the bulk handling co-operative about wheat silos in this State.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: And consult your colleagues.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I said I would consult the Attorney-General on a matter raised by the honourable member for Flinders.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That is what I am talking about.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I do not know what the honourable member is talking about.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am not attempting to misquote or misreport the Premier in any way. I understood him to say, in answer to a previous question (and you, Mr. Speaker, heard this, and so did everyone else), that this Government would not erect a silo at Booborowie or Appila.

The Hon. F. H. Walsh: That is right.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am not misreporting the Premier. I went on to say that I was glad the Premier had now made the statement that he would consult with other authorities in this matter. I quote section 14 of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act:

(1) The company shall, with all practicable speed, erect adequate bulk handling facilities—

- (a) at each terminal port; and
- (b) at a sufficient number of railway stations, railway sidings, and depots, to receive the wheat and barley which is to be taken to the terminal ports.

Subsection (3) states:

The company shall not erect a country bin unless the design and materials of such bin have been approved by the Minister. The

Minister may give a general or special approval to any design and materials.

That has nothing whatever to do with the site. I am seriously concerned with the previous statement of the Premier that this Government would not agree to erect a silo at Booborowie or Appila. That is contrary to the intention of the Act, which is that the authority shall decide the site.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ridley will be seated. The honourable member sought leave to make a statement, which this House refused. I gave him leave to make an explanation leading to a question. I hope he will not abuse the right to make the explanation and that he keeps the explanation pertinent to the question. The member for Ridley.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Premier reconsider this matter as an important principle is involved in the interpretation of this Act? Because of its importance the Government should reconsider this question.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I believe that I said in reply to a question of the honourable member for Flinders that I would consult my colleague. The answer to the honourable member for Ridley is that, if he is not prepared to accept that, then, so that I will understand what he is saying, I ask him to put his question on notice.

CONCESSION TICKETS.

Mr. HUGHES: Will the Premier, representing the Minister of Railways in another place, ask his colleague for the reasons for not issuing workmen's weekly tickets for travellers between Moonta and Wallaroo?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Yes.

GUMMY SHARKS.

Mr. McANANEY: The sale of gummy shark is prevented during the month of November because of pressure, I understand, from the Eastern States. Many sharks are caught in the nets at Victor Harbour during this period but, because they are dead, they have to be thrown away and wasted. Will the Minister of Agriculture investigate the necessity for this regulation and, if possible, ascertain whether this wastage can be prevented?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

CADETSHIPS.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary in another place, a reply to the question I asked last Thursday regarding the back-dating of Public Service cadetships?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The report from the Chief Secretary states:

Instructions have been issued by the Public Service Commissioner that cadetships and studentships awarded by that department should operate from January 1 in the year of commencement. This decision was made retrospective to include scholarships commencing in 1965.

PENOLA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works tell me what progress is being made in regard to a Penola water supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Engineer for Water Supply reports:

All of the mains in the scheme have been laid but there have been unforeseen delays in the delivery by contractors of the borehole pumping plants and the overhead storage tank and there has also been a delay in the provision of power transmission lines to two of the bore sites by the local electricity authority. However, consumers are being supplied by measure by the use of a temporary pump on one of the bores and the railways overhead tank. The railways tank is not as high as the department's tank and consequently the pressure at which the water is supplied is not up to the standard which will eventually prevail and this is the reason why consumers are not yet rated. Within the next month the department's elevated tank will be completed and put into service and an additional temporary pump will be installed so that a supply under normal conditions will then be available. It is anticipated that the permanent pumps will be installed before the coming summer.

HAWKER-QUORN ROAD.

Mr. CASEY: Recently the District Council of Kanyaka applied to the Highways Department for a grant to continue forming the road from Hawker to Quorn prior to sealing it. I understand that the department has granted a sum that will be adequate only to maintain that road, and this could lead to a reduction in the number of personnel in the road gang at Quorn, that is, subcontractors, etc. It certainly would not meet the need to seal this road, which is a vital link to the Flinders Ranges, an increasingly popular tourist resort in this State. Will the Minister of Education refer this matter to his colleague in another place to see whether a further grant can be made to the Kanyaka District Council?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do so.

GILES POINT FACILITIES.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yesterday, in answer to a question about the construction of deep-sea loading facilities at Giles Point, the Minister

of Marine said he intended to set up a committee to further investigate bulk handling. Can the Minister indicate the personnel of this committee and say whether the committee will visit Yorke Peninsula and take evidence from primary producers and others concerned, as was done by the Public Works Committee when it made exhaustive inquiries into bulk handling facilities for Giles Point?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think it would be wrong of me, at this stage, to indicate the composition of the committee because it has not been approved by Cabinet and I therefore cannot anticipate it. However, I give my assurance that, on the formation of the committee, the fullest possible investigations will be made; there will be no limitations on the committee.

MOUNT GAMBIER TO ADELAIDE RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CORCORAN: Often in the past I have complained of the standard of rolling stock used for passenger accommodation on the night service of the Mount Gambier to Adelaide train. The member for Mount Gambier and the former member for Victoria have also complained, but as yet no improvement has taken place. Will the Premier ask his colleague, the Minister of Railways, whether he has considered replacing this rolling stock?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Some representation has already been made concerning this important service to Mount Gambier. I believe that provision will be made in this year's Loan Estimates for new rolling stock. However, I shall obtain a report from my colleague and make it available to the honourable member as soon as possible.

WINDY POINT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I noticed a reference in His Excellency's Speech to the fact that the Government will continue to encourage migration to the State and will do everything in its power to assist in the growth of the tourist industry. This encourages me to raise again in this House a matter I have raised often in the past—the development of Windy Point as a premier tourist resort in South Australia. As the Minister in charge of the Tourist Bureau, has the Premier considered this matter and, if he has, will he authorize plans for the development of Windy Point, plans which unfortunately had to be shelved last year or the previous year?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: This matter has already been considered. Unfortunately, the

situation does not lend itself to the type of accommodation that I believe is in the honourable member's mind. At this stage I can only say that the matter has not been proceeded with very far. I hesitate to say whether provision will be made for this development on the Loan Estimates this year, but what happens in the future remains to be seen.

CEMENT SHORTAGE.

Mr. JENNINGS: I have been informed by several sources over the last day or two that South Australia is again suffering from a rather alarming shortage of cement. Will the Premier use the facilities of his departments to ascertain the truth of these allegations? If they are true, will he also ascertain whether this shortage is either caused or accentuated by the export of a large quantity of South Australian cement to other States?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am conversant with some facts associated with this matter, particularly those concerning the pending shortage which, by now, may have occurred. I shall ascertain from those concerned whether it has, in fact, occurred. There has been something of a stampede by those wishing to purchase cement. The cement companies concerned have coped reasonably with the position but, because of the demand for South Australian cement in particular, they have to install certain machinery that has not been completed. At the request of the companies, Cabinet agreed that clinker should be imported for the present to help meet any emergency that may exist. I will obtain the fullest information on the other points raised by the honourable member. However, I assure the House that Cabinet has tried to help as far as possible, but certain matters, such as shipping, which are beyond its control, have caused delay.

EGG MARKETING.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Provision exists in Commonwealth legislation for the money that is collected by means of a levy to be repaid to the States by the Minister for Primary Industry after taking into account any recommendations of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia. Is the Minister of Agriculture satisfied that the reimbursement will be made strictly according to the quantity of eggs and egg products exported, which is at present the plan of the sponsors of the scheme? Is the Minister satisfied that the Minister for Primary Industry will not be tempted to alter the payments to

the States from this basis to one of perhaps supporting individual State authorities for promotional purposes?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Could that be done under the Act?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, the Minister for Primary Industry could allot it to a State authority, as far as I can see, for any reason connected with promotion or perhaps some emergency that a State might experience. As I understand the Bill, the Minister for Primary Industry has power to make these reimbursements after taking into account any recommendations of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities. If the council has a constitution, I have never seen it, and therefore it leaves the matter rather in the air. Is the Minister satisfied with that position, and is he satisfied that this State will receive its proper reimbursement as planned by the inventors of the scheme?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member has cast some doubt on whether a Minister in another Parliament will do certain things. This, of course, is purely hypothetical at this stage, and it is a matter that will have to be considered further when the occasion arises. I point out that the Minister is obliged to take notice of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities, which is composed of the egg boards of every State of the Commonwealth. This means, of course, that protection is given to the various States, which in turn will have some say in advising the Minister as to the way this fund should be disbursed to the States. To my knowledge, all of the egg boards comprise grower representatives in the majority, and this in itself indicates to me that some protection is given. If there is any further information that I can get for the honourable member from the Chairman of the Egg Board, I shall be pleased to get it for him.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister of Agriculture has said that the Commonwealth Minister must take notice of the recommendations of the egg marketing boards of the States in connection with the allocation of revenue from the special tax. Is the Minister of Agriculture satisfied, after considering the history of these special marketing schemes, which have always been heavily weighted in favour of the Eastern States, that this scheme protects egg producers in this State, or will they receive a lesser subsidy for export eggs than producers in other States

because of the way funds are allocated by the Commonwealth Minister as a result of recommendations by the egg marketing boards of the Eastern States?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: First, I must correct the Leader. I do not think I used the word "must" in my reference to the Minister's taking notice of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities. I believe that I said they would advise the Minister. Apparently I have more confidence in the Minister for Primary Industry than has either the Leader or the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It does not seem to matter what our opinion is of the Commonwealth Minister or whether we have confidence in him. We have to consider whether the primary producers of this State are to have the opportunity to express their approval or disapproval of the egg marketing scheme. Is the Minister of Agriculture satisfied that the scheme will adequately protect the egg producers of this State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am satisfied that this scheme will be to the advantage of egg producers in this State.

