

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 16, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Is the Premier now able to give the information I requested yesterday concerning the additional £600,000 allotted to Victoria at the last Premiers' Conference? Can he say whether the £600,000 is in the base figure for Victoria and will be reproduced in each of the five succeeding years, or whether it is only for the one year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not had an opportunity to go through the report I have on this matter, but the information I have received is that the special additions for Queensland and Victoria will be reproduced in each of the five years of the new arrangements. For Queensland the sum of £1,000,000 will be added to the figure for the base year of 1964-65 for the purpose of calculation, so that in 1965-66 Queensland will receive an addition of somewhat more than £1,000,000. For future years an additional £1,000,000 will be added into the base figure each year. For Victoria, the special addition of £600,000 will be added to the 1965-66 figure. It will form part of the base for calculation of grants in years subsequent to 1965-66. These special additions offered by the Commonwealth were not at the expense of any other State, as it is not a matter of dividing a pool; each State's grant is calculated separately. I think it is a question of the £600,000 being added to the base figure for Victoria. Betterment factors, such as population increase, enter into it and could affect the position in subsequent years.

POLICE RECRUITS.

Mr. HUGHES: I have the greatest admiration and respect for the Police Force and the way the law is enforced in South Australia. Therefore, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether the National Service training call-up will have any effect on cadet enlistment in the South Australian Police Force? If so, what steps are being taken by the Government to maintain what is recognized as the most efficient Police Force in the Commonwealth?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be pleased to get that information for the honourable member.

DROUGHT RELIEF.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In the North and North-East of this State, which parts have suffered extremely for 12 months and have had little or no rain, some of the cattle are too weak to move. I know that a South Australian Minister—

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member desire to make a statement explaining his question? If so, he must have leave.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask leave to make a statement. The Minister of Mines, who has recently travelled in Central Australia, has drawn attention to the extremely desperate conditions there. Can the Premier say whether a request for drought relief has been received by the Government, either for transport concessions or for some other relief, and if it has been, whether the Government has considered the request? If no request has been made, will the Government consider one if it is made?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: To my knowledge, nothing has been reported to the Government at this stage on the serious position in this area of the State. I believe, from information given me, that few stock can be seen in the course of several hundred miles of travel and that such cattle are in bad condition. I assure the honourable member that if any request is made the Government will consider seriously what should be done in this matter.

STURT HIGHWAY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am absolutely horrified and appalled at the Highways Department's action on the Sturt Highway near Waikerie and between Waikerie and Kingston. A new highway is being constructed and the department is removing all trees on both sides of the road to the full width of the 3-chain road. Also, towards Truro, where no reconstruction is taking place, the bulldozers are removing beautiful trees. Apparently it is contemplated that the same thing will be done on the road to Kingston when it is reconstructed. It must be apparent to the Minister of Roads and to the department that such action will create a dust nuisance, and a sand-drift nuisance on some rises. As this serious matter requires urgent attention, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether steps can be taken to stop this wanton destruction of trees and flora along the roadways in this area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Normally this question would be addressed to the Minister of Education, for him to take it up with the Minister of Roads and Local Government,

but I have had a letter from the honourable member's constituents requesting that I do something about this matter, as it could adversely affect agricultural production. I express sympathy for the people concerned. I have sent a minute to the Minister of Roads drawing his attention to the letter from the honourable member's constituents and, if what they say is true, I am sure he, too, will have a sympathetic understanding of their problem.

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR.

Mrs. BYRNE: As at present no toilet facilities exist at the South Para reservoir, can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to erect such facilities there?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member raised this matter during the Address in Reply debate, I sought a report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who informs me that it is intended to provide toilet facilities for the public at the reservoir, and that instructions have been issued for the preparation of design and estimates of cost at an early date.

HOTEL HOURS.

Mr. HALL: On May 25 last I asked the Premier whether he would include in a referendum concerned with a lottery in this State the matter of 10 o'clock closing. He replied at that stage that no request had been received and no decision made concerning extending hotel hours. Since then, the result of an Australia-wide public opinion poll has been published in one of our newspapers, and I believe that in every State except South Australia the public was overwhelmingly in favour of 10 o'clock closing. However, surprisingly enough, in this State a majority was not against it. Since that time (only just recently, I believe) the annual meeting of the Australian Labor Party in Victoria has revealed the Victorian Party's favourable attitude to the 10 o'clock closing of hotel bars there. I believe that, when this eventually comes about, South Australia will be the only State with 6 o'clock closing. Will the Premier say whether he has reviewed this matter, and whether he has received any representations regarding it? Further, will he take the necessary steps by referendum to ascertain public opinion on this question?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I cannot add anything more to what I have already told the honourable member earlier in this place. Indeed, what is happening over the border is not my business. I have enough to do in South Australia.

WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Works say when work will commence on the Fulham Gardens and Henley Beach floodwaters drainage scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter came before my department when my predecessor was in office. An arrangement has been entered into between Henley and Grange and Woodville councils; I understand that my department has fully approved the scheme and that tenders have been called.

SEAT BELTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday afternoon I was upset by the apparent attitude of the Premier on the question of the compulsory installation of seat belts in new motor cars. During question time yesterday I asked the Premier whether the new Government had considered proclaiming section 162a. (3) (c) of the Road Traffic Act, which provides for the compulsory installation of seat belts in new motor cars after a certain date. This legislation was passed in 1963. In answer, the Premier said:

As yet, the Government has not considered this matter, but it will be considered as soon as possible.

I thought that that was treating too lightly a matter of great seriousness because this is a matter of saving lives in the community. Therefore, later, when the House was going into Committee, I raised the matter again and tried to emphasize its seriousness. However, the only reply I received from the Premier when he replied in the debate (and I think it was an extraordinary reply) was:

I shall not give any further information to the honourable member for Mitcham: I gave a considered reply in question time.

Will the Premier, in the interests of road safety in this State, take up immediately with Cabinet the question of proclaiming a section of an Act that was passed with the overwhelming support of members of both sides of this Chamber?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, I do not see that it is my fault if the honourable member becomes upset. Surely I cannot be held responsible for that. The time factor is important in this matter. As yet, I have not had an opportunity to consider this matter any further than has been indicated. If the honourable member wants information more quickly, I am afraid that there are not sufficient hours in the day to satisfactorily deal with every little question that comes along.

Mr. Millhouse: This is a big question, not a little one.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not wish to be drawn into a debate on this question at this stage. In fairness, if the honourable member must persist in this question then let him put it on notice.

Mr. HURST: Can the Attorney-General ascertain the number of seat belt manufacturers in South Australia, the correct names of those companies, and the names of the directors of those companies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report from the Registrar of Companies and endeavour to inform the honourable member of the information he seeks.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. BURDON: Late last year a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the fluoridation of water supplies in South Australia. Can the Minister of Works say whether this matter has been considered and, if it has been, what is the Government's intention regarding the committee's report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The committee was set up by this House, and the then Premier, speaking on behalf of the House, said that he would be happy to recommend the appointment of the committee on the understanding that its findings would not be binding on the Government or on the House. Up to the present the Government has not considered the introduction of fluoride into metropolitan reservoirs. However, as Minister of Works who is much concerned about expense, the necessity to supply water to country areas, and the extension of metropolitan supplies for the development of the State, I believe that any additional cost in respect of matters such as the introduction of fluoride would only be detrimental to the progress of country and metropolitan supplies. Therefore, as Minister of Works, I would strongly oppose its introduction.

Mr. RYAN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the cost of adding fluoride to waters

in the metropolitan area reservoirs has been considered by the Government?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Engineering and Water Supply Department has considered the cost of adding fluoride to water in the metropolitan reservoirs. The figure is available but I am unable to say, from memory, what it is.

Mr. Millhouse: It is about £70,000.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I thank the honourable member. I thought that was about the figure.

Mr. Quirke: About the cost of 20 miles of country road.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As a Minister, I am concerned about spending money in respect of this vexed matter. Many problems are involved. While one section of the community strongly advocates the addition of fluoride to the water supply, another section, possibly more vocal, opposes it. Because of these different views one has to consider both sides of the question. At present the Government has not considered adding fluoride to water in metropolitan reservoirs.

ULEY WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Earlier this session I sought from the Minister of Works a report on the Uley Basin on Central Eyre Peninsula. Has the Minister that report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

The Mines Department has advised that, to date, 290 bores have been drilled in Polda Basin, of which 20 have been undertaken since the end of November, 1964. Recently, drilling has been confined to the Kappawanta area in an endeavour to delineate the good quality water. Four large diameter—43in.—holes have been drilled at $\frac{1}{2}$ mile intervals along a line south of the existing Polda trench and pump tested. They are numbered 4, 5, 6 and 7 in order running southwards from the existing trench. Test results on these bores were as follows:

| Bore No. | Salinity parts per million. | Time Pumped days | Max. Yield g.p. hour. | Max. Drawdown Feet. |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 4 | 1,450 | 7 | 38,000 | 14 |
| 5 | 685 | 1 | 20,000 | 6 approx |
| 6 | 545 | 1 | 4,000 | 14 approx. |
| 7 | 650 | 7 | 43,000 | 11 |

It is proposed to use water from one or more of the above borest for the Polda to Kimba water supply. One additional bore is ready for testing.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works obtain information for me regarding progress on the reconstruction and rebuilding of the Morphett Street bridge to carry traffic from Adelaide to the North Adelaide section of my district? Can he ascertain whether tenders have been called, the estimated cost, and when this work is expected to be completed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to obtain a report and inform the honourable member.

CARRIBIE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last July I asked the Minister of Works a question regarding the development of a water basin located in the hundred of Carribie in the southern portion of Yorke Peninsula. In a full report, the Minister said that, before large expenditure was incurred in harnessing the supply, the quantity of water available over a lengthy period would have to be ascertained, and this would necessitate sinking pumping bores and continuing prolonged pumping tests. Can the Minister say whether the sinking of these pumping bores and prolonged pumping tests have taken place, and whether those pumping bores have proved to be adequate for development?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I should like to answer the honourable member's question and I think I could answer it correctly but, lest I be misquoted, I shall obtain a report and inform the honourable member.

PLACE NAMES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Prior to the adjournment I asked the Minister of Lands to obtain information on the procedure in naming new suburbs, and to see whether there was some way of preventing the multiplication of names by various subdividers. Has the Minister a report on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Leader approached me privately on this matter, and I have now received the following report:

In 1916 a resolution by the House of Assembly regarding the substitution of British or South Australian native names for place names of enemy origin within the State led to the passing of the Nomenclature Act, No. 1283 of 1917. Pursuant to this Act a Nomenclature Committee was formed, and following the performance of the specific duties laid down by this Act, continued to act in an advisory capacity to the Minister of Lands on nomenclature matters generally, although the 1917 Act was repealed in 1935: Section 5 (g) of the Crown Lands Act provides for the naming of counties, hundreds, towns and other places by proclamation. The disadvantage of the multiplicity of suburban names was raised in the

early 1940's and with the assistance of the Department of Lands and the postal authorities names and boundaries of suburbs within the Burnside Corporation area were proclaimed, the number of suburb names being reduced from 80 to 26.