Mr. LAWN: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his predecessor had sufficient time to conduct a poll of producers in relation to the Commonwealth egg marketing scheme, and whether he refrained from conducting it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Answering the second part of the honourable member's question first, I can say that the previous Minister did not refuse to conduct a poll, but I should add that plenty of time existed between the time the legislation was passed in October last year and the elections of this year, in which such a poll could have been held. I point out, too, that this scheme was first sought in 1961, and that it was not until last year that the former Government even got around to considering a poll. Western Australia, Tasmania, the Northern Territory and Queensland (which are in a similar situation to our situation) have agreed to the scheme, and they apparently did not fear the New South Wales and Victorian set-up—a fear that has been suggested in earlier questions today. In fact, every State agreed to the scheme without conducting a poll, and it is obvious from the debate in the Commonwealth Parliament that no-one there desired a poll, either.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is not quite correct.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No; one member (Mr. Jeff Bate) suggested a poll, but he could not obtain a seconder to his motion. We were represented in that Parliament by members from this State, but none voted against the scheme, although one honourable member, who obviously knew nothing about the matter, spoke against the scheme. Had the former Government desired a poll (and it seems so intent on suggesting one now) it has had ample opportunity to conduct one since 1961.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In recent years, the New South Wales Egg Board has maintained a wholesale price level for eggs that is substantially higher than the price maintained by the South Australian Egg Board. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the implementation of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan will cause the South Australian wholesale price to conform with the price in New South Wales?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is intended that a uniform price shall prevail throughout the whole of Australia, but I cannot say what its basis will be. The honourable member suggests that it could be linked to the price in New South Wales but, of course, this begs the question. As yet, it is not known what the basis will be, but this will be determined in due course by the committee of C.E.M.A.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask leave to explain my question. An allegation has been made today that, while Minister of Agriculture, I could easily have held a poll of egg producers on the C.E.M.A. plan. Indeed, there has been an imputation about my sincerity on whether I would have held a poll. I do not intend to argue these matters now, but I will refer to them during the Address in Reply debate. Over several years letters have been written while this plan was being discussed.

The SPEAKER: I understood that the honourable member sought leave to make a statement explaining his question. Is that what the honourable member wished to do?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain my question.

The SPEAKER: Then I ask the honourable member to confine his explanation to his question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Over the years I have written and received many letters which are in the official docket on the C.E.M.A. plan. Will the Minister of Agriculture make the docket available to me so that I can make my statement fully during the Address in Reply debate?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I did not, at any stage, cast any reflection on the sincerity of the member for Alexandra, nor do I think any honourable member thought so. I shall be happy to make the docket available to the honourable member, provided that it is not removed from the Chamber.

LAMEROO AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Works explain the delay that has occurred in the preparation of a site for a new oval at the Lameroo Area School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The development of the area at the Lameroo Area School for additional playing fields involves ground formation, which is the responsibility of the Public Buildings Department, and water reticulation and grassing which is carried out by the school committee under subsidy arrangements with the Education Department. The school committee submitted a quotation from the District Council of Lameroo for ground formation and applied to the Education Department for a subsidy for the water reticulation and grassing. The subsidy was approved in February of this year. The Public Buildings Department had sought details of the ground formation work proposed by the district council when a further request was received from the headmaster for improvements to the drainage of the existing oval. A request had also been received for improvements to the paved areas at the school.

As the drainage of these areas could be affected by the work proposed on the new oval, it was considered essential that a complete survey be undertaken and an investigation made into whether or not all works should be carried out as one project. An officer will inspect the site within the next two weeks. If it is practicable to proceed with the establishment of the new oval as a separate project, approval will be sought immediately for the expenditure involved in the ground formation and for the district council to undertake the work. Funds are available for the work on the new oval. The extent of the other work is not known and it is not possible at this stage to say whether funds will be available.

PORT PIRIE YARDS.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that the Commonwealth Railways and the South Australian Railways have reached agreement regarding the layout of the Port Pirie railway yards in connection with the standard gauge between Port Pirie and Broken Hill. Can the Premier

inform the House of the terms of this agreement? If not, will he obtain a report from his colleague?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am not acquainted with the details of the agreement but I will obtain a report from the Minister of Transport and bring it down as soon as possible.

HOUSING FOR HANDICAPPED.

Mrs. STEELE: I noticed with interest in His Excellency's Speech that the South Australian Housing Trust is to build rental houses of special design to meet the needs of persons confined to wheelchairs. The Australian Council for Rehabilitation of the Disabled, with which is affiliated every worthwhile organization in Australia interested in the welfare of physically handicapped people, has done much practical work and research in this field. Will the Minister of Housing refer to the Chairman of the trust the fact that specialized information is available for the guidance of housing authorities making provision in this field?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I would have no objection to conveying this information to the Chairman of the trust, but I think in fairness that the honourable member could, if necessary, arrange for an interview with the Chairman. After all, the trust is prepared to do something, and if the honourable member considered that she could suggest anything better or do anything to assist, I am sure the Chairman would be only too pleased to receive her by way of a deputation, which I could arrange. Alternatively, if she has something she would particularly like me to take to the Chairman, I am prepared to help in that way.

JAMESTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. QUIRKE: I wish to refer to two matters concerning the Jamestown Primary School on which application has been made through the normal channel, namely, the inspector of primary schools situated at Port Pirie. One of these matters concerns an extra classroom that is urgently needed because of the congested conditions at the school. The other matter concerns certain ground work, including the grassing of a playing area. This grassing is most necessary because of the tenacious type of soil on which the school is built, and the acquisition of a new area that needs ground treatment. I think that two departments may be concerned with these matters. Approval was given some time ago for a subsidy for the irrigation equipment necessary to water the grassed area.

I have received a reply from the Superintendent of Primary Schools in which he states that the matter is receiving attention. Will the Minister of Education obtain a full progress report so that the school committee will not be embarrassed in making its preparations?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

UPPER PORT REACH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The report of the Public Works Committee on the Upper Port Reach Development Scheme was recently tabled in this House, and this excellent report contained several matters which I read with much interest. Can the Minister of Housing say whether Cabinet has considered the report and whether the Housing Trust intends to start this development scheme during the next financial year?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: This matter has not been considered, but as soon as it is I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member.

PANITYA LAND.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I am reliably informed that several blocks in the hundred of Panitya have been surveyed but have not been gazetted. Can the Minister of Lands give any reason for this delay?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

EAST TERRACE LAND.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what was the total price paid for the land on East Terrace that was purchased by the Housing Trust for the erection of a multi-storey block of flats? Secondly, what was the sale price of this land, which was sold as a result of the Government's decision to abandon this project?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I will ask the Chairman of the Housing Trust to supply this information and will inform the honourable member as soon as I have it.

MARTIN REPORT.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: In this morning's press, the Minister of Education made an interesting statement about the Martin Report on Education. The Minister criticized the report on tertiary education and said he favoured the erection of 18 schools in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should seek the concurrence of the Speaker and the leave of the House if he wishes to make a statement.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the indulgence of the House, I desire to make a statement. Can the Minister of Education say where the 18 schools are likely to be erected?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not see the connection between my comments on the Martin Report concerning teacher training and the statement on the erection of 18 schools. I should appreciate the honourable member's explaining the connection.

FURNITURE REMOVAL CHARGES.

Mr. HALL: It has been brought to my notice that some unusual charges have been levied by a transport company on people migrating to South Australia by air. Coming to this State by air, these migrants have not received the advantage of free transport of the main bulk of their luggage, and have had to have it transported by sea. In this instance a family had arrived in Australia by air with 11 tea chests, one trunk and five crates transported by the *Port Launceston*, which arrived at Outer Harbour on February 22. When the gentleman concerned went to the wharf to collect his goods he could collect only nine of the 17 articles, because he could not fit them all into his own conveyance, but on collecting those that he could he was told that he would have to pay £10, covering wharfage fees and subsequent transportation of the remaining goods to Para Hills, which he, in fact, did pay.