Consultations between the Nomenclature Committee, the postal authorities and local governing bodies continued and by 1945 general agreement had been reached with all metropolitan councils and corporations resulting in approximately 800 subdivision names being reduced to 250 approved suburb names. Certain amendments due to housing development generally were made in 1951 and the overall plan has remained stable since that time with additions when necessary. Due to the very considerable amount of work necessary in the various departments and authorities following a proclamation of this nature this aspect of the matter was allowed to stand over to a more opportune time, but every endeavour has been made to make these approved suburb names and boundaries known to the general public. While there has been a general acceptance of these names by the public the use of land agents "estate names" within the boundaries of these suburbs creates confusion. Suburban names on plans of subdivision are satisfactorily controlled through the powers of the Town Planner but legislation would be necessary to prevent advertising of incorrect names of new subdivisions which often leads to their adoption by the public. Following a recent request by postal authorities the Nomenclature Committee is investigating legislation in other States with a view to recommending that suitable legislation be sought in this State.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: On May 18, I asked a question of the Minister of Works regarding a water supply for Kimba. The Minister, in his reply, said that a start would be made in 1966. In view of the very dry conditions prevailing, the high cost to the Government of carting water to Kimba, the fact that a satisfactory report has been received already from the Public Works Committee and that Cabinet has approved the project, will the Minister endeavour to have an earlier start made on this scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the anxiety of the people in the Kimba area, which is a dry one, and I appreciate from reports I have seen that the people there are labouring under great difficulties. However, I point out that in every country area for which a scheme has been recommended there is some degree of urgency. In addition, prior to the present Government's assuming office the previous Government had made promises about the commencement of many schemes to which this Government is committed. We are not complaining about that. I assure the honourable member that I will reconsider this matter and,

if such is possible, without being unfair to other sections of the community, I shall try to have an earlier start made.

APPILA SILO.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yesterday I received a reply to a question I have been asking since the beginning of the session. I appreciated the reply: it was lengthy and informative, and helpful to me and to the House. Unfortunately, however, it did not answer my question. The answer given yesterday was that the authority for certain action on an application for a silo was the same Act as that under which the former Government made its decisions, namely, the Bulk Handling of Grain Act. Although I have searched through that Act, I cannot find where it gives power to any Government to prohibit the erection of a silo because the site is not near a railway station. Can the Minister of Agriculture say which part of this Act gives the Government the right to prohibit the building of any silo on any particular site, or whether the Government acted constitutionally when it refused to erect a silo at Appila?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I went to some trouble to prepare that report for the honourable member yesterday, and I am surprised that he is not yet satisfied. However, he has raised one or two further points. It would be difficult for me to satisfy the honourable member, but I said yesterday that this action was entirely in line with the way in which the former Government would have acted and in which I believe it intended to act.

Mr. Heaslip: That does not answer the question.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: If this statement is not correct then the Opposition can contradict it. I believe that I covered the question fully yesterday and that constitutionally I was working under the same principle as laid down by past precedent.

RAILWAY TRACKS.

Mr. RODDA: An article appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of June 5 in which officers of the Australian Railways Union expressed surprise at the deterioration of railway tracks in South Australia and also said that, because of the acute shortage of examiners, it was not possible to make adequate examination of rolling stock, and that large loads were being hauled by diesel electric locomotives at high speeds thus making it difficult to maintain railway tracks. We have had four derailments on the South-East line, and one who travels on the passenger service on this line once a week

tends to get the feeling that it is not a safe method of travel. I am not criticizing the railway staff as they give every courtesy and attention to passengers. I have been in two derailments and the honourable member for Mount Gambier has had even more harrowing experiences than I have had. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Railways to consider the problems raised in the article, in the interests of the rail-travelling public?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall discuss this matter with my colleague, but I assure the honourable member that this Government is mindful of the need for the railway system to be in the best possible order. Labour for the type of work necessary is at a premium at present but the recently announced service pay increases may help relieve this position.

BERRI TRAFFIC.

Mr. CURREN: On the Sturt Highway between the Monash turnoff and the traffic islands at the junction of Sturt Highway and Crawford Terrace, Berri (a distance of about 1½ miles), a serious traffic hazard exists at peak hours. Several large factories are situated on the Monash road and traffic to and from these when joined with the already heavy traffic on the Sturt Highway has created a serious hazard, particularly in the mornings and evenings when employees are travelling to and from work. Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Roads to have a survey taken to see whether the present roadway can be widened to provide for four lanes of traffic on this section of the highway?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to convey that question to my colleague.

EGGS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my request yesterday that he make a statement about the operation of the forthcoming scheme of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities, and my specific query about the position of people in remote areas who may keep fowls technically for commercial purposes?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I answer the latter part of the question first because this seems to be the important part. The honourable member referred to graziers in the Far North keeping a few fowls and selling eggs to passers-by who asked for them. Under the suggested scheme the situation will be the same as that which applies today. If they have more than 20 birds they must submit returns to the South Australian Egg Board. Legislation passed in the Commonwealth Parliament will

apply from July 1. The first 20 birds of any flock will be exempt. The birds need to be six months old before they come under the provision of this legislation, and the main purpose of it is to provide that all producers shall pay towards an orderly marketing scheme. This has not been the case. Under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution people have been able to send eggs across the border and have escaped paying any levy. However, this will not prevent people from sending eggs to other States. Under this system everybody will contribute by way of a levy towards orderly marketing. Indeed, the same system has functioned in Tasmania for some time, the birds being taxed instead of the eggs. Ours will be the same as that system; the tax will be collected fortnightly, and it will be encumbent on every producer who owns more than 20 birds over six months in age to submit a simple return.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Will that include people in the Far North?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Everyone in the Commonwealth will be included. All States except South Australia had agreed to this scheme. In regard to the return to be submitted, the people concerned will be charged on the basis that has been outlined, whether they sell in this State or in any other State. Two extra men will be employed, to be known as public relations officers rather than inspectors. Indeed, I hope that good relations will exist in this important industry, the orderly marketing of which would have been completely lost had the Act (to function as from July 1) not been passed in the Commonwealth Parliament. I know that both the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) are visiting what will be a well attended meeting at Murray Bridge this evening. I shall be happy to accompany them, if only to facilitate their entry into my district, and I shall also be happy for them both to join me in a cup of coffee at my home afterwards.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister used the word "producer", but I believe that actually, in the Commonwealth Act, the term used is "commercial producer". Will the Minister clarify this position? For instance, can he say whether a person who keeps 25 fowls, but who does not sell any eggs, comes within the term of a producer? Can he say also whether such a producer has to make returns or will the term "commercial producer" apply only to a person who sells eggs? I may add that I have a personal interest in this matter.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is considered that anyone who has more than 20 birds is a commercial producer. The reasoning for this is that most people would not use as many eggs as 20 birds would produce, particularly in the flush season. The authorities had to fix a basis and they fixed it on 20 birds, the same figure as was previously applied by the State Egg Board. Although this was not referred to in the question, I take the opportunity to say that it is intended that the P.A. licences issued previously by the Egg Board will still be issued and producers will be able to sell eggs to any person provided that they take out this licence and submit returns. At this stage the South Australian Egg Board does not intend to charge any other levy. Therefore, only one levy will apply: 7s. a bird. Working this out on the basis generally used by poultry farmers (15 dozen eggs a hen a year), the figure will be a little over 5½d. a dozen, which is about the same sum as is being paid now by those selling eggs to the South Australian Egg Board. Therefore, those who have been contributing all the time to the funds of the State Egg Board will be at no disadvantage; the only difference will be that everyone will now contribute. This is in accord with the principle that all should contribute and that one section should not be at a disadvantage compared with another.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he would make a statement about the operation of the C.E.M.A. plan, and I repeat that request. The statement I seek is one that will explain to the owners of poultry where they stand and what should be done when this scheme operates. Considerable confusion exists, and, with respect, it has not been cleared up by the Minister this afternoon. I do not know whether the Minister made his statement with full awareness of the position, but I think he is confused himself and at least he has added to the confusion. In reply to a question by the Leader, he stated that it was considered that anybody owning more than 20 fowls would be a commercial producer but, so far as I am aware, that is not the way the legislation operates. The Bill introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament (and to my knowledge it was not amended in any way) defines a hen as a female domesticated fowl not less than six months old. It goes on to say:

Subject to this Act, a levy is on each prescribed day imposed in respect of hens kept for commercial purposes on that day. That is different from the interpretation the Minister gave today. I again ask the

Minister whether he will get a prepared statement in full detail, so that everybody who owns fowls will know just where he stands and what he should do when the Act operates.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am sorry that I have not cleared up the issue for the honourable member, for I intended to do so. I had hoped my reply would satisfy the honourable member, but apparently it has not. Some time ago, the Minister for Primary Industry in Canberra prepared a statement and had it circulated to all sections of the press throughout South Australia and, I understand, other parts of Australia. In fact, I noticed that the *Advertiser*, by way of an advertisement, gave the whole text of the C.E.M.A. plan. I have this statement before me, but as it is rather lengthy I seek your permission, Mr. Speaker, to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

LEVY ON HENS.

The Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. C. F. Adermann) today announced the details of the effects of the Poultry Industry Acts which were passed by the Federal Parliament yesterday.

Mr. Adermann said that the main points of interest to commercial egg producers were:

- (1) A levy will be imposed on an Australia-wide basis on hens over six months of age which are kept for commercial purposes.
- (2) The levy will not apply to flocks of less than 20 hens and will not apply to the first 20 hens in flocks in excess of 20.
- (3) The levy will be applied fortnightly and will be based on the number of hens owned by any person on the last day of each fortnight commencing from July 1, 1965.
- (4) The fortnightly rate of levy will be prescribed by regulation but an undertaking has been given to Parliament that the rate from July 1, 1965, will not exceed 3½d. per hen per fortnight, *i.e.*, approximately 7s. per hen per year.
- (5) The maximum rate permitted under the legislation will be 10s. per hen per year.
- (6) All commercial egg producers will be required to submit simple returns to the State Egg Boards in their States setting out the number of hens over six months owned by them at the end of each fortnight. Commercial producers in the A.C.T. will submit returns to an official to be specified as no board exists for the A.C.T.
- (7) Payments of the levy will, as a general rule, be required to be made in respect of each fortnight by the last day of the following fortnight, *e.g.*, the first fortnight commences on July 1, 1965, and the levy for that fortnight will be

imposed on the number of hens, less 20, kept on July 14, 1965, and must be paid by July 28, 1965.

- (8) Payments will be made by the owners of the hens to the State Egg Boards in their States and boards have authority to deduct the levy from the proceeds due to the owner in respect of eggs consigned to the board. If an owner does not consign eggs to the board he must pay the board the levy by the due date otherwise he will incur a penalty at the rate of 10 per cent per annum. Owners in the A.C.T. will make payments to an official to be specified.
- (9) The funds collected will be paid into Commonwealth Consolidated Revenue and an equal amount will be paid from Consolidated Revenue into a Trust Fund from which payments will be made to each State for assistance to the industry in that State.
- (10) The Commonwealth Hen Levy will replace the present egg equalization levies imposed by each of the State Boards for the purpose of equalizing returns from local and export sales. State Boards will, however, maintain their levies on eggs for the purpose of meeting the costs of handling, grading and marketing eggs for local sale.
- (11) The levy is designed not to affect the production of "broiler" chickens and special provisions are embodied in the legislation in respect of broiler-breeding hens.
- (12) Administration of the levy in each State will be the responsibility of the State Egg Board as an agent of the Commonwealth Government. State Egg Board inspectors will be properly authorized by the Commonwealth to check returns submitted by owners.
- (13) Penalties of up to £150 are provided in the Act in the event of persons failing to fulfil obligations imposed on them by the legislation.
- (14) All State Egg Boards will be preparing detailed instructions for the guidance of owners of hens in their respective States. These instructions will be widely circulated but it is stressed that the levy is payable by all owners of hens kept for commercial purposes and the obligation rests with everyone liable to pay the levy to acquaint himself with the requirements under the legislation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I now have a copy of the report of the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry on the egg marketing scheme. To me this report makes it perfectly clear that the Act applies only to commercial producers. Many people keep 25 hens but are not commercial producers and have never sold an egg. Are they liable for a penalty of £150 for not putting in a return? Will the Premier get an opinion from

the Crown Solicitor of the definition of a commercial producer under the Act, so that this could receive the widest publicity? I should have thought that a commercial producer was one who produced eggs for sale, but many people keeping over 20 hens do not sell their eggs. Would the Premier obtain this definition so that any apprehension may be removed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be pleased to consult the Attorney-General and ask him to obtain an opinion from the Crown Solicitor. I should be the last person to impose unnecessary hardship on any section of the community, and the question of who is a commercial producer should be resolved as soon as possible. The question is: how are we to count them up? I think much has been said in favour of it, but I should hate to be a member of a Government that imposed an unnecessary hardship on the community. However, I shall be pleased to consult with my colleague on the matter.

USED CARS.

Mr. LANGLEY: A practice has recently been brought to my notice, whereby it appears that some used car dealers in an effort to overcome the law of displaying the deposit and full price on vehicles in their businesses are displaying no prices at all. On seeing a prospective purchaser pulling up outside the premises in perhaps an old car, they offer a trade-in far in excess of the value of that old car, but immediately raise the prices of the cars in the yard. As dealers who comply with the law and show the deposit and full price on the vehicles could be at a disadvantage in view of this practice, will the Attorney-General say whether this matter is receiving consideration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter is being investigated at present. The practice of some used car dealers in jacking up prices of cars that have no advertised prices exhibited on them is causing concern and acting to the detriment of legitimate traders in this field. I hope to be able to take some recommendations to Cabinet in due course.

RAILWAY CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On June 3 I was interested to see a report in the *Advertiser* of proceedings at the Premiers' Conference, portion of which I shall read:

Mr. Walsh suggested at the conference that members of Parliament who had served a total of 14 years should be entitled to gold life passes entitling them to travel on railway systems anywhere in Australia. He said a decision could be reached by correspondence after other Premiers had considered the suggestion.

Since that report appeared I have been approached by a constituent of mine, who is a retired employee of the South Australian Railways, with 50 years' service. He tells me that retired railway employees receive no travel concessions, the only exception being, I think, for former heads of departments of seven years' standing. I understand the Australian Transport Officers Association has several times requested the Railways Commissioner to allow railway employees some concession on the railways after their retirement. As the Premier is seized of the benefits of free travel for retired members of Parliament, will he also use his good offices with the Railways Commissioner (or, as this is a matter of policy, will the Government do so) to obtain travel concessions for retired S.A.R. employees?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know of any question of policy involved, as the honourable member seems to be trying to express in his question. I went to Canberra and placed before the meeting there a proposal that had been considered at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting held in Perth. It involved passes for ex-members of Parliament who had been in office for a certain qualifying period, to be made available for interstate travelling. The Premiers of the various States undertook to consider the matter and to give a decision in writing in due course. As far as ex-railway personnel are concerned, we have already made an announcement as to who can travel on railway services at concession rates, that is to say, those of a certain age and/or under certain conditions. I doubt whether the taxpayers of this country could stand up to any proposal that went beyond that. If the honourable member wishes me to obtain further information I think I can presuppose the answer, for it will be "No". If that is not satisfactory I shall obtain a further report, but it will only confirm what I already believe to be correct.

INDUSTRIAL COURT.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Late last year Mr. President Pellw retired from the Industrial Court, that vacancy being filled by the then Mr. Deputy President Williams. However, no appointment was made at that time to fill the vacancy caused by the elevation of the Deputy President. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry ascertain from his colleague whether the filling of this vacancy has been considered?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to get a report from my colleague and advise the honourable member when it is to hand.

BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: About three years ago there was a line on an appendix to the Loan Estimates showing a figure for solid improvements or extensions to the Bordertown High School. There have been no solid improvements or extensions to the Bordertown High School but several timber frame classrooms have been erected instead. I understand that it may now be necessary to make further additions to the high school because of its increasing numerical strength, and little room is left on which to build additional timber frame classrooms. Will the Minister of Education have this matter investigated to ascertain whether any further necessary additions made to this high school can be an extension of the present solid construction building?

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

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. COUMBE: No doubt the Premier recalls that last year the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, when Premier, invited the local metropolitan councils to form what would be a metropolitan drainage authority. As I have a particular interest in this matter because of projects that are about to be proceeded with in my district, can the Premier say what progress is being made in the formation of this authority? Can he say whether any forward steps have been taken and whether it is likely that the authority will be set up soon?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The matter referred to by the honourable member is under the control of the Minister of Local Government in another place. Certain matters relating to it have been mentioned in Cabinet from time to time. This question is receiving attention from Cabinet, but no finality has been arrived at at this stage. However, it is receiving all possible attention in an attempt to solve this important problem.

KAROONDA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question regarding the proposed water scheme for the town of Karoonda?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member and the Minister of Lands have persistently been asking questions about the Karoonda supply, and I am pleased to be able to reply. Two schemes have been prepared by the department to take Murray River water to supply Karoonda and country lands *en route*. The first involves the laying of about 23 miles of main from Bow Hill to Karoonda, at an

estimated cost of £159,000. The second proposal involves the laying of about 32 miles of main from Tailem Bend and would supply the township of Wynarka *en route* at an estimated cost of £204,500. Estimates of revenue to be derived from both schemes have been taken out, but in each case the return is extremely low, being less than 0.5 per cent. In view of the very unsatisfactory financial aspect of both proposals, and the limited amount of Loan funds available, it is felt that the department's resources should be directed to schemes in which the return on the initial capital outlay is not so unfavourable.

SOIL SURVEYS.

Mr. HALL: The previous Government approved the scheme whereby a soil survey was to be made of areas adjacent to the Bolivar sewage works for the purpose of ascertaining whether soils were suitable in that locality for the possible use of effluent for irrigation purposes. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the progress of the soil survey in that area?

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

LEASES.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Lands stated some time ago that the Government's policy would be to refuse the freeholding of land except in certain cases that were fairly advanced at the time. He added yesterday in the House that when soldier settlers' blocks were sold the new lessee would retain the right to freehold the land comprised in the lease. I wish to refer to holders of a perpetual lease who are not under the War Service Land Settlement Agreement, irrespective of whether or not they are returned soldiers, but have previously held the right to freehold land. Is the Government considering whether or not those people will have the right to freehold land, or has a decision been made upon that matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I can say "Yes" to both questions: the Government has considered this matter, and where people have had a right to freehold land that right will continue.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On May 19 I asked the Premier a question regarding students' travel concessions, and the Premier undertook to get a report on the matter. Has the Premier that report?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government does not intend to alter concessions as they apply at present to university students.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thank the Premier for that answer although it was in the negative and will be disappointing for university students generally. Has the Premier an answer to my recent question about travel concessions for war widows?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I recently made a press statement in which I said that certain travel concessions would apply, particularly to age and invalid pensioners. The position of war widows has not been further examined. However, if a war widow receives an amount exceeding that provided for those persons entitled to an entitlement card under the age and invalid pensioners section, that widow would be excluded from the provisions of the travel concessions.

LAND TRANSACTIONS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have received reports that it is the intention of the Attorney-General that before any land transaction receives the Land Titles Office consent it must be verified by a solicitor. Can the Attorney-General say whether this matter has been finalized and whether it has reached Cabinet for approval, or whether he intends to go ahead with this proposition as an added emolument to the lawyers' profession?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer to each of the questions is "No".

OIL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday I asked the Premier a question regarding an agreement that was reached at the recent Premiers' Conference concerning the distribution of oil royalties in respect of off-shore oil drilling. Can the Premier say whether the 50/50 division between the Commonwealth and this State applies to territorial waters of South Australia, or whether it applies to waters outside territorial waters up to the continental shelf? The State, I think, has never had any dispute as to the rights it had over territorial waters. However, the position regarding waters outside territorial limits has been governed by an international convention that enabled the adjacent country not only to have the oil rights but to exploit them. Therefore, two separate questions are involved. Can the Premier say whether the Government has agreed to handing over to the Commonwealth the oil rights of the State's territorial waters, or does the agreement only apply to the extra-territorial

waters which are the waters between the 3-mile limit and the edge of the continental shelf?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I was a lone voice in trying to get a further adjournment of this matter so that I could bring it back to this State for further consultation, particularly because of Queensland's capitulation in the matter. I do not say that ungenerously of Queensland. As I mentioned yesterday, Queensland had been in harmony with our proposition, but then came the Prime Minister's announcement which, it seemed to me, was already ratified by the other members of the conference. Some discussion did take place following certain matters raised by the Premier of Tasmania, but the upshot was that I was the lone voice and I did not get very far. As I said yesterday, I understood that the proposed agreement was for it to be on a 50/50 basis. The report I have for the Leader is as follows:

The proposed agreement for a share of royalties on a 50/50 basis between the States and the Commonwealth applies to all waters whether States' territorial waters or waters on the continental shelf. The proposal is that the agreement to be entered into between the Commonwealth and all States will have annexed to it the legislation which the Commonwealth will pass and the legislation which the respective States will pass. The legislative pattern will be complementary to the agreement which is executed by all parties. The proposal is that there will be no amendment to the legislation by any of the parties without the agreement of all parties.

WINE INDUSTRY.

Mr. QUIRKE: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the wine industry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As yet, Cabinet has not reached a final decision on this matter.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 15. Page 352.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): Last evening when the Government Whip kindly gave me leave to continue my remarks I had stated that the main subject to which I desired to address myself in this debate was the fact that the Speech with which His Excellency opened Parliament related to domestic but not to developmental matters. Having looked through the Speech rather carefully, I find 38 paragraphs, out of which only 10 refer

to matters that could even be remotely described as "developmental" matters. Breaking it down again, of those 10 I find that one is definitely of a restrictive nature. Five others are old schemes previously announced to this House, which are being carried on by the present administration, but which were prepared, inaugurated and approved by the previous Government. Of the remainder one is doubtful and only three are definitely positive propositions. I believe that in a State such as ours this kind of approach to the affairs of Parliament by a new Administration in the first session is seriously disappointing. I am sure that no-one would countenance the view that this State has anywhere near reached the point where we can mark time with development and aim our resources at domestic affairs, such as social services, and so on. Admittedly, these things are necessary; indeed, they are vitally necessary up to a point. Beyond that point some might well be desirable and from then on they can perhaps only be described as luxuries. I entirely agree that our people should live in good surroundings, that they should be governed by good laws, that they should be protected when they need protection, that they should be cared for when they are sick, and that their misfortunes, if they are genuine misfortunes, should be regarded, at least to a large degree, as the responsibility of the general community. However, I do not believe that we should place major emphasis on things of this nature, but that we should place most of our attention and emphasis on developing the State.