Two days later the remaining goods were delivered to Para Hills in this gentleman's absence, and the truck driver asked for a further £10 from his wife, as a fee for the delivery of these goods from Port Adelaide. The housewife did not have the money in hand, and one of the articles had to be removed and left with the driver, as a pledge that the fee would be met. Subsequently, on March 29, one further remaining crate arrived at Outer Harbour, and was delivered to the migrants' new home, for which they were further charged £6, the truck driver saying that it made no difference whether six crates or only one crate was involved: the truck had had to go that far, and £6 was the charge. In aggregate this family paid £26 to have 11 tea chests, two trunks and five crates transported from Outer Harbour to their home. Will the Premier take this matter up with the Commonwealth authorities with a view

to providing free transport of migrants' goods from their port of arrival to the home, which concession is extended to those coming here by sea but not to those coming by air? Will he also investigate the charges levied by transport companies for taking the luggage of migrants, who have come to this State by air, from the port to their homes, and ascertain whether they are exorbitant in the circumstances?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: First, I should require certain details, which can be dealt with confidentially. I will do my best to ascertain from the people concerned whether similar concessions available to people coming into this State by sea can be extended to those arriving by air.

COUNTRY TROTTING CLUBS.

Mr. RODDA: Last year the Lottery and Gaming Act was amended to increase the turnover tax by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, at the same time providing for a disbursement of funds collected from this tax on the following basis: five-sixths of the money collected from the bets on trotting in the State, and one-sixth of the money taken by bookmakers on interstate trotting meetings, to be divided amongst clubs in proportion to the volume of bets made at trotting meetings held by each club. I have received a letter from the Naracoorte Trotting Club pointing out that, despite the amendment, country trotting clubs are still receiving collectively the same sum as they previously received, namely, £200. It is suggested that the balance of the money paid to the South Australian Trotting League is being used to promote metropolitan training tracks. Will the Premier have this matter investigated and ascertain whether country trotting clubs are not receiving their full entitlement of these moneys, as is suggested in the letter? If there are any irregularities will he see that they are corrected?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I will try to obtain all the information possible. However, I remind the honourable member that each country trotting club has a representative on the trotting league, and that it is no use coming into this House and saying that the metropolitan clubs are spending money on tracks at the expense of those country clubs, because I would not believe such a statement for a moment. I am hoping that certain approaches will soon be made on this matter with a view to giving more authority to the club that raises the bulk of the money from trotting in this State, so that it may distribute

proceeds throughout the country. I do not believe that much overhead would be involved in this.

RAILWAY TIME TABLES.

Mr. HUGHES: Will the Premier ask his colleague, the Minister of Railways, to obtain from the Railways Commissioner a full report on the reasons for altering the time tables between Moonta and Wallaroo and, in effect, cutting out a service that could be well patronized if times and fares were more suitable? Will the Premier also ascertain from his colleague whether one train was cut out to reduce train miles by 22 miles a day in order to increase statistics at the expense of the service and the travelling public?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I will obtain the information from my colleague and give it to the honourable member as soon as possible.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has been brought to my notice that the Municipal Tramways Trust does not allow tram or bus passes to be used during vacations. The case referred to me concerns a first-year university student living in my district. The present university vacation began on May 14 and will continue until June 7. Although this student has some academic duties at the university during the vacation, she has been told by the M.T.T. officers that she cannot use either her May or June pass during the vacation. This is in line with M.T.T. policy on school concession passes and I suggest that there is a distinction between the two; schools are closed during the vacation, whereas university life goes on in a modified form at least, during vacation. Therefore, will the Premier ask his colleague, the Minister of Transport, to take up with the M.T.T. the desirability of allowing student concession passes (certainly for university students) to be available not only during the term but also during the vacation?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I will get the information requested by the honourable member from my colleague, but I do not know where we will finish up if we must provide reduced rates from one year's end to the other for those receiving a tertiary education. I do not wish this to be a reflection on the person referred to by the honourable member. However, if the honourable member analyses this matter a little more closely he will find that many students receiving tertiary education are working. Surely he would not expect the taxpayers to have to provide for

concession fares in these cases. I should not imagine that the honourable member would wish students in his district to enjoy concessions when travelling to work.

UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The previous Government announced that, when plans were finalized by the Highways Department for another bridge in the Upper Murray district, terms of reference would be made available to the Public Works Committee as to where the new bridge would be located. Can the Minister of Works say what stage has been reached by the Highways Department on this project? Can the terms of reference to the Public Works Committee be prepared so that it may inquire concerning a bridge across the Upper Murray River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I believe that the honourable member said that this was a matter that came under the jurisdiction of the Highways Department and, therefore, did not come under my jurisdiction. I think the question should be referred to the Minister of Education, who represents the Minister of Roads in this House. As I understand it, this is a matter for the Highways Department, and I am not able to answer the question.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: As I understand the position, inquiries were instituted by the Highways Department concerning the design of a new bridge over the Upper Murray reaches, and the Upper Murray councils finally decided in favour of Kingston. I understand that the matter was referred to the Highways Department for the design of a bridge, and that when a certain stage was reached Cabinet would refer terms of reference to the Public Works Committee, which would conduct an inquiry into the question of a bridge across the river at Kingston or somewhere else. Can the Minister of Education say whether the Highways Department has finished designing the bridge, whether specifications are ready, and whether the Government is able to make these terms of reference available to the Public Works Committee on this important project?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get the information from my colleague in another place.

NARRUNG WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works undertake to obtain for me a report on the present stage and planning of the Narrung water supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to get a report on this matter for the honourable member, and I shall inform him as soon as I have done so in order that he may ask a question on it.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from May 18. Page 60.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): At the outset I should like to mention publicly something I indicated to the Premier privately on March 7: I congratulate him and honourable members opposite on their magnificent win at the election. I should particularly like to congratulate the Premier on leading his side to victory. The statement I made on March 7 still holds good: while, by virtue of the Constitution, we are in Opposition, and while it is the function of the Opposition, of course, to oppose matters which it believes to be not in the general interests of the people, I hope that the Opposition will prove to be constructive in its stand on all matters coming before the House, and I hope it will be proved that it will always have as its objective the general welfare of the people of this State. Indeed, I hope that our opposition will not be carried to the extreme and that it will not be unduly swayed by Party politics.

My ex-Ministers would be only too happy to help those who have recently received their portfolios in matters on which they desire some history or background knowledge. I do not wish to appear presumptuous or to interfere unnecessarily in any way when I say this, but I can assure honourable members opposite that ex-Government Ministers will be only too happy to co-operate in this way. On many occasions, of course, we shall have differences of opinion with honourable members opposite on matters of policy and on methods of carrying out certain duties, but these differences will never be directed at personalities.

I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your accession to the high office of Speaker in this House. I had great pleasure in seconding your nomination, and I have not the slightest doubt that you will hold this office with distinction. Since I have been in this House I have witnessed a progression of various Speakers; every one of them has held the office with distinction and impartiality, and I have no doubt that you also will uphold that tradition. You are one of the senior members of the House, and you are well steeped in the tradition of the Speakership, and well versed

in Standing Orders. More important, you have seen over the years that the Parliamentary system functions best of all if a certain amount of judgment is exercised in applying Standing Orders, for if they are applied too rigidly Parliament does not have the opportunity to function as well as it should.

I should also like to convey my compliments to the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) on his accession to the office of Chairman of Committees. I assure him that members on this side of the House will respect his office and will do all they can to assist him in the difficult work that will inevitably confront him as he assumes that office. I turn now to the Governor's Speech and to the composition of the Ministry. I do not in any way wish to take personalities into account here, but I myself held the portfolio of Minister of Lands—at the time it was known as Commissioner of Crown Lands—for about ten months, and on another occasion I held the portfolio of Minister of Agriculture in an acting capacity. I know the volume of work involved in both these portfolios, and I say advisedly that, unless these two portfolios are separated and administered by separate officers, they cannot be successfully fulfilled. The very volume of work involved cannot possibly be handled by one person. Further, even if it were possible for one Minister to undertake that volume of work, it would be highly undesirable for the two portfolios to be merged, because these two offices are concerned with the great rural industries of this State, on which our well-being is so largely dependent. The portfolio of Minister of Lands involves the vast majority of land in this State, and, in addition, our export income depends on the great agricultural activities of this State. Therefore, I emphatically assert that it is highly undesirable to allocate these two portfolios to the one Minister, and I urge the Premier to give this matter every consideration possible. I do not wish to misquote the Premier, but I believe he stated that this might not be the permanent position. I believe that the Premier was truthful when he made that statement, but it is rather interesting to know that it is not and has never been the policy of the Labor Party to have these two portfolios separated. The Lands Department was probably the first department established in South Australia, although it did not then have its present title and was not under a Minister. However, even before responsible government was established the Lands Department was a principal revenue department of

this State. The Ministry of Agriculture was established in 1875. Since then the Agriculture Department and the Lands Department have been under one Minister six times. When I say that I do not include occasions when a temporary appointment may have been made whilst a Minister was absent for a fortnight or so. The first of these occasions was throughout the term of the Price Ministry from 1905 to 1909—this was a Labor Ministry.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: He was a stonemason, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I believe he was. The second occasion the two departments were administered by the one Minister was for a period of six months only in the Peake Ministry between 1909 and 1910. The third occasion was throughout the term of the Crawford Vaughan Ministry of 1915-1917. The fourth occasion was for a period of nine months during the term of the Peake Ministry between 1917 and 1920, and the fifth occasion was throughout the Gunn Labor Ministry. The sixth occasion was throughout the term of the Hill Labor Ministry of 1926-27. It is rather significant that, when the Departments of Agriculture and Lands have been submerged under one Minister and placed in a relatively inferior position, Labor has always been in office.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What about the Peake Ministry?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have explained that; that was because of two temporary appointments, and I included them for historical purposes. It appears that Labor Governments (the Premier's Government is not alone in this) have had the two departments administered by one Minister. This has been a feature of Labor administration.