I am not surprised that this kind of Speech should have come down to us on this occasion; it has always been my view (possibly as a rather intermittent student of politics) that its contents are an inherent part of Labor's thinking. Wherever one looks in the British Commonwealth, which is, of course, the most advanced of any of the civilizations having a democratic government (and which I say without prejudice to the United States), one finds the two-Party system functioning, regardless of the names that might be attached to the Parties. I have often asked myself why this is so, and I believe the answer lies in the very structure of the Labor organization itself. I say this not in a critical sense, for I am trying to look at it in an analytical sense, merely to discover, if I can, why this situation exists. The Labor organization is a huge machine set up under a system of Party rules and government, which is far too complicated for me to understand.

cl

It has as its basic structure the trade union movement which has been a mighty force in the British Commonwealth. I have no criticism to make of it as such; one might tend to be critical of its policy, but that is another matter. The organization of that movement is the basic foundation on which the Labor political movement rests, and one has only to see who becomes elected to Parliament from the Labor Party's side to see how true this is. I do not know, but I hasten to guess that probably seven out of 10 Labor members of Parliament have at some time or other held responsible positions in the trade union movement. Therefore, by instinct and by necessity, we get a strong bias towards the influence exerted by this movement in the halls of legislature on the Labor side. Indeed, the very existence of a Labor Parliamentarian, as a member for his Party, depends not on his being acceptable to the people of the district that he intends to represent, but first of all on obtaining pre-selection from the executive of his Party. As I say, this is the first prerequisite, and the matter to which the up-and-coming Labor member first addresses himself. He must see that first of all he is *persona grata* with the President of the Labor movement in his State, so that he will be assured of selection to represent the district for which he is nominated. Under the system under which I was elected I did not have to consult anybody on North Terrace. I did not have to consult the Liberal organization or the Leader of the Party: I had to consult those who were members of my organization in my own district. These were people who knew me: they knew my worst qualities as well as the few better ones that I may have; they were people who were my friends and neighbours—people of the district.

Mr. McKee: You're being very modest.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I try to be modest and perhaps that is something the honourable member for Port Pirie might emulate. I had to satisfy the people amongst whom I had lived all my life that I was a reasonable and satisfactory person to represent them. I had to preface my ambition to enter politics by service in the local sphere to the people whose support I was about to seek. However, that is not the case with a person who aspires to be a member of the Labor movement. The people in a district do not decide who their nominee shall be; this is decided by the executive of the movement in its central halls. I believe that this predisposes every Labor politician to the inward look rather than the outward look. He must satisfy the movement and be *persona grata* with the movement.

He is educated politically within this influence and in these surroundings.

In the Governor's Speech, I found that, for instance, such an important matter as migration was tucked away in a small part of one sentence. There is a reference in the Speech to a Minister of Housing, but little is said about any new policy for housing. What is said about transport is ominously restrictive in its approach; it is not developmental, but purely restrictive. If there is one thing that this Government appears to be intending to do that will do damage to decentralization and to various other avenues of the development of the State, it is this apparent tying up of transport within the railway system. Much will be said both inside and outside Parliament about this matter and much will be said before the next election. I can say that definitely, if it is any information to the Government. I agree that the railways could do more in rendering a better service and I believe that this is the correct approach to rehabilitating railway matters. I agree with what is being said by the Government in this regard, but I do not agree to compelling people to use a service that they do not want to use and with compelling them to stay off the roads and highways for which their money has paid.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: What is the honourable member presupposing?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Premier knows very well that I am not far off the mark.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: The honourable member would do much better to wait.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will have something more to say in due course, but the Premier cannot brush me off in this way.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I don't want to brush the honourable member off.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Then keep quiet and listen to what I am saying. I entirely agree with the proposal to rehabilitate railways so that they can render a better service; I believe the department can do this. I have always said that the Railways Department and the Commissioner can do much more to attract patronage to the railways if a better service is provided and a businessman's approach is adopted to the affairs of the department. As an administrator and controller of his department, the Commissioner is without peer in Australia; there is no question about that. He knows how to run trains, conserve finance and organize the general traffic of his department. However, I believe that he could have done more in going out after business. In later years he has changed his policy somewhat in this respect with good results.

The references to transport in the Governor's Speech, in my view, show a restrictive and not a developmental approach. Very little is said in the Speech about primary industries. The Opposition is concerned that so little is said about agriculture, mining, land settlement and forestry. The fishing industry received no mention at all. I may develop this subject later because I believe it is a matter of serious concern. The Speech contains a paragraph about natural gas, but I believe that this was included for effect; there was nothing new in it. It was a recapitulation of many statements made by the previous Premier in this House, and it did not raise any excitement in me nor, I believe, in anybody else who read it.

The Speech contains only a brief reference to electricity. If anything at all is the keystone on which industrial development rests in this and other States it is electrical power. If the Government is wise it will make sure that, first, it does not interfere with the activities of the Electricity Trust while it is under its present management, and secondly, it will give the trust every possible consideration in expanding its activities where the trust recommends and desires this course. I believe that the Electricity Trust of South Australia is probably the best run organization of its kind that can be found anywhere in the western world. It has been extremely efficient, forward-looking and economical in its approach. It has kept ahead of requirements but not so far ahead as to be extravagant, and it has developed the power resources of the State with the most modern equipment. In addition, it has kept the price of electricity in South Australia stable for twelve years at a time when money values have declined substantially and when every other single item one can think of has increased sharply in cost. I believe that our success in competing with industries in other States in manufacturing in the electrical field and in motor cars (where we are exporters to other States, with transport costs) is reflected largely in the ability of the trust to keep these industries supplied with cheap power.

All the water schemes mentioned in the Speech, including sewerage, were approved by me, as Minister of Works in the previous Government, and they are provided for in the financial structure that the previous Government worked out for about five years ahead. There was nothing new in them. Since that Speech one or two new schemes have been announced. I am concerned that the Minister of Works is already forecasting some financial difficulty in carrying out his works programme. I cannot understand this.

Mr. Jennings: Can't you?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, and I will tell the honourable member why. All the schemes that had been approved before I left office were provided for financially five years ahead.

Mr. Ryan: Where would the finance have come from?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: We would have got as much Loan money each year as in the previous year. There was no reason to think we would have got less; indeed, this year the Premier came back from Canberra and said he had got more. If this is so, why has the Minister of Works at this early stage had to warn the House that he may not be able to carry out his programme because of financial restrictions? I cannot understand it. The only reason I can advance is that possibly the Minister of Social Welfare has such bright ideas about enlarging his departmental scope that some developmental projects have to suffer as a result of his desires. If this is so, the position is already serious—and I believe this is the position. I raise the matter because it is inexplicable to me that the Minister should find himself in financial difficulty and have to advise members about the curtailment of the programme at this stage.

I will now get back to the Governor's Speech as it applies to rural development. One has only to look at the composition of the Ministry to appreciate why primary industries have had so little attention. We were disturbed to learn that the portfolios of Agriculture and Forests, which were previously receiving the full-time attention of my colleague, the Honourable Mr. Brookman, are now tacked on to the portfolios of Lands, Repatriation and Irrigation.

Mr. Ryan: And the Minister is doing a mighty good job.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: He is no super-man, although he appears to be shaping that way. He is obligated with the responsibility of looking after five big departments—and they are big! As Minister of Agriculture alone, he administers over 30 Acts and has control of or is the Minister to whom about 32 boards report. I have given these figures from memory; I looked them up some years ago when I was Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I thought there were twice that many!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister agrees with me that the ramifications of the department are colossal. If he does his job as I know he wants to do it, he is required to

go around the countryside to see what agriculture is doing and what it wants, to mix among farmers, to see how the extension services of the department are applied, to see the problems that exist in relation to stock and weeds, and to know what all the Acts he administers are. I am sure he would want to do that.

It used to be said that the Playford Government was a Government of farmers. That was true, because of the eight Ministers in Cabinet all but two were actively engaged in primary production. We now have a Cabinet without a single farmer in it. I would have thought that one of my friends from Millicent, Wallaroo, Frome, or other country districts might have occupied the seat of the Minister of Agriculture. I do not want it thought that I have anything against the present Minister, whom I have commended, but I would have thought for decency and appearance sake if for no other reason the Premier would have chosen a practical farmer for this portfolio. I would have thought that as a recognition of the part played by primary industries in the economy of this State the Party would have chosen a country man with a country background and knowledge. The reaction to the composition of the Ministry in country districts is one of dismay and disturbance, not only because a man without detailed technical knowledge of country affairs is the Minister of Agriculture but because the Government apparently thinks so little of primary industries that it does not even give them a proper guernsey in Cabinet. In addition, while the Premier has given the Hon. Mr. Bywaters five big departments he has given the Attorney-General the new Ministry of Social Welfare.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think that should go to a farmer, too?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not say that at all; I am saying that we have taken away the representation in Cabinet of primary industries and have at the same time created a new Ministry. This is the picture that has been presented to the people of this State, and I suggest that it is not an encouraging picture. I do not believe it is even a decent representation of the primary industries in this State.

Mr. Ryan: I think he is sour; that is the trouble. I don't think he has recovered.

Mr. McKee: He has a chip on his shoulder.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Obviously my remarks have penetrated, and I am rather pleased about that because I believe they have not realized until now what they have done to primary industries.

Mr. Ryan: You do not agree with the verdict of the people!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the honourable member for Port Magpie—I am sorry, Port Adelaide—ceases his early morning warbling we shall be able to get on much better. It is essential that development of this State take priority over any other considerations. I use the term “priority”. It has been suggested to me that whether we look at social welfare or whether we look at development is rather a matter of emphasis. I think it is much more than a matter of mere emphasis; I think it is a matter of urgent necessity and urgent priority. Possibly, as Sir Thomas Playford said when speaking earlier on this subject, the previous Government may have erred a little on the side of stretching development and not quite keeping up with social matters. If that is so, I accept the criticism, but I say, as the Premier has already said more than once in recent weeks, that South Australia has developed faster than any other Australian State economically, developmentally and financially. There can be only one reason for that: the administration of the previous Government. I accept the compliment.

Mr. Casey: I think the farmers have had a bit to do with this; you can't take the credit away from them.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Far be it from me, as a practical farmer and a previous Minister of Agriculture, to decry the part which I personally, the member for Frome, and the other farmers have played in the development of the State. The honourable member cannot pin that on my lapel. I have always given the farmers in this State full marks, for they are the best farmers in the Commonwealth, a fact that is acknowledged in any State. When it comes to a question of administration and a question of government, I say that the progress and development of this State and the credit for it rightly belongs to the Playford administration, and it can belong nowhere else.

I should like to say a word or two about the various matters that appeared in the Government's policy speech, because this is a most important document. To me, it is much more important than the Speech with which His Excellency opened Parliament, and I think there should be, in all decency, some relationship between the two. However, the relationship appears to me to be somewhat remote. First, I should like to say a word or two about the Harbors Board. I was pleased to see a reference to this, and I was also very pleased

to receive a report of the Public Works Committee on the Upper Port Reach Development Scheme. This is a project in which I have been most interested for several years. It has been somewhat slow to reach an advanced stage, necessarily slow because much preliminary work and testing of soils, and so on, had to be done before any real programme could be worked out for it. I was very pleased to read the following paragraph on page 4 of the report dealing with the history of the scheme:

It was Mr. Sidney Crawford, the Chairman of the South Australian Harbors Board who, many years ago, looked with distaste upon the waste lands and marsh between the Semaphore and the Grange, who foresaw the possibilities of the area, and who formed the ambition to “tidy it up” and transform the waste into useful space.