I wish to link this to the politics, general welfare and standard of living in this State. I do not believe that any member opposite would deny that, during the last few years, this State has made a great move forward. I can remember that when I first entered this House South Australia was a mendicant State and had the lowest standard of living of any State in the Commonwealth. Shortly after my entry into Parliament the Prime Minister of Australia (Rt. Hon. John Curtin) stated that South Australia would always be a mendicant State and would always have inferior standards because it did not have the natural resources of the other States. However, the fact remains that by applying the first emphasis on development rather than on social

amelioration we have seen the State go forward until its secondary industries are respected in other States. In fact, I believe it would be correct to say that about 80 per cent of our secondary production is exported to other States. This has been achieved because we have placed our entire emphasis upon the development of our resources.

We were criticized by members opposite for not spending as much on social welfare directly as some of the other States have. However, anyone who has studied economics knows that you cannot have a high standard of living unless you have a high standard of production; you cannot have houses unless you build them; and you cannot have employment unless you have industry. The moment that you have a low level of employment then you automatically start to have an inferior standard of living.

I maintain that the constitution of the new Ministry shows that there is a shift of emphasis from the devotion of energy in the things that cause the development of the State towards the development of social expenditures. Honourable members opposite are not entirely alone in this matter, but this will inevitably lead to a grave situation. I wish to show the problems that will arise in South Australia, but before doing so I wish to emphasize that unless we are careful there will be a slowing down in development and this will react not only against people who own factories but also against people who are employed in factories and against housewives and others in the community.

I shall now deal with the economic position of the State at present and consider it in relation to the immediate past. In the immediate past one or two big new enterprises have been established in the State and, apart from the amount of employment they have provided, they will create a big field of permanent employment.

Let me refer to the volume of expenditure involved, even on their installation. The oil refinery was established at a cost, finally, of about £18,000,000, and some extensions are still taking place. The Chrysler factory involved an expenditure of about £20,000,000, and the new factory at Elizabeth for General Motors-Holden's was again in the order of £20,000,000. I am not sure of the expenditure at Woodville, but it was a large sum. The sum spent by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla was stated by the Premier only a few days ago to be about £60,000,000. These are large sums when

injected into any economy, but their injection into the South Australian economy has enabled us to absorb a greater number of migrants and to have a high level of employment. In fact, the problem up to now has been that it has been difficult indeed to get the necessary people to carry out the works involved.

What is the programme ahead? I have stated only a few of the works. I could mention the large rubber factory being erected at Salisbury, and I could speak of many other smaller projects. The programme immediately ahead includes one industry, negotiations for which were completed just prior to the election and which I am pleased to see the Premier has continued to support. That industry, which is at Port Pirie, will involve an expenditure of about £6,000,000. It will provide some very useful employment and an export industry totalling some £3,000,000. Negotiations were in train at the time of the election for an extension of a forestry industry in the South-East. These negotiations were fairly well advanced; in fact, the deadline for their completion was June 30 this year.

I cannot speak with any knowledge on this matter, but I hope that that industry will materialize. Most of the outstanding matters were fairly well covered by the negotiations that had taken place when my Government went out of office, and although two or three matters were still outstanding I hope that that industry will be established. Although it is a worthwhile one, it is not in any way (if I may say so) an employer of labour of the consequence of any of the first four industries that I mentioned, and certainly it does not represent anything like the capital investment of those industries. There was, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a project for developing the salt industry in the northern part of the State. Difficulties are involved there in getting firm contracts from overseas. Those negotiations were of a meagre variety, being not very firm and at the most only explorative. However, I hope that that project will go forward. It is having some difficulty because the Japanese are extremely keen buyers, and many alternative sources of supply of salt are available to them. Another industry, which was attended to by my colleague, concerned lime sands at Port Lincoln. Again, that could be a most useful industry, although it is not of the order of the industries I have previously mentioned.

We can see that the greatest emphasis must still be applied and the highest priority must

still be given to the establishment of industry. I assure the Premier that, if it is necessary for some sacrifice to be made to secure a long-term permanent industry in this State, I will support him in the event of any consequent unpopularity. For instance, it may even be necessary to defer some social amelioration in order to achieve such an industry. There is no politics in this matter, and I and my Party would be prepared to support any move at all to secure a worthwhile industry in this State.

Having said that, I want to refer now to two matters concerning His Excellency's Speech. The first of those matters is contained in the Speech, but the second one is conspicuous by its absence. I want to be fair to His Excellency. Incidentally, I felt when I heard his Speech this time that it was the poorest one he had ever made. Had it not been for the fact that he was able to talk about some of the accomplishments of the old Government (I might say the late lamented Government, because it will be lamented, of course) there would not have been very much policy in the Speech at all, because for some reason or another (and I have not got down to the psychology that is governing this part of the Government's thinking) the matters mentioned are meagre indeed compared with those that were mentioned in the policy speech at the time of the election. In fact, most of the matters mentioned then are conspicuous by their absence in His Excellency's Speech. Whether His Excellency had been able to explain to members opposite that it would be foolish to proceed with these matters and he has been able to dissuade them, or whether it is that having assumed office and having had the advantage of getting the information that is available only to a Minister the Government has found some of these things to be impracticable, I do not know. It might also be that some of these matters are not politically very popular, and that the Government does not want any fuss before the legislation comes into the House. I am not anticipating the debate concerning such legislation. Paragraph 11 of the Governor's Speech states:

The discovery of natural gas in the Gidgealpa area is, of course, of the greatest industrial significance. Gas reserves proved to date in the area are sufficient to supply the heating requirements for the first two units of the new Torrens Island power station for 15 to 20 years, provided the supplies are reserved wholly for the trust. Preliminary studies indicate that usage on this restricted scale might possibly be an economic proposition if the necessarily large volume of capital funds for a pipeline could be found at

favourable rates of interest. However, if considerably increased natural gas supplies are not found there would be neither significant returns to the prospecting companies for expenditures already made nor appreciable economies to the Electricity Trust as compared with using alternative fuels. It appears to my Government, therefore, that a further waiting period is necessary to see whether considerable increases in gas may be found. However, it has been decided that the Electricity Trust will make some additional provisions and expenditures on its Torrens Island power station development, so that its plant may be fairly readily converted to use natural gas should further discoveries make such utilization desirable. My Government appreciates the initiative of the exploration companies concerned and the very large amount of risk capital which is still being poured into petroleum exploration in this State, and accordingly any agreements the Government may contemplate in connection with the purchase and distribution of natural gas will recognize the necessity of a fair return for the effort made.

That has the advantage, I think, of being the longest paragraph of the Speech with which the Governor opened Parliament. What does it mean? Exactly nothing. True, additional expenditure was approved by the Electricity Trust so that it could convert to natural gas. However, that decision was made six months ago, after consultation with the Chairman of the Electricity Trust, and was announced before the recent election. What does that paragraph mean now? It means that nothing will be done and that the Government will hope for the best.

With the present development of the Leigh Creek coalfield it has reached its full output. It is impossible to increase economically its power capacity. Whether we like it or not the amount of open-cut coal, which was discovered after about 11 years' investigation by the Mines Department, is limited. The capacity of the coalfield on the present ratio of overburden to coal is for 30 years, and some of that time has passed. With an increased ratio that period could be extended slightly, but the Leigh Creek coalfield, at present supplying 70 per cent of the power of this State, is now fully developed. It provides 2,000,000 tons of coal a year, which provides 70 per cent of the electricity used in this State. It is the cheapest fuel here, and is appreciably cheaper than imported oil or coal. The use of electricity is increasing by about 14 per cent a year, and this increased electricity is being generated with a fuel that costs about 50 per cent more than Leigh Creek coal fuel. Unless a local alternative to Leigh Creek coal is found to carry on what that coal has been

doing so successfully in the last few years, we will soon be confronted with an unavoidable increase in power costs. Within five years, unless action is taken, power costs will rise dramatically and impede further industrialization in this State. I understand that the cost of the fuel in a unit of electricity is about 20 per cent. The last Electricity Trust report stated that the fuel cost in a unit of electricity was .48d. That, if my arithmetic is correct, would mean that about 20 per cent of the total cost of the electricity supplied relates to fuel cost. Let me relate that figure to the cost of fuel in Victoria, for in that State this cost is quite easily defined: the cost of fuel in that State is not 20 per cent; and it involves not only the cost of fuel itself but also the cost of purchasing electricity from the Snowy Mountains undertaking, the total cost being 8 per cent. Honourable members can see just how far we are behind our most competitive State at present.

Our fuel costs for electricity are 20 per cent of the ultimate selling price of that electricity, and it is interesting to note that there is no suggestion in Victoria that that 8 per cent will increase. Indeed, every possibility exists that it will decrease. The electricity authorities in New South Wales are now locating their power stations on the coalfields, so as to eliminate transportation costs which have previously been heavy in that State. My considered opinion is that inside five years New South Wales authorities will be able to make a reduction of 25 per cent in the present electricity costs, and in 10 years' time the cost of electricity there will fall to about one-half the present cost.

Honourable members will know that already that in South Australia we have had to adjust our electricity charges to large users, to try to meet competitive interstate charges. Queensland and Western Australia also are now in a much more favourable position than we are in this State. Queensland has embarrassingly enormous resources of natural fuel at its disposal; having found substantial quantities of natural gas, it apparently has no use for it. The paragraph in His Excellency's Speech dealing with the development of fuel for electricity connotes a wait-and-see policy, but we in this State cannot tolerate such a policy. I take honourable members back to the period when the Leigh Creek coalfield was opened, and when legislation was introduced into this House to appropriate the first £300,000 into a fund to provide for the opening of the field.

Honourable members in Opposition then—and there are not many of them in this House these days—together with the then Leader of the Opposition quite properly made the point that this was a speculative proposition, and the Leader actually moved to have the matter referred to a committee for inquiry—to put it off, in other words. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, will know that the Government of the day could not have proved that Leigh Creek could be established entirely successfully, although it could assert—and did assert—that in other places open-cut mining had been undertaken successfully and had survived competition, thrived, and provided a cheap source of fuel. If it had not been for the fact that Leigh Creek was opened, even with some degree of hazard involved, we should have been in a disastorous position later on when we were denied other fuels during the war. What is the position with regard to natural gas? Gidgealpa represents a good but small source of supply; it is capable of supplying gas at an adequate pressure, but would not justify the heavy expenditure in establishing a main at this stage. Oversea experts have estimated that to establish a main from Gidgealpa to Adelaide it would cost about £18,000,000, although in the final analysis it would probably be about £20,000,000. That might be justified if Gidgealpa could guarantee a supply of natural gas for 25 years, at the rate of 100,000,000 cub. ft. a day, 300 days a year, which would be what we should probably require by the time a gas main were constructed. That would be an economic proposition and would enable the amortization of the main to take place and the gas to be supplied to consumers at prices competitive with alternative sources of fuel. This would include the gas to be supplied to the Electricity Trust at a price competitive with the present price of Leigh Creek coal. If gas were to be supplied at a price competitive with that of Leigh Creek coal it would have to be at about 26d. per 1,000,000 British thermal units, which is about the cost of Leigh Creek coal. This would be impracticable unless other uses were found because everyone knows that this fuel would be most profitably used for the household. The next most profitable use of fuel would be where it is used as a direct alternative to oil for heating purposes. The Electricity Trust can give only a relatively low price for the fuel because it can supply only a small proportion of fuel for heating to the ultimate consumer. I believe that about 40 per cent can be supplied.

This is not a matter that can be left in abeyance. I have noticed with much concern that of the two boring plants on the field one plant has already been removed and the tempo of exploration has slowed down. This is wrong. It is a fantastic dream for the State to hope for large sums of low interest money. The cheapest money that can be obtained is the money that can be provided by the State through its own public accounts. I have checked with overseas bankers and with representatives of overseas pipe constructing authorities and I believe that, if money were sought from other sources, the capital costs of a main, including interest and amortization charges, would be at least 50 per cent higher than if the money were provided from the State's own resources. We do not contemplate the expenditure of £20,000,000 unless we also contemplate its financing. I believe it is wrong to let this matter ride until something turns up. In fact, I believe that an alternative to Gidgealpa already exists.

In Queensland there appears to be a large volume of natural gas. Its potential has not been proved, but the circumstances of the occurrence would indicate that it is a matter for consideration, although we may never need to go there. Undoubtedly there is an enormous quantity of natural gas to be found in the Northern Territory. Honourable members may say that the Northern Territory, south-west of Alice Springs is far away, but if members like to study what has happened in America they will see that mains there, from one side of the country to the other, are justified provided the amount of gas to be transferred is sufficiently large to enable large industries to be established. Negotiations took place for the establishment of an ammonium nitrate plant—a major plant—in South Australia. The plant would have used a large quantity of gas if it had been available at a price competitive with what the product would have brought on the world market. I wish to emphasize that it is necessary that we do not sit back and take a negative view with regard to the development of natural gas. The report in the Governor's Speech indicates a "wait and see" policy. That would be reasonable if we were not faced with the unmistakable fact that every year our consumption of electricity is increasing and new electricity has to be supplied with a much more costly fuel than has been used in the past.

All members know that finance ultimately controls a Government and in this respect I

wish to congratulate the Premier in connection with his first visit to the Loan Council. It is no mean task for anyone who has not previously attended a Loan Council or Premiers' meeting to put forward the case of his State without any previous background in the proceedings and in the history of the various decisions that have come from Loan Council meetings over many years. I compliment the Premier on the fact that he submitted a case that was apparently accepted by the Commonwealth Government. Although I do not know whether the report was factual, I have seen in the press that the State is to receive £5,000,000 additional grant next year. I do not know whether this is in addition to the old formula. I believe that our allocation this year was about £39,500,000 tax reimbursement and if the old formula had been continued we would probably have received (and this is an approximate figure) about £3,000,000 because of population increase and other factors. I do not know whether the £5,000,000 is what, under the old formula, was £3,000,000 or whether it is in addition to the amount under the old formula. Nevertheless, everything is helpful and the Premier has on his plate some formidable election promises to meet, so he will require as much money as he can get. But that is beside the point.

I congratulate him on being able to submit a case and apparently make it stick. I wish him success in the further negotiations that will finalize this matter next month. But that does not prevent me from saying that fundamentally the financial proposals of the Government are not very sound—and that is a kind way of putting it.

Mr. Ryan: You are saying it politically, are you?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No; I am not getting political. I want to deal with financial facts and, if possible, to place the position before honourable members fairly and squarely. This is not a pat one moment and a kick the next. This is what I hope will be a useful contribution to solving the financial problem that every Government has to face.

First, I should like to make a statement about the financial state of the Treasury at the time the Treasurer took office. I believe it is fair and proper for me to submit a final statement of my control of the State's finances for the period for which I was Treasurer. I got a report from the Under Treasurer at the end of February. It is on the official files and available to the Treasurer. This report was furnished to me six days before the elections.

Here, let me pay another compliment to the Treasurer. I have been interested to note that, in the two monthly balances drawn up since the election, the control of the Treasury has been almost precisely what was provided for in the Estimates by Parliament. Obviously, with some items the expenditure is not so high as expected while with others the expenditure may be slightly greater; in some cases the income predicted by me as Treasurer may not be reached while in other cases it will apparently be surpassed. However, the fact remains that the Treasury accounts have been maintained, in my opinion, in the two months that have elapsed since the election strictly in accordance with the Budget last presented to Parliament.

I want to have the contents of this document incorporated in *Hansard* so that the position may be clearly appreciated. It is signed by the Under Treasurer and reads:

State of Treasury at end of February, 1965.

(1) Consolidated Revenue Account—		£	£
Deficit on current year			
to date	2,630,000		
Less previous surpluses in hand	1,922,000		
Net deficit			708,000
(2) Loan Account—			
Unspent balance on account of current year	568,000		
Add previous balances carried forward ..	1,698,000		
In hand			2,266,000
Net balance		£1,558,000	

The Consolidated Revenue Account would appear to be running very closely in accordance with the Budget approved by Parliament though, as usual, with a number of variations which broadly balance each other. The Budget forecast a final net deficit of £570,000 after absorbing past surpluses, and the present outlook in relation to commitments and authorities for expenditure is that a small improvement on that forecast may be possible. Ordinarily over the last four months of a financial year revenues tend to exceed expenditures because the manner of receipt of Commonwealth grants favours the last four months. As a matter of interest, for instance, the monthly account of tax reimbursement showed that the Treasurer last month got from the Commonwealth Government £2,000,000 additional tax reimbursement over the previous month, because the amounts expand towards the end of the year. The statement continues:

Borrowings on Loan Account to the end of February have been proportionate to the entitlement approved by Loan Council and expenditure to date rather less than proportionate to the estimated expenditure for the

year. However, invariably works payments are relatively heavier during the latter months in the year, and the present indications are that full authorized provision will be required to meet commitments. An over-run of Loan expenditure in Engineering and Water Supply because of greater progress with works than anticipated, and for Loans to Producers through the State Bank mainly for co-operatives, seems probable with some counterbalancing under-run in some other departments (for example, harbours). Apart from funds for the ordinary operation of the Government finance, the Treasurer is responsible for trust funds and deposit accounts amounting to £14,671,000 at the end of February, and these are held in fixed deposits of varying maturities at interest at the Reserve Bank of Australia.