That is a well-deserved tribute to one of the grand men of South Australia. I have been associated with Mr. Sidney Crawford and the other members of the Harbors Board, Mr. Carl Meyer particularly, and more lately Mr. Colin Verco, who is now the Chairman, and I had a great deal to do with them in these matters. I pay a tribute to Mr. Crawford and Mr. Meyer, who have recently retired as Commissioners of the board. They have rendered signal service to the people of South Australia, and I believe that their retirement is a matter for some regret. There comes a time in life, of course, when the years pass by, but for the services they have rendered (Mr. Meyer as Chairman of the Harbors Board over a number of years and latterly as a Commissioner, and Mr. Crawford, for 28 years, I think, associated with the board as Commissioner and latterly as Chairman) they deserve the appreciation of the people of this State, and, as a former Minister of Marine with eight years' association with them, I pay my tribute to the services that they have rendered. I was rather interested to note that a project for the establishment of a new oil terminal at Port Pirie had been submitted by the Minister and by Cabinet to the Public Works Committee for investigation. I also noticed that another project, the building of a new Government office headquarters at Port Adelaide, was to be referred or had been referred to the committee for investigation.

Mr. Ryan: You will agree that the latter one was long overdue.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The project at Port Pirie is estimated to cost nearly £1,000,000; the estimate was £960,000 or thereabouts when I last saw it. The building at

Port Adelaide will cost £500,000 or more, although I am not quite sure of the figures on that. These two projects are being referred to the committee at the same time as the proposal for a deep-sea port at Giles Point is being deferred, and quite honestly I cannot fathom this. It only bears out what I have been saying all the way through, namely, that developmental projects appear to be taking second place to more domestic affairs. The project at Port Pirie was on my table almost a year ago, and I think the Minister, if he looks up the date, will—

Mr. Jennings: What about the one at Robe? That has been deferred.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That had never been on my table, and I never dealt with it. The honourable member need not attempt to sidetrack me, because I am not easily derailed. I am not criticizing the board for putting these projects forward. I think the board has a proper function to perform, and that is to press for the projects which it considers should be implemented. However, I do offer some kindly criticism to my friend the Minister of Marine, because I believe that at this stage it is quite wrong in policy to be deferring a project at Giles Point which was approved by the previous Government and for which I had instructed the Harbors Board to draw the plans and get on with the preparation. The Minister assured me yesterday that projects which had been approved by the previous Government would be carried out. I know he is going to tell me that he has not knocked the Giles Point project on the head.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You approved of the work before the committee's recommendation came in?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, but we did it afterwards. If the Minister has a look at that he will find that what I say is correct. I think the Public Works Committee approved of the Giles Point project on or about December 9. There was ample time for us to deal with this matter well before the election came around, and we did so. I know that the Minister will say also (and in all fairness I accept the comment) that the Giles Point project is not abandoned but merely deferred. However, I make the point that if the Minister is going ahead with the plan, why does he not get on and do it? For what reason has he deferred it? He has deferred it, I understand, because he wants to have an investigation made into the location, capacity and requirements of deep-sea ports around the South Australian coast. I presume that is the ambit of the

inquiry. But if, having made the survey, he then proposes to go ahead with Giles Point, what is he waiting for? Why does he not go ahead with it now? Thousands of acres of valuable land on lower Yorke Peninsula can come into production provided the cost of transport of the produce from that area is not unreasonably high. If farmers have to cart barley from Ponalowie Bay to Wallaroo or Ardrossan, then such development of the land is out of the question. I believe my colleague, the member for Yorke Peninsula, will agree with me. Recent scientific discoveries in the use of manganese will enable this land to be brought into production. The farmers there need somewhere to deliver their goods, and the proposition at Giles Point would largely solve their problems. They will still have to cart their produce 45 or 50 miles, but people on Yorke Peninsula are used to carting over long distances, and at least the scheme would be the best proposition they could possibly have. I do not wish to steal the thunder of the member for Yorke Peninsula, who made a good speech on this topic: I just want to put in perspective the action the Minister appears to be taking. I believe it is a wrong concept to propose spending £1,000,000 at Port Pirie when the Minister has deferred a £1,000,000 project at Giles Point.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: When was this report dated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I understand it was December 9.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The date I have here is April 1 this year.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister cannot get away with that. I know when the report was brought in and when the chairman informed my office that the committee was bringing in a favourable report. I know when that was: it was long before April 1. I am reminded by the honourable member for Yorke Peninsula that it was December 14.

There is another thing about Giles Point. It is a deep-sea port capable, under the present plan, of accommodating vessels up to the maximum draught we are likely to get here now, and with another 100ft. or so of extension it would run into another 8ft. or 10ft. of water, which would in any context be a genuine deep-sea port. We need these ports around the coastline. The depths of water at our ports are a real problem to the Minister of Marine. We have huge dredging programmes in hand at Port Adelaide and Thevenard. I am most concerned about the gypsum industry at Thevenard, which has been somewhat hampered

and will soon be more seriously affected by the lack of water in the channel between the north and south beacons. It is costly. Here is a decentralized industry in the Far West of the State being hamstrung by lack of funds for the deepening of the harbour—and we are considering building a new headquarters for the Harbors Board at Port Adelaide! It doesn't make sense. I offer it as a criticism that is hard to refute and I hope the Minister will look closely at these things before he finally commits himself to these other works.

Another port in which I am interested is Port Neill, in my own electoral district. This is a similar proposition in shape and type to that at Giles Point. It has good water and is at the outlet of a rapidly developing agricultural area. It is at the front door of the county of Jervois, which has had a remarkable increase in grain production in the last 10 years. The Port Neill project would greatly benefit all the farmers on eastern Eyre Peninsula. I do not know what will happen about it. Tests are being made of the swell characteristics of the water there to determine whether or not a breakwater is required; but I think we are wasting our time making those tests because, if the Minister places an embargo on the building of outports in South Australia, we may as well forget tests and knock the thing on the head straightaway. So many curious anomalies and differences arise between the policy speech that the then Leader of the Opposition made to the electors and the Governor's Speech that they arouse much concern.

For example, we were to have two big new hospitals in the metropolitan area. I understand now that the term "immediately" has been reduced to "sometime" and that instead of 500 beds at Tea Tree Gully it is now proposed to build the first wing of it one day. I do not know what the people in the district of the honourable member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) will be thinking about this change of outlook. They have been expecting the hospital foundations to be put down within months of the election. That is what they no doubt read into the declaration that the then Leader of the Opposition made in his speech. But I think they now know that this is impossible, both technically and financially. The Government has realized that a sudden increase of 1,300 public hospital beds in this State is entirely unwarranted. After all, the average ratio of population to hospital beds throughout the Commonwealth is about 178 people to each hospital bed, and the South Australian average

has been slightly below that. But at present we are rebuilding the Royal Adelaide Hospital and are adding to the capacity of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We have provided a large proportion of the money required to enlarge the Adelaide Children's Hospital and to rebuild the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital. We have a new hospital at Port Lincoln and another proposed for Port Augusta, which I hope comes to pass because the member for Stuart (Hon. L. G. Riches) has been looking for it for a long time, and it was promised. There is the big proposition at Whyalla, on a share basis. Then we have hospitals like St. Andrews on South Terrace, which has recently been opened and is large. When we look at these things, I fail to see, as Mr. Stewart Cockburn said in his feature article this morning, that we need another 1,300 hospital beds in South Australia at this stage. I come to the conclusion that the proposal for these two large hospitals was strategic and political. I cannot regard it in any other way. It is interesting that the two districts in which the Labor Party interested itself most in the election are each to have a big new hospital.

The university is going to Bedford Park and there is a need for a teaching hospital associated with it. It will be costly because teaching hospitals cost more than ordinary hospitals; that is understood. But I hope that the Government will husband its finances in these things and do first things first. To run seriously ahead of requirements in hospitals or anything else is extravagance.

Mr. Quirke: If they had one today they could not staff it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: We are hard pressed to staff our existing hospitals.

Mr. Hughes: You wouldn't build it overnight.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, and it would take some time to staff it, too. The honourable member for Wallaroo is lucky enough to have a Government hospital in his town but, if he lived in my district or that of the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) or of the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), he would know that hospitals are frequently running out of matrons, staff and sisters, and some are reaching the point where, because of lack of staff, accommodation and facilities, they are being down-graded as training institutions. This is a serious matter

Mr. Quirke: Some could close.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The point is that, the moment a country hospital becomes a hospital for only the first two years of a

girl's training or, as has happened, the first year of a girl's training, it cannot get the girls to come as probationer nurses; they are not interested. They come to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Memorial Hospital or somewhere else where they get a full course. This is a serious problem in country hospitals. People should not be drawn off to staff unnecessary accommodation in the metropolitan area at a time when country hospitals are seriously short of staff and cannot get it. Since taking office the Government has announced that it would not carry out its promises to exempt Eyre Peninsula from the road maintenance tax. The publication of the South Australian Road Transport Association Inc. dated April, 1965, stated in its President's report:

In commenting upon promises of the new State Government to exempt certain areas, the point was made that total abolition would undoubtedly make a very useful and valuable contribution to the further development of South Australia and the expansion of industry. No doubt this was written at the end of March as it was published early in April, and this was the fond hope held by the association at that time. I attended the annual dinner of the Eyre Peninsula branch of the association, as I always do, at Port Lincoln. I know from the discussions that this matter had occupied the meeting for most of the afternoon business session. Members were all agog with the idea that Eyre Peninsula would be exempted as this would provide them with a fulcrum on which to lever the Government into exempting the whole of the State. This was the association's policy and it hoped to be able to implement it. Members of this association now have the answer, and so do the people of Eyre Peninsula, and of Kangaroo Island. It was reported in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday before the election, I think, that the Premier made a firm promise in support of the Labor candidate (Mr. Rayson), at Kimba, that Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island would be exempted from the road tax. Now people know how much that promise was worth.

The Attorney-General, in his supercilious way, was pleased to comment on the legal opinion that the Crown Solicitor had provided for the previous Premier, as "gobbledegook". The Crown Solicitor said exactly what the legal position has now been discovered to be: that the Government cannot do this. Apparently the Attorney-General considers the opinion of the Crown Solicitor to be gobbledegook. I hope they are still friends. Last August the present

Minister of Education bravely accompanied me to a meeting at Port Lincoln at which we faced a barrage of 400 angry men. We received a bit of a doing as they went for us. The Minister, then the member for Whyalla, explained why the Opposition had supported the road maintenance tax in the House. I give full marks to the Minister as he supported the attitude which the Opposition had taken at the time, and he said (and I noted this with some interest) that if anomalies were created the Opposition would consider them. This was done and the member in the House at the first opportunity announced there were anomalies, that the Opposition had acted hastily in supporting this legislation, and that, after having a proper survey made of the position, the Labor Party would introduce a Bill to exempt Eyre Peninsula, which it did.