They consist of amounts deposited by various authorities and instrumentalities, such as the Housing Trust, Highways Fund, Superannuation Fund, the university, and the like, and drawn on from time to time for their own authorized purposes; certain Commonwealth moneys provided for the State to disburse in accordance with the relevant Commonwealth legislation, such as rail standardization moneys, the home builders fund, and war service land settlement provisions; and various loan and revenue appropriations which have already been provided and committed for the Electricity Trust, for departmental stores and plant replacement provisions, and for comparable purposes.

The state of Crown funds at the end of February is shown hereunder—

	£
Fixed deposits at Reserve Bank (£19,000,000 less £4,000,000 in Treasury bills therefrom at 1 per cent to finance temporary lag of revenues and repayable by June 30 each year)	15,000,000
Less holding on account of trust and deposit accounts	14,671,000
	329,000
Current account at Reserve Bank (£2,904,000 less unrepresented cheques, £2,372,000)	532,000
Bank deposits in London and at State Bank	542,000
Advances held by departments and minor departmental expenditures awaiting recovery or pending debit	155,000
	£1,558,000
Funds held for those ordinary Crown purposes authorized through Revenue and Loan Budgets—see page 1 statement	£1,558,000

I would add that it is not necessary or normal for an amount equivalent to the temporary borrowing (at present £4,000,000) to be held separately from ordinary loan and revenue funds on deposit at interest. However, the State is entitled to borrow at the concession rate of 1 per cent to finance lag of current revenues. Late in February, until receipt of the Commonwealth grant for the month, this lag reached above £4,000,000. It was not

immediately necessary to borrow the amount because previous carry-overs of revenue and loan surpluses had not been so far used up, but it was profitable to the Budget to take up this entitlement at 1 per cent and hold corresponding amounts earning interest at higher rates.

When the Treasurer took charge of the Treasury, every account in the Treasury was scrupulously in order and in credit. He did not have the problem I had when I took over the Treasury and found that the trust funds had been used to carry on the current accounts of the State. When the Treasurer took over, ample money was provided. The reserves available were sufficient to successfully cover any normal adversity that might arise out of the Budget I had presented. Of course, that does not mean that there was, or is, money available for all of the matters on which members of this House (and I speak of both sides of the House) could think of spending money. The money available to the State comes now from greatly circumscribed sources. It comes from a tax reimbursement from the Commonwealth, which I emphasize is not in the final analysis determined by the Premiers: it is determined by the Commonwealth Treasurer.

Let me deal with that aspect of our financial position. Honourable members are well aware that the Commonwealth has undertaken a large additional defence expenditure. Honourable members may have views on that matter. Some may say that it is unnecessarily large and others may say that it is not large enough, but that is not a matter for our determination. The fact is that the National Parliament has decided upon a much heavier defence expenditure. The very circumstances of the defence expenditure will mean not only that more will be spent in Australia, but that there will be a much greater increase in expenditure overseas. Many weapons necessary for a modern army are not available in Australia. In fact, most of them are available in only one country. So, whether this Parliament approves or not, the fact is that the Commonwealth Parliament has approved of expenditure over the next few years of a vast sum, half of which has to be found in the form of oversea currency.

The second thing I want to say to honourable members is that the overseas funds that have been supporting development in Australia appear to be no longer available to us. I know that some honourable members opposite have taken the view that they do not want these funds, anyhow, but without them we would have to raise the money in Australia or do without the development, one or the other.

These funds will not be available to us and certainly will not be available to support our overseas expenditure, which is running at a high level today.

The third thing I want to say is that the prices of Australian commodities overseas have fallen dramatically. That is outside the control of the Treasurer; he cannot be held responsible for it in any way. However, the wool cheque this year is down already by about £70,000,000, a reduction of about 20 per cent, and that is overseas money that is not available. It is not in the power of local governments—I am speaking not of district councils but of State Parliaments—or of this State's Treasurer to do anything in this matter, but it still has a tremendous impact on this country's economy. I do not want honourable members to think I am a pessimist, but our wool cheque is down drastically, as are the prices of most of our primary products.

The price of sugar has dropped greatly. I believe the Minister of Agriculture can confirm that, whereas not long ago sugar production was fantastically profitable, its price is now down to about the cost of production. The overseas price of wheat is also below cost of production. While our overseas expenditure is rising badly, and must continue to rise while we are involved in our present heavy defence expenditure, we shall have a complete reversal of the easy position that we had in relation to overseas funds. This year—and again I speak from memory and subject to correction—I think this State's visible trade balance is favourable but the Australian trade balance is down to the extent of about £150,000,000. This will inevitably have repercussions when the Premiers go into Loan Council for the annual Loan Council meeting. These factors will greatly affect Commonwealth revenue, as they will involve it in increased taxation. I ask members opposite whether the Commonwealth Treasurer will increase taxation and incur the displeasure that always arises as a result in order to make liberal handouts to the States? I am rather a cynic on this, as I have attended many Loan Council meetings and know that frequently the States get the lion's share after the Commonwealth has had enough! However, we do not get a lion's share, and the Commonwealth does not ordinarily undertake a taxation programme to bolster up State expenditure.

What were the proposals the Leader of the Government submitted on behalf of his Party before the election to deal with this particular

matter? The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) mentioned this matter. I had rather hoped that it had gone to sleep, as it was not mentioned in the Governor's Speech; I thought perhaps the Government was having another look at it before going into it, as it has some catches. However, it appears from what the member for Glenelg has said—and he no doubt is much more in the confidence of his colleagues than I am—that it is still a matter of active politics. I shall outline what the Premier said because to me it is an interesting solution, although I do not think it is an effective one. I do not want it to be considered that I am advocating it, so I dissociate myself from it before going any farther. I shall read from the transcript of the Premier's policy speech the solution he submitted. This evidently is still a matter of current politics, as it received some mention from the economic adviser of the Government, the member for Glenelg, only yesterday. So that I shall not be accused of quoting things out of context, I shall read perhaps more than I need, and in doing so I shall read a part that gives me a mention that I do not deserve. This is what the Premier said:

So soon as I mention anything concerning finance I am always asked, "Where will you get the money?" Let me remind you that the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, M.P., as Treasurer carried on with a deficit of almost £2,500,000 for the first six months of the present financial year and the affairs of the State went on without any fuss.

I did get a good mention! He continued:

Ours is not a policy of extravagance; it is one of accuracy in budgeting. We have two State-owned banking institutions. The State Bank is a trading bank and has done outstanding business in financing the development of this State. The Savings Bank of South Australia was brought under the control of Parliament in 1945 at the request of the trustees and under the Act passed by Parliament in that year. While South Australia possesses a number of great State undertakings, such as the South Australian Housing Trust and the Electricity Trust of South Australia, these institutions and a number of lesser State undertakings do not bank with our own banking system.

The position regarding taking over the Savings Bank in 1945 is not accurately stated. In 1945 the Commonwealth Treasurer, who was a man of great integrity—

Mr. Ryan: A Labor man, wasn't he?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: He was one of the successful Labor Prime Ministers. He decided to nationalize the private banks of Australia, and proposed to introduce legislation to that effect. If any honourable member looks at the Constitution he will

see that the Commonwealth Government has control over banking but is denied any control over State banking. When Mr. Chifley started to investigate taking over private banks he found to his surprise that the Savings Bank of South Australia was not a State bank. It had been established by Act of Parliament and placed under the control of a board of trustees, but it was not a State bank. Neither the Government nor anyone else outside the trustees had any control over the bank, which was governed by an Act of Parliament. The well-known sign that no doubt every honourable member has seen since he was a boy, "Guaranteed by the State Government" was, in fact, not correct, because there was no guarantee of the Savings Bank by the State Government, and it was not a State Government instrumentality.

The late Mr. Chifley rang me one night and said to me, "That bank of yours is not a State bank, and unless you do something about it it will come within the ambit of our legislation." I asked, "How long have we got to do something about it?" and he replied, "You had better get busy on it and push an Act through Parliament and make it a State bank." It is true that the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank at that time actively supported the bank's becoming a State bank, but its reason for doing so was to avoid being taken into the net of the Commonwealth legislation which, incidentally, ultimately was disallowed by the Privy Council. Although the bank was made a State bank, it was not made a State bank subject to the control of the Treasurer. Its funds have always been at the complete disposal of its trustees. However, I will say that the trustees have been extremely co-operative. Incidentally, one limitation is placed upon them: they are not permitted to invest in securities in other States if the money is required for securities in this State.