This was a political attempt to isolate the honourable member for Eyre and myself, if I did not misunderstand it. Having been faced with that challenge, I told the then Premier not to worry about me because I was with him all the way. I do not apologize for the action the then Government took, but time has proved that Labor's policy in this regard was legally impossible. It is a lesson that has not been lost on the people of Kangaroo Island, of Eyre Peninsula, or of the State generally. The publication of the South Australian Road Transport Association further stated:

Reference was made to the important variations in the control of the movement of goods brought about by the relaxation of the restrictive laws introduced mainly as a measure of relief following the imposition of road tax.

This refers to the amendment of the Road and Railway Transport Act made last year which relaxed somewhat the provision of the Transport Control Board and the licences that it had issued and allowed further freedom for people to use the roads. The publication further stated:

The "free area" surrounding Adelaide has been extended to a 25-mile radius. Further, it was provided that on expiry of current licences there will be complete liberty of movement of goods by road in South Australia. The report stated. "These important alterations to the law should ultimately react not only to the benefit of the road transport industry, but to the State as a whole."

Fond hopes! Instead of further relaxation what are we faced with? The co-ordination of all transport! I do not know what that means, and the Minister will not say, but no doubt we will hear in time.

Mr. Hall: Yesterday's statement was that we were getting increased rail fares.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know whether the Minister meant that freight charges would increase. He said that freight would be increased. Giving him the benefit of the doubt and reading his policy speech, I think he meant the volume of freight would be increased. I hope he meant that.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Minister of Works looks doubtful.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You make me look doubtful.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know. In his policy speech the Premier said definitely that transport would be co-ordinated and that instructions would be issued to the responsible Minister to bring this about without an increase in rail freight costs or passenger fares. I am wondering whether my interpretation of what he said yesterday is correct. I hope it is. In the light of the Government's backward somersault on road maintenance tax I wonder whether we will get the same somersault with railway freight charges and passenger fares. I do not know, but I hope not. Instead of these people getting what they hoped to get, they are now saddled with control of their industry down to the very last point. I say as a firm policy statement of the Liberal and Country League Opposition Party that, when we are returned to office, we will abolish all restrictions on the movement of goods by road in South Australia. Let there be no doubt that that is what we intended to do, and what we will do. I suggest that every restriction the new Minister of Transport imposes on road transport hereafter will be a nail in the coffin of the Labor Government in all districts of South Australia.

We have reached the stage when the Government finds that promises will no longer suffice. It has to perform, and this is seriously different. I do not want to be unduly critical of the Government or to disturb friendships. I do not think I will do that, but one must speak plainly on these matters in this place. I know that there is a heavy load on Ministers, as anyone who has been in Cabinet for a few years realizes. I also know that sittings of the House become onerous. Not everybody can work with such concentration on the front bench in the noise and fury as can the Minister of Education, and another of the difficulties is that while a Minister is here, his office work is not being done. My successor in office does not have the Aborigines Department to worry about, but I know that he has a full-time job without that. We found in a check in my office that I handled 16,000 dockets each year.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The number is not becoming smaller!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I would not think it was. The Minister agrees that there is a heavy load. In addition to attending to Executive Council and Cabinet work, interviewing and handling telephone calls, a Minister welcomes the opportunity of familiarizing himself with the ramifications of projects under his control. Lost causes are being revived with the advent of a new Administration and I notice that not all the lost causes are coming from this side of the House! Some of the Minister's own colleagues are presenting a few to him.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There are a few more that they are not stating publicly!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That remark is significant when one realizes the pressures on Labor Ministers from behind them. On performance alone will the Government be judged. I believe it is realizing that it is far easier to make promises than to honour them in practice. We have had a spate of them before, during, and since the election. I brought along a folder of press cuttings, and my colleague, the honourable member for Alexandra, also has a thick book of them. The Attorney-General has been making two or three announcements a day as to 'what he is going to do, and has been most prolific and extravagant in that regard. I do not know how he is going to do all these things. At any rate, he has promised to do everything from demolishing all the inner suburbs to building houses for aborigines at Mount Davies. It is interesting to see all these things and I wonder whether my friend, the Minister of Works, reads the announcements of his colleague, the Minister of Social Services, with some trepidation and an icy grip around his heart, because he must wonder where the money is coming from for this work as well as for projects such as new sewerage schemes and harbour work.

That leads me back to the point that this approach in His Excellency's Speech is domestic and not developmental. When the Attorney-General was sitting on this side of the House, he said that every matter he brought up was Labor policy. It did not matter what he said or what criticism he offered—it was Labor policy. This kind of thing, however, will no longer satisfy the electors of South Australia. No longer will they be interested in that.

The *Herald* of May 1 dealt with the Governor's Speech and spoke of a fresh breeze that was blowing across South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: A cold breeze!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have an idea that in the rural past of the State it is a cold easterly breeze that heralds drought. People who expected that the "promised land" would arrive now wonder when they will receive free school books, when hospitals will be built at Tea Tree Gully and Bedford Park, when equal pay will be introduced throughout the State, when superannuation adjustments that were such a bold bid in the election campaign will be made and when we are going to have one vote one value in practice and not talk about it.

Mr. Ryan: Will you oppose it when it is introduced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will, and so will the honourable member. He will not bring it in. We need not worry about that. One vote one value will not be brought in, but the Government will try to re-arrange the electoral boundaries, to the detriment of the primary producer. The primary producer will protest until he is blue in the face, but he will have no voice in the House, and so his voice will not be heard.

I wonder what will be the position with town planning when the Attorney-General is finished with it! An advertisement appeared on page 2 of the *Advertiser* a couple of days before the election about the Government's promise on grape prices. I wonder what the grapegrowers are thinking now. The honourable member for Angas referred to this in a question yesterday. The advertisement was about 5in. across and 9in. long and appeared right beneath the leading article, in the most expensive spot in the paper. On the top was a caricature of Sir Thomas Playford.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was a very good one.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The Leader enjoys being caricatured; he is used to it. It was a very good one and I am rather surprised that the Labor Party saw fit to give the Leader so much space in its very costly advertisement, but it did. In big, black print it said "Grapegrowers Beware". The advertisement stated:

The Prices Commissioner has fixed recommended wine grape prices for this year's vintage and this decision must not be interfered with by the Premier if Playford is still Premier on Monday when he meets the Wine and Brandy Producers Association. He could deal a death blow to growers. Safeguard the livelihood of growers by voting Australian Labor Party.

I wonder what the grapegrowers think of that advertisement now. The Premier yesterday denied any knowledge of this and said that

it may have appeared but that he knew nothing about it.

Mr. Quirke: Grapegrowers are being led to the end of the garden, I think.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not think the Premier can escape justifiable criticism as easily as this. This advertisement, inserted at a well-chosen time, was calculated to lead the grapegrowers to believe that, come what might, they would get the Prices Commissioner's prices for all their grapes. I do not believe the advertisement was intended to convey anything other than that.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That's what it did convey.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and what effect that had on the election results in Chaffey or Barossa nobody can calculate. It was the most unfortunate thing that happened in the election campaign.

Mr. Jennings: I'll say it was!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I use the word "unfortunate" advisedly, for I do not wish to use the word "dirty". On June 7 a feature writer in the *Advertiser* commented on the Labor Government in the United Kingdom. I think a strange relationship exists between the picture as we see it in the United Kingdom and that as we see it developing in this State. The writer had this to say:

Mr. Wilson and his Labor Government are floundering. The rot set in about Budget time in early April—

We have not had our Budget yet, but we are hoping for the best—

Since then nothing has gone right for the Government. The Government itself has done scarcely anything right. Mr. Wilson has lost his grip. The Government has plunged into a succession of retreats and about-turns . . . Mr. Wilson's forays to Washington, Paris, Bonn, Rome and Vienna have done little to create the international statesman image he sought. At home his political astuteness and smart retorts in Parliament have lost their glamour. Real leadership is seen to be lacking. As for the electorate, disillusionment has become widespread.

The *Economist*, the left-wing paper which is obviously a supporter of the Labor Administration in the U.K. had this to say:

Part of Labor's difficulty has come from half-baked ideas in Opposition which could not be checked against reality until it was too late.

I think any administrator might well ponder those words. It is not the way in which we pick up the broom and sweep clean in any new position; what counts most is that an Administration wears well. Any politician knows that. Nor is it the flush of success that carries a

politician into office as a member of Parliament that matters; what counts is whether his electors get to like him as they know him longer, whether that member can establish a reputation for genuine service to the people he represents, or whether they merely regard him as someone who wanted their votes at election time and who does nothing in the interim. The people of this State will exercise that judgment on the Government. I believe that broken promises and reserved decisions are anathema to the Government. If it thinks people have short memories and will forget these things, I suggest they will not be allowed to forget them. The list, already becoming substantial, will be kept before the electors, and in time they will be reminded of the Government's actions.

I have spoken, I hope, more in kindness than in anger, and the criticisms I have offered, I believe, are in the interests of the people of this State. I say again that what matters is the development of the State—not who carries it out or who gets the honour and glory for it, but the fact that we get on with the job. It is far more important to give further opportunities, to create an economic climate in which people should seek to advance and develop, and to put into their hands their tools of trade, for these things are far more important than anything handed to them on a plate. If no unemployment exists and if it is a good healthy community, one can best serve the people by providing them with opportunities to work for themselves. I hope the Government will heed this point, and that the Minister of Works will not be hampered unduly through lack of funds or by an unnecessary and unwise diversion of funds into other channels from carrying out those essential projects which are so important to this State. I support the motion.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I have much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened this, the 38th Parliament. I, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, who said he believed it was the Governor's worst, believe it was the best Speech during his sojourn here as the direct representative of Her Gracious Majesty the Queen. In fact, I believe, and I think every honourable member on the Government side agrees, that it is the best and most memorable speech delivered for the last 32 years, because it contains the matters which the Labor Party in this State considers and has believed for a long time should be on the Statute Book of

this State, and which, along with many other matters of policy that have been enunciated at election after election and endorsed by the people, will during the term of this Government be given effect to. Here I point out to honourable members opposite that this Party has been Government for only three months: yet they expect the full impact of the policy outlined by the Premier to be put into effect. We have three years in which to carry out this policy, and I doubt whether too much of it will have been neglected by the end of that time.

Since the election of March 6 we have had our numbers increased by the welcome addition of the honourable member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) who, I think we all agree, delivered a most memorable maiden speech in this House a few weeks ago. Indeed, I congratulate her on her effort and I hope that many of the views she expressed will be given effect to during her stay here. I hope her term here will be a long and memorable one. Another addition to the Government was the honourable member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) whose maiden speech was also memorable, and, I am sure, only the first of many that we shall hear from him. I take this opportunity also to wish him a long, happy, and enjoyable stay in this House.

I am not forgetting the new member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) who, as a young man, has entered this House as the successor to the gentleman who was the oldest member on the Labor side, Mr. Fred Walsh. Mr. Walsh rendered great service to the Labor Party and to the trade union movement over the years. I hope that the new member for West Torrens will spend as long in this House as did his predecessor and even longer. I congratulate him on his maiden speech. I also wish to congratulate the honourable member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) on his maiden speech. Although a member of this House during the last Parliament he made his maiden speech this session. I believe that his was one of the longest and probably one of the most entertaining and constructive speeches made by a new member. He was not frightened to answer interjections, although this is usually not done by a member making his maiden speech, and he handled them expertly. The member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) made his maiden speech yesterday and I take this opportunity of wishing him well in the future. I congratulate him on his speech because he dealt with the problems of the South-East capably and efficiently and he understands these problems well.