Mr. Ryan: Aren't the trustees appointed by the Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They are appointed by the Governor, who, incidentally, also appoints the Supreme Court judges. Does the honourable member believe that those judges are subject to the control of the Treasurer, merely because the Governor appoints them? Obviously, he does not believe that. The trustees' duty, which is specifically defined under the Act, is to look after and properly invest the depositors' money; they are the trustees for the depositors, and they are not subject to the will of the Treasurer. I make these comments because of the

opening statement in the Premier's policy speech. Let me deal with the proposals as the Premier further elaborated them. He said:

Labor's plan, therefore, is (a) to strengthen the State banking system by amalgamating the State Bank and the Savings Bank so that trading bank and savings bank facilities, with Savings Bank cheque accounts, will be available throughout the State.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly I do not know what the Premier was trying to say because, first, it is well known that the Savings Bank has been given power under Act of Parliament to provide trading bank facilities if it so desires.

Mr. Ryan: At whose request was that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That was done at the request of the trustees of the Savings Bank, and it was done to meet the competitive position which arose because the Commonwealth Government had licensed all the private banks to have savings banks as well, and the private banks were in a favourable trading position because in the one premises they were able to give a savings bank service and a cheque account service. The Savings Bank, to meet that competition, asked Parliament to give it the right to have trading bank accounts. Parliament gave it that right, and it has that right without the necessity for any amalgamation. Further, I believe that in every place where there is no Savings Bank, the State Bank is an agent for that bank, and it has always been prepared to act as such. Therefore, how we are to strengthen the position by putting the two under one authority, I do not know. The funds will not be increased and the facilities available to the depositors of either bank will not be increased by such a move. Both Houses of Parliament approved the legislation on this matter, introduced by my Government and supported by the Opposition, whereby we gave the Savings Bank full authority to operate trading bank accounts. The bank has found this not very profitable, and of its own volition it has stipulated that cheque accounts must be always in credit. I do not quite know what the Premier was trying to imply when he said that we would strengthen the two banks by putting them together. I point out that the banks have entirely different functions, and putting them together would be a very bad marriage.

Mr. Lawn: You didn't listen yesterday to the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I have the time to get around to the member for Glenelg I shall comment on one thing he

said. I heard the honourable member yesterday. The Savings Bank was established in 1848 as a very small organization to encourage thrift. It was established in a back room with a board of trustees, and it has been subject to the control of the trustees, who have managed it magnificently. It is rather a compliment to the bank that, notwithstanding the fact that in South Australia we now have all the competitive savings bank services, including those provided by the Commonwealth Bank, the Savings Bank has, I think, about five times the deposits of any of the other savings banks. It is purely and simply a savings bank. The people's savings are placed in the bank for investment by the trustees, who are trustees in the strictest sense. The moneys are not available to be handed out for social amelioration by the Government, because no Government has, or ever has had, that power.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It never should have.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is so.

Mr. Lawn: Do either of the two banks invest money in other States?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Savings Bank has invested a relatively small sum in other States over the years.

Mr. Lawn: It has invested some money in the Victorian Water Board?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The bank's affairs are matters for the trustees, but I believe it has a small sum invested in one or two semi-government institutions in other States. This investment would not be more than £500,000. Whenever the bank has invested in another State in the last 25 years, it has always asked the Government before doing so whether the Government or a semi-government authority wanted the money in this State at that time. I assure the member for Adelaide that the amount invested in other States is insignificant and can be withdrawn when it falls due merely by the Treasurer's stating that the money should remain in this State. He has power under the Act to do that, and it does not need the amalgamation of the banks to enable it to be done. I quote the second of the Premier's proposals, and this is the gem of all time:

To provide that all Government and semi-government institutions bank with the State banking institutions. I believe that this will permit expansion of the home purchase plan, industries assistance and personal loan schemes, and also provide for hire-purchase at reasonable rates.

I speak with some knowledge of the Treasury: if the Government took its account from the Reserve Bank and put it in the hands of the amalgamated banks it would sink them overnight. The Government's expenditures are so large that these small institutions could not possibly finance them. If any honourable member (and I include the member for Glenelg) doubts that statement I invite him to ask the Treasurer to obtain from the Under Treasurer a report on whether these combined banks could accommodate the financial requirements of the State. I omit any reference to the semi-government institutions, the hire-purchase, the personal loans, and the expansion of industry as stated by the Premier: I emphasize only the financial requirements of the State. I am sure that the Under Treasurer's statement would agree with his statements to me that the service provided by the Commonwealth Bank is one that no other bank can provide. A total of about 182 semi-government institutions exist in the State, and each has an overdraft. At the recent election I asked representatives of one or two in the metropolitan area whether they banked with the State Bank or the Savings Bank and they replied that they did not, and they named their banks. I asked them whether they were in credit or deficit and they said that at present they had loans for £350,000. What benefit would there be if these accounts were given to the amalgamated banks when every one of them was in the red?

Mr. Lawn: Do you suggest they obtained £350,000 for nothing?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. They obtained it from a bank and paid interest. I suggest that, if the Savings Bank or the State Bank had to provide it, they would not have the funds. They have no power to create credit. I have taken up more time than I should have, but everyone likes to have a swan song.

Mr. Lawn: You are a bit too late.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like to have the opportunity on occasions during this Parliament to rehearse my swan song. I now turn to the other and most important of the three proposals made by the Premier:

That, as Commonwealth and interstate loan investments fall due for reconversion, they shall be re-invested in our own Government-guaranteed State undertakings.

I ask a simple question: whose loans are these Commonwealth loans that we are going to call in? They are our loans. In the last 25 years, in aggregate, the Commonwealth

Government has not raised by public loan as much as one penny for its own loan purposes. True, in some years some of the money that has been raised has been used for Commonwealth purposes but, speaking without the Treasury figures (which are no longer available to me), over the last 25 years the State Governments have become debtors to the Commonwealth Government for about £700,000,000. In other words, of the money owed in Commonwealth loans, about £700,000,000 of it—a fantastic figure I know (and it could well be £900,000,000)—has been raised from the taxpayer and paid by the Commonwealth into loans, on which the States are paying interest. If the Treasurer would give me his ear for a moment I should like to ask him to obtain from the Under Treasurer the figure which the States, as an aggregate, owe the Commonwealth today, and on which they have been paying interest to the Commonwealth since the war. I believe that the sum is over £700,000,000.

Mr. Hudson: Item (c) in the Premier's policy speech does not refer to Commonwealth Government securities.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that. If the member for Glenelg will listen to the words "that as Commonwealth and interstate loan investments fall due for conversion", and if the words mean anything to him, it will be obvious to him that this refers to Commonwealth loans. Otherwise, the words would not mean anything, because no other interstate or Commonwealth securities are falling due. If the member for Glenelg knows the history of this he will also know that some years ago Victoria decided to use this same method of conveniently raising money, and it instructed its State savings bank to sell some of its Commonwealth securities, and invest the money in State undertakings. The bank did sell some, and invested the money in some State undertakings, but at the next Loan Council meeting the Commonwealth Treasurer, who has a complete record of all these transactions, pointed out to Victoria that it had defaulted on an agreement into which the States had been obliged to enter.

That agreement stipulates that the Commonwealth Government will not underwrite the Loan Council programme unless (a) the State Governments support the Loan programme; and (b) the State Governments' undertakings support the Loan programme. Without that support from the Commonwealth our Loan programme would fall down in most years, and this year probably by about £70,000,000.

Therefore, the proposals contained in the policy speech are so fantastic as to be unrealistic, from the point of view of financing the proposals that honourable members opposite are anxious to put into effect. I do not intend to anticipate the machinery necessary to amalgamate these banks, but from the point of view of financing any additional expenditure in social services, or in any other additional expenditure, they will not provide one penny for the intended purposes. I have said that I would comment on the important contribution to the affairs of the nation by the honourable member for Glenelg. He spoke of the worst gerrymander the world had ever seen.

Mr. Clark: He said only Australia.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not want to misquote him, but I think we were told it was the most pernicious, crooked, cruel and detrimental gerrymander that had ever taken place since the time of Pharaoh.

Mr. Lawn: You wouldn't deny that, would you?

Mr. Hudson: I said it was the most vicious gerrymander in Australian history.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member's history on Charles Cameron Kingston was good, but not so good about this "gerrymander", because he forgot a few points. If he likes to look at the gerrymander—and I use his term—

Mr. Hudson: You admit it!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member wishes he can get some honourable members to give him a few more expressions to use here; I shall not object.

Mr. Clark: That could be arranged.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Constitution Act Amendment Bill (Electoral Boundaries) was reserved for Royal Assent on October 20, 1955. The second reading of the Bill had taken place on September 22, 1955, but, the House having divided on the second reading, no division in fact took place, for only one honourable member objected to the Bill. That was the Hon. Sir George Jenkins. He tried to divide the House, but he was not able to do so because he could not find any Labor member or any other members to hold the bridge with him. He was the only member who objected to this pernicious gerrymander, the worst in the history of the world! He was the only cleanskin. If the member for Glenelg looks at some history that is more modern than the history he quoted, he will see that no division was called for because all the members of the Labor Party who were in the House voted for the Bill.

However, that is not the most interesting point about this gerrymander. If honourable members look at the composition of the House at that time they will see that the Government was represented by 21 members but, as I have already pointed out, one of those members was violently opposed to the Bill. That left only 20 supporters for the Bill on the Government side and as the Government had to provide a Speaker it did not have a sufficient number to carry the Bill, except with the support of the Labor Party. They are the facts of life and some of the members in the House now were present then and know that we did not have the numbers to carry this pernicious gerrymander without the support of the Opposition!

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They are only some of the facts of life.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank the Minister for his interjection because it enables me to go a little further. Members opposite voted for the Bill because they were told to vote for it. Some members opposite wanted to oppose the Bill but they had to support it because they were told to do so and I was a little amused to see that some members made sure that they were out of the Chamber when the vote was taken. However, the fact remains (and *Hansard* proves it) that the Government could not have carried this pernicious gerrymander (which the member for Glenelg has suddenly found to be so bad) except with the support of the Labor Party.

The member for Glenelg gave some of the history of the Kingston family. I do not know why this history was given; it was something like "the flowers that bloom in the spring". However, I did not object to what he said about the Kingston family and I agree with him that they made a great contribution to this State and to the laws of this State. I believe that Charles Cameron Kingston was probably the greatest statesman (without any qualification and not excluding the Premier) that this State has produced. However, I am not quite sure how he became relevant to the Governor's Speech. Yesterday, the member for Glenelg said:

Charles Cameron Kingston was a great South Australian, and in Commonwealth politics a great Australian. In sponsoring legislative reform he stands as the most important figure in our history.

I agree with that. Later in his speech, the honourable member said:

I should like to see his name commemorated when, according to Labor's policy, Bedford Park becomes a separate university.

I do not believe that Bedford Park should become a second university. As a matter of fact, Bedford Park is vested in the University of Adelaide. If honourable members look at universities in other States they will find two universities in the same locality do not make good bed fellows. There has been friction in New South Wales and Victoria. I believe that, when the time comes for another university to be established in South Australia, it should not be established in the metropolitan area. I know that much is said about decentralization, but when it comes to establishing things we are prone to put them into a convenient place rather than realize that the advantages of a university, for instance, are not necessarily associated with a capital city.

I point out that some of the great universities of Great Britain were established purely and simply as university towns. I cannot see why a university cannot be established at Mount Gambier, or alternatively, Naracoorte, Murray Bridge, in the upper river area, Whyalla, or Port Lincoln. I believe that any of these centres would be appropriate for the establishment of a university by the time it would be needed in six or eight years. It would be a useful exercise for the Minister of Education to have a competent committee appointed to examine where another university should be established and land acquired so that it could be established without large capital cost for the purchase of the necessary land.

I want to return for one moment to Charles Cameron Kingston. Honourable members should remember that he made this great contribution. In sponsoring legislative reform, he stands as the most important figure in our history. I looked up Charles Cameron Kingston many years ago, for a personal reason: I have a walking-stick at home made of Irish blackthorn; it has a gold band around it and was presented to Thomas Playford by Charles Cameron Kingston. I looked him up to see what his politics were, and all the rest of it. While doing so, I came across a statement by him. I remembered it and thought I should read it for the benefit of the honourable member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) and his colleagues who, in their policy speech, appeared to desire the abolition of another place. This is what Charles Cameron Kingston said, as recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. Clark: What date was this?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: November 28, 1900.

Mr. Clark: That was when he was getting very old, wasn't it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No; it was when he was in his absolute prime. In those days, *Hansard* was not reported precisely as it is today but, for the purposes of the quotation, I use the precise statement that appears in *Hansard*:

He did not favour the abolition of the Legislative Council. He never had, and he was pleased to have the opportunity of stating his views in that respect in their midst.

He was a member of the Legislative Council and was, in that debate, getting the stick. The report continues:

It was a good thing to have two Houses. He believed in the Second Chamber for second thought, and revision, and review. He believed also that the marked difference between the two Chambers should consist of the larger district for the Upper House and the longer term. He advocated the larger district in the hope that thereby they might secure a highly desirable freedom from purely parish and local interest. He believed also that as regarded the longer term they might thereby assure themselves a greater independence of temporary popular clamour, because he held that it was not the duty of either House to give way to every breath of popular opinion.

I suggest that is a good test for the honourable member for Glenelg to consider. I now want to deal with some remarks made by the lady who graciously moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is true that there has been, and is at present, a great problem arising with some of the houses built by private enterprise, through their not being up to standard. I accept that there has been a problem but I doubt whether the solution advocated works for the ultimate benefit of the people, because it would undoubtedly increase costs by about £200 a house. In fact, I believe I could produce, if I liked to do some research, figures to show that it would raise the cost even more than that. Experience has proved that the consumer usually gets the best deal when free competition is adopted by private enterprise. It is not desirable to impose on the building industry a stricture that would raise the level of all costs merely to deal with a few people not playing the game. In those circumstances, the solution offered was not a good one.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 o'clock.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT, LAND SETTLEMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEES) BILL.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Industries Development Act, 1941-1958, to amend the Land Settlement Act, 1944-1959, as amended, to amend the Public Works Standing Committee Act, 1927-1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes certain amendments to the Industries Development Act, Land Settlement Act and Public Works Standing Committee Act, and its main purpose is to enable the committees established under those Acts to function more effectively. In addition, the opportunity is being taken to extend for a further two years the life of the Land Settlement Committee, which would otherwise expire in December of this year.

The first amendment, which is to the Industries Development Act, is made by clause 2, which inserts a new section 12a providing that membership of the committee is not deemed to be an office of profit within the meaning of section 45 of the Constitution Act. Section 45 of the lastmentioned Act provides, as honourable members know, that if any member of the Parliament accepts any office of profit from the Crown (except offices required by the Constitution Act to be held by members) his seat immediately becomes vacant. The Government has been advised that members of the Industries Development Committee hold an office of profit under the Crown. Both the Land Settlement Act (section 14) and the Public Works Standing Committee Act (section 15) contain express provision that membership of each of those committees is not to be deemed to be an office of profit, that holding office or accepting payment as a member of a committee shall not be deemed to be the acceptance or holding of contracts with the State Government, and that the seat in Parliament of a member is not to be vacated merely because he accepts payment as a member of either committee. Such a provision is not included in the Industries Development Act. A possible reason for this is that it may have been thought that

section 54a of the Constitution Act would operate as a saving clause. Section 54a was inserted in the Constitution Act in 1939, and the Industries Development Act was not passed until 1941. But it will be seen that section 54a relates only to membership of any committee appointed by either or both Houses of Parliament. The Industries Development Committee is appointed, not by either or both Houses, but by His Excellency the Governor. There are, therefore, very strong grounds for argument that the members of the committee are and have been ineligible as members of Parliament, and members will be aware of the very considerable penalties which under the Constitution could attach to present and past members of the committee if this legislation remedying this oversight and validating what has happened is not passed. New section 12a is along similar lines to the saving sections in the Land Settlement and Public Works Standing Committee Acts. By subclause (2) the amendment is made retrospective to the commencement of the Industries Development Act in 1941.

Clause 3 of the Bill deals with the Land Settlement Act. By subclause (2) it amends section 8 of that Act. That section provides that four members of the committee shall form a quorum, but that when the committee meets for the consideration of its report or recommendations the quorum shall be six. This has given rise to difficulties in the past because, if only two of the seven members of the committee are away or indisposed, the committee cannot consider a report or make recommendations. It is proposed to reduce the quorum for this purpose to five. As I have already stated, the opportunity is also being taken by clause 3 (1) and (3) to extend the

life of the committee for a further period of two years. I do not think that any honourable member will disagree with the Government in its view that the provisions of the Act should not be allowed to lapse. The amendments are on lines similar to those which have been passed every second year for a long period.

I come now to clause 4, which deals with the Public Works Standing Committee Act. That Act provides, by section 5 (2) and section 7 (1) (c), that the holder of an office of profit under the Crown cannot be a member of the committee and that upon acceptance of any office of profit under the Crown the seat of a member on the committee becomes vacant. This means that any member of any Parliamentary or Standing Committee who receives payment for his services as a member is ineligible to be a member of the Public Works Standing Committee. It also means that a member of the Public Works Standing Committee cannot be appointed to any other paid committee. The Government is of the opinion that it should be open to all members of both Houses (except Ministers of the Crown) to serve, if the respective Houses so desire, on two or more committees. Accordingly the statutory bar is being removed from the Act by clause 4. I point out to honourable members that neither the Industries Development Act nor the Land Settlement Act contain disqualification provisions along the lines of the provisions being deleted from the Public Works Standing Committee Act.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 6.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, May 20, at 2 p.m.