I thank most sincerely the electors of Mount Gambier for the confidence they displayed in me on March 6. I also wish to thank all those who worked ably for the cause, which was so successful. In return for the confidence displayed in me I assure the people of Mount Gambier that I will, on all occasions, devote my efforts to the best of my ability on their behalf. I congratulate the Premier and all members of his Cabinet on their selection and elevation as Ministers of the Crown. I am confident that we can expect, and that the people can be assured, that they will carry out their duties and high responsibilities of office in an efficient and capable manner for the continued growth and prosperity of South Australia. Every effort will be made by the Government to see that no stone is left unturned to enable the progress of South Australia to continue most efficiently.

I wish to refer briefly (and I shall not debate his remarks) to the speech made by the previous speaker, the honourable member for Flinders. I was surprised to hear his long list of complaints about the Government because I believe that most of them were an indictment of his own Party. In the last 25 years a great many things have been done in South Australia, but a great many more things have not been done, and it has fallen to the lot of this Government to correct that position. If we are given a period of three years (and not just three months) I think we will be able to show the people of South Australia at the end of that time that we have done the job they entrusted us to do. In His Excellency's Speech reference was made to the passing of two members of the previous Parliament. I refer to the late Hon. Ken Bardolph and Mr. Harold Tapping. Reference was also made to the passing of former members, Messrs. Homburg, McAlees and James Corcoran. I extend to their relatives my sincere sympathy in their sad loss.

As a result of the election of March 6 the Labor Party obtained a mandate from the people of South Australia to form a Government. By their vote the people made it clear that they renewed the mandate given to the Labor Party in the 1962 election. I do not need to repeat what has happened during the last three years. In accordance with the renewed mandate, the Labor Government was formed and it was sworn into office on March 10, 1965. No-one will deny that since taking office the Premier and his Ministers have devoted themselves with much energy and attention to the problems confronting the State.

With the creation of the Ministerial office of Premier and of a Premier's Department I look forward to seeing the new department meeting with success in encouraging and fostering new industries in South Australia and in the extension of existing industries and, in particular, in the decentralizing of industry.

On many occasions over the years we have heard much of the decentralizing of industry. Does this mean that the beginning and end of this matter is that, provided we move outside the boundaries of the metropolitan area, we have accomplished the object of decentralizing industry? I am a firm believer in the growth of industry, as it is the only means of ensuring employment for our rising population. No-one will deny that what this country wants urgently is people. But why do we concentrate this growth of population in an area or, should I say, a narrow strip of country between Port Noarlunga in the south and Gawler in the north? We know that industries like to be established close to potential sources of labour, and this is an understandable approach. What I desire to see eventually happen (and I make no apologies for my views) is that out of the new Premier's Department, in the years ahead, will come concrete plans for the establishment of industry in selected country areas and for the further development of provincial centres. I look forward to this becoming a reality in South Australia possibly in the foreseeable future, and I hope that Mount Gambier will be one of the selected centres. We must, in the interests of further development and the expansion of industry, establish industrial centres in selected country areas, and I believe that the State must assist in the adequate provision of transport, water, electricity, houses and people in these areas to really give meaning to decentralization.

There are ways other than industry to assist in decentralization. I strongly suggest that branches of the Motor Vehicles Department be established at Mount Gambier and at other selected centres in South Australia. I also suggest that other Government instrumentalities, such as a construction branch or workshop of the Public Buildings Department, be established in Mount Gambier. In this connection I had the information from the Minister in the House yesterday that it was intended to establish workshops of the Public Buildings Department in certain country areas. I believe, on the assurance of the Minister, that this will become an established fact within the next couple of years.

I listened with interest to the reference in the Governor's Speech that the Government would continue to encourage migration and do everything in its power to assist the tourist industry. These two matters vitally concern my district. I make an earnest appeal to the Government that every effort be made on behalf of industry in the Mount Gambier district to encourage about 20 selected migrant families to settle there each year to relieve the acute labour shortage in local industry. The timber industry, a vital and growing industry in the South-East, is continually short of labour. There is also a shortage of female labour in the textile industry.

The tourist industry in Mount Gambier and surrounding districts is something that the Corporation of Mount Gambier and various local organizations have been keenly interested in fostering, and if any member of this House has not had the pleasure of seeing the lakes, particularly our famous Blue Lake, and the district generally I ask that he please accept this as an open invitation to make a visit. The tourist industry ranks high as an income earner, and on behalf of the citizens, the corporation and local organizations, which are recognizing the tourist potential of the area and have set out to develop its resources to the full, I request that their efforts be rewarded with suitable and adequate Government subsidies. As Mount Gambier is one of the main gateways to this State, the development of its natural attractions will do much to impress the visitor as he enters the State.

The creation of the Ministry of Housing to co-ordinate the building resources of the State is a most important development in a rapidly developing State, and this is another matter in which I am keenly interested. I have previously mentioned the desirability of bringing 20 migrant families to Mount Gambier annually; therefore, housing is a vital matter. Accommodation should be available for these people when they arrive. I greatly appreciate the work of the Housing Trust and its officers, so I do not want my remarks misunderstood in any way. I congratulate the trust on the large number of houses already built in Mount Gambier—701 for rental and 619 for sale. I pay a tribute to its officers for their courtesy at all times. However, I request that, in addition to providing 20 houses for migrant families each year, the normal waiting period for trust houses be reduced. I do not think the waiting period for a person seeking a house in the country should be any longer than

three months, whereas in my area it is now nine or 10 months. Because of this long waiting period, men who have accepted work at Mount Gambier have had to return to their families because they have been unable to secure suitable accommodation. As a result, many potentially good employees have been lost to local industry. I hope this can be overcome soon by the erection of additional single-unit houses in Mount Gambier.

In his opening Speech the Governor referred to the Minister of Transport and said that one of his principal tasks would be to devise a system of co-ordination among the various available forms of transport operating in this State. I believe it is essential to ensure that the greatest economic use is made of the huge capital outlay on our railways and that every step should be taken to ensure that our railways and co-ordinated services, through modern systems, give the best possible service to the people who now use them. It is also essential to ensure that through these improved services many more people will be attracted to public transport, thus giving greater benefit to the State. From a reply given recently to the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) I am encouraged to think that improvements will eventually be made to the passenger side of the railways, particularly to the service between Adelaide and Mount Gambier, by the provision of air conditioned carriages. I strongly suggest to the railways authorities that public relations would be greatly improved if travellers were provided with more modern facilities for showering, washing and changing, etc., at the Adelaide station.

School enrolments continue to increase at a rapid rate, particularly in the Mount Gambier area. Possibly the position in my district is no different from that elsewhere in the State, but the enrolment at the East Gambier Primary and Infants School now exceeds 1,000, and I should like the Education Department to give early consideration to building another primary school to relieve the pressure there. A new school would help to relieve the increasing pressure on the primary school at North Gambier as well. The enrolment at the Mount Gambier Technical High School has now reached 570, which exceeds the 550 for which the school was originally built. Therefore, early planning for an additional technical high school appears to be a necessity; otherwise, the present school will become an area of prefabricated buildings. I draw the attention of the Minister of Education and his

department to the need for teaching agricultural science at the technical high school and for purchasing land that I believe is available for this purpose. Alternatively, I suggest that farm mechanics be included in the school curriculum, as many students attending the school come from farming areas. On several occasions since I entered this House two years ago I have made approaches to the Education Department to build a new high school in Mount Gambier on a new site already purchased by the department. This is becoming more urgent every year. The present school was built 50 years ago for 120 students. Enrolments are now nearly 800, and students are accommodated only because prefabricated classrooms have been erected and alterations have been made. On a recent inspection of the school I found it was possible to put only one more prefabricated building on the area. Before the end of the year I believe that the area will be covered by prefabricated buildings. I appeal to the department and the Minister for urgent action to erect the new high school as soon as possible.

The situation of the Mount Gambier Adult Education Centre will be improved in a few months when the infants school is transferred to a new site adjacent to the Mount Gambier primary school. When this happens, I hope the way will be clear for all necessary buildings to be constructed within the grounds of the centre, thus enabling all activities connected with adult education to be carried out at the same locality and eliminating the necessity to use other buildings outside the centre, as at present. The removal of the present infant school will make available a valuable area of land for modern buildings facing Helen Street.

I congratulate the Education Department on the building of an occupation centre for handicapped children in Mount Gambier. This centre commenced recently under the guidance of the headmistress, Mrs. Sims, and it is making good progress. However, I should like to see certain necessary work carried out there as rapidly as possible. I know the Public Buildings Department is at present calling tenders to improve the centre by erecting urgently needed fencing and carrying out paving work, etc., which will not only assist in containing the children but will greatly improve the appearance of the centre. The enthusiastic committee of the school is doing very fine work under the presidency of Mrs. Vivianne Hutcheson in

providing amenities for this school, and those people are to be congratulated on their valuable work in the interests of these children.

I now wish to refer to the provision of centres outside the metropolitan area for the training of teachers. I understand that in New South Wales various centres have been established for this purpose, and in most instances (with the exception of Wollongong on the South Coast) all the teaching colleges there have commenced in old school buildings, including high schools. I believe that possibly the day will come when the high school at Mount Gambier (which will be abandoned following the building of a new high school, which we hope will take place shortly) can be used for this purpose. I believe this will have much to commend it in decentralizing education and also giving a little more impetus to a country centre.

Another matter contained in His Excellency's Speech concerned the building of a new Government office block in Mount Gambier. I assure the Government that this is an urgent matter, because our public servants, who carry out most important work on behalf of all sections of the community, are now working under most difficult conditions. In addition to this, I again draw the attention of the Government to the necessity of providing a new building for police court work in Mount Gambier. It is hoped that when the Government erects this new building, provision will be made for two court rooms. This is necessary because with the expansion of the district the increased work of the Supreme Court often clashes with the work of the magistrates and justices. I realize that the Ministers of our new Government have not seen these buildings which house certain departmental officers, but I hope some of them will soon be able to visit the district and carry out inspections which will acquaint them with the true position.

When making my maiden speech in this House some two years ago I referred to the equalization of domestic electricity charges throughout the State. Another problem that I also mentioned then concerned the inequality of water charges between my district and certain metropolitan areas. We now have equal domestic electricity charges throughout the State through the operations of the State Electricity Trust. I again draw the attention of the House and particularly the attention of the Minister of Works, under whose jurisdiction the Engineering and Water Supply Department operates, to the many requests I have made in this House since my maiden

speech on behalf of my constituents in Mount Gambier regarding the rates that apply there, namely, 9½ per cent as against the metropolitan rate of 7½ per cent. I represent a country district, and as a member of Parliament in South Australia I will never be satisfied until there is no discrimination between city and country interests. Following the recent reply to a question I asked, I hope that in some way or another this state of affairs will be rectified in the foreseeable future.

The importance of the timber industry to Australia is something that is not always understood. I am afraid that many Australian people do not fully appreciate the necessity for Australia to become more forest-minded and conscious of the need to greatly increase forest plantings. Many eminent foresters have for some time been advocating greatly increased forest planting. In discussions with some of these gentlemen it has been made very clear that the urgency regarding Australia's forests is such that we should double our forest areas by about the year 2,000. It will be seen that Australia has a big problem on its hands when it is realized that under 1 per cent of Australia is represented by commercial forest land. Many eminent foresters today are advocating softwood plantings, particularly radiata pine, in much greater acreage than in the past because of the rapid depletion of the Australian hardwood forests and the time required to rehabilitate those forests, and particularly because of the length of time for hardwood forests to mature compared with the softwood species, which require about 40 years. This is only about one-third of the time required for our native hardwood species.

Therefore, it is becoming clear that, as Australia is spending about £80,000,000 a year on imports of timber, something must be done, as it is hoped that our population will continue to grow at a comparatively fast rate. As a consequence, the demand for timber will increase. Then it becomes clear that the planting of softwoods is the answer, because that is the timber that can supply almost all our timber requirements. The principal building materials produced from radiata pine in South Australia illustrate this point and the growth of the forest industry in South Australia. In all grades of flooring, 21,000,000 super feet are produced annually; 2,000,000 super feet of weatherboards; 1,000,000 super feet of scantlings (and I believe this will increase as our forests reach maturity); lining boards, 1,500,000 super feet; sawn boards, 9,000,000 super feet; and mouldings, 9,000,000 super

feet, giving a total production of 43,500,000 super feet per annum. Of this amount, about 20,000,000 super feet is used in South Australia, about 23,000,000 super feet is going to Victoria, a small quantity is going to New South Wales, and a little is finding its way into southern Queensland in cases. In addition, radiata pine is ideal for all forms of pulping purposes, and this is assuming greater significance every week.

Radiata pine, which is a native of California, has established itself in a remarkable manner in our 25in. and 30in. rainfall areas. It is believed that radiata pine can be used satisfactorily for 95 per cent of timber usages in Australia. This has been made possible by the introduction of modern methods of preservation that have given to softwood a durability that will, in certain circumstances, exceed the natural durability of our main hardwoods. One important question that now arises is from where are the additional lands for planting purposes to come. This concerns South Australia particularly, a State that has no natural forests but which is wholly dependent on plantation trees. The State has about 150,000 acres in softwood, but 125,000 acres are in the South-East in the high rainfall area, about the only area that is suitable for large scale plantings.

The question of obtaining suitable land to carry out extensive plantings by the Woods and Forests Department could be a problem after the mid 1970's. Some suitable land adjacent to the present pine forests is being held for grazing purposes. Is the Government to purchase this land at high prices, or are we to evolve a scheme whereby private landholders, with suitable land for softwood plantings, are encouraged—through co-operation with the department—to become forest farmers? I understand that many farmers are keenly interested in growing softwoods as a crop, but one of the main problems to be overcome is the question of taxation. However, I believe that, as the problem of afforestation is both a State and Commonwealth matter, it should be possible, through discussions with State and Commonwealth authorities, to arrive at a satisfactory solution. I have previously mentioned tree farming, and as succession duties and taxation are a major problem in carrying out this plan, I urge that the Minister of Forests seriously consider approaching the Commonwealth Government to find a solution to the problem in the interests of afforestation which is so important to the South-East.

The South-East of this State employs many people in the timber industry, and I understand that about 80,000 persons are employed in forestry services throughout Australia. It is obvious that employment in this industry in the South-East is important to many people. About 95 per cent of Australia's needs come from softwood plantings that have been assisted by the preservation methods. The uses of the timber are unlimited: it can be used in all forms of paper and building materials. The Postmaster-General's Department is at present using hundreds of thousands of telegraph poles that have been treated with a preservative that has shown good results in Victorian forest areas where creosoted poles have withstood the ravages of fire much better than have natural posts. South Australia's share of this industry is a small one compared with the Eastern States. The total annual production from the Australian forestry industry is about £230,000,000, and the sum invested in sawmilling equipment throughout Australia is about £100,000,000. Recently certain remarks were made in another place about a price ring by the Woods and Forests Department for fruit cases. I am not going to debate this matter, but I refer to the part played by this department in converting to a valuable commodity for the fruit industry the small diameter timber in our State forests. This timber is not used for building purposes.

For about 30 years this department has rendered a valuable service to the Australian case trade, but possibly in the future much of this timber will be diverted to pulping plants, and pulp products will probably replace many of our known case uses. I do not think that anyone can prove that excessive profits have been made by the Woods and Forests Department and private sawmillers in the past in converting this small timber to cases. The removal of this small timber is a necessary silvicultural operation for the further growth of our valuable pine forests. More than 20 years ago I approached the then Conservator of Forests on behalf of employees of the Woods and Forests Department asking that the employees be allowed to purchase their houses in certain forest settlements. At that time these people considered that they should have the right to do this, but the request was refused by the Government. I do not know how many employees would have taken this opportunity if given it. However, my attention has been drawn recently to the fact that in Mount Gambier approaches were made to the Playford Government for employees of this department

to be able to purchase their houses, houses that are the property of the department but which the employees now rent. I understand the Government refused the request. I urge the present Government to consider this plan whereby employees who desire to do so will be able to purchase their house, whether in Mount Gambier or elsewhere. The people who have approached me have given many years of valuable service to the department and will continue to do so, and no doubt if this request were granted they would continue in the employment of the department until they retired. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I, too, am pleased to support the adoption of the Address in Reply. First, I join with other honourable members in expressing appreciation of the work done in South Australia by His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan. They have made many visits to the district of Light during their term of office and these have been much appreciated. With other honourable members, I offer sympathy to the families of deceased former members of this Parliament. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to office and congratulate the member for Adelaide on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. I also congratulate the new Ministry and I know that we all wish them well in their honest endeavours for the betterment and welfare of the people of South Australia. I offer a cordial welcome to the new members.

I turn now to some matters in His Excellency's Speech that affect the people of my district in particular. I am pleased to know that the Government intends to press on with the policy of the previous administration of erecting houses for purchase on £50 deposit and I hope that the special needs of country towns will not be overlooked in this programme. One town in my district that I have in mind is Kapunda, which has been enjoying a steady commercial growth in recent years and where there is a real need for housing. There is no doubt that low deposit housing brings house ownership within the reach of almost everybody and thereby develops a more stable community.

His Excellency referred to the work of the Minister of Transport and stated that one of the principal tasks of the Minister would be to devise a system of co-ordination among the various available forms of transport, both passenger and freight. It is this system of co-ordination that is of special interest to me and it has special significance for the people

living in my electorate. Remarks made by the Minister of Transport in the Address in Reply debate indicate clearly the trend of the co-ordination proposals and I should like to quote from his speech in another place on May 18. He said:

Investigations made since the Government assumed office clearly show that the previous Government in the amendments it made to the Road and Railway Transport Act in 1964 . . .

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in order in quoting from *Hansard* a speech made in another place.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, the speech is a fairly clear exposition of the Government's policies in relation to the freedom of the roads for commercial road users that was enjoyed under the previous administration. This ties in with the lack of reference in His Excellency's Speech to the new Government's policies on roads. I think I can give an example of the way this new policy seems to be working in practice in my electorate. The north of the river road through Morgan linking the Murray Valley with the western part of the State and Western Australia has been sealed in progressive stages over the last few years. When one reflects on the great industrial development taking place around the top of Spencer Gulf, it is easy to understand the increase in road traffic using this important road link. Only a few miles between the common boundary of the Saddleworth and Eudunda district councils and the town of Auburn remain to be sealed to provide a sealed road between Sydney and Minnipa on Eyre Peninsula and my colleague the member for Eyre tells me that the sealing has extended to about 30 miles beyond Minnipa. On May 27 I asked the Minister of Education who represents the Minister of Roads in another place, about the Government's programme for sealing this section of the road. During the recess I received a letter, which reads:

The only length unsealed on this road is the 5½ miles between Marrabel and the boundary of the District Council of Eudunda. Earthworks will continue during 1965-1966 but it is not expected that the sealing will be completed until 1967-1968.

Mr. Quirke: Don't forget the Saddleworth-Auburn section.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Burra reminds me that the road between Saddleworth and Auburn is not sealed, either. More than 12 miles of this main road has yet to be sealed. When this is done, there will be a complete sealed road between Minnipa and Sydney. If we assume the Minister's informa-

tion to be correct, it may be at least three years before this work is done. If it is the policy of the Government to reduce expenditure on road building in an attempt to force traffic to use the railways system, this will have extensive repercussions in country districts.

I am not happy with the Government's restrictive approach to road transport and I do not think it is an approach that will encourage people to use the railway services. But I do agree that it is desirable to encourage people to use public transport and I was very pleased to see in His Excellency's Speech that improvements to existing railway services will be made and more rolling stock provided. This is a positive approach and I hope that it will benefit my district, especially in relation to passenger services on the Eudunda-Kapunda-Adelaide run. The daily passenger rail service by the very old type 75 car leaves Eudunda at 6.23 a.m. and arrives at Adelaide at 8.35 a.m. It leaves Adelaide station at 5.21 p.m. for the return journey. True, there is also a daily Bluebird service between Adelaide and Eudunda but it travels to Eudunda each morning, leaving about 7.45 a.m. and leaving on the return to Adelaide at about noon. On March 31 the Minister of Railways was good enough to receive a deputation from the Kapunda, Eudunda and Freeling district councils, introduced by me, when the difficulties of the service were explained to him. The purpose of the deputation was to point out that the present Bluebird service was receiving little patronage because it was running in the reverse direction to public requirements and a request was made that the Bluebird car replace the old type 75 car. Incidentally, this Bluebird car formerly ran to Morgan daily as part of the co-ordinated road-rail service to River Murray towns, but from reports I have received from constituents at Cadell and Morgan, I understand they are well satisfied with the road bus services they now receive. The Minister indicated to me subsequently that he well understood the desire of the people living in the area served by the Eudunda-Kapunda railway to have a good daily rail service to Adelaide, but could not at present replace the old type 75 car with the Bluebird. However, his long-range plan is to provide a new type of car for country runs similar to the type 400 now operating on suburban runs, but with provision for toilet and luggage accommodation to make them suitable for country use. I am informed that the Chief Mechanical Engineer has not decided

on the final design, but the horsepower of these new cars will be the same as that of the Bluebird and the seating accommodation will be slightly less. However, the feature of these cars that I consider to be a serious fault is the lack of air conditioning. I suggest that the provision of a new type of car without this amenity, especially after passengers have had a little experience of luxurious Bluebird travel, will not be well received. Air conditioning nowadays is relatively inexpensive and I hope the Chief Mechanical Engineer will review his design, so that these new cars will not be obsolete as soon as they are built. The Eudunda-Kapunda passengers complain about the old cars being cold and draughty, and although these new cars should be fast and the seating comfortable, increased public acceptance of rail travel will not be realized if air-conditioning is not provided. I frequently use the Bluebird service between Hamley Bridge and Adelaide, and I know how excellent these cars are. I might add that the deputation that waited on the Minister was not unmindful of the development of Freeling and Kapunda as residential towns for commuters by providing a fast rail service to the city. I hope the building of these cars will be speeded up, and if it is not possible to provide air-conditioning for comfort all the year round at a reasonable figure, then certainly an effective heating system should be installed for winter travelling. I was interested in the section of His Excellency's Speech relating to primary production—

Mr. Nankivell: Where was it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It reads:

My Government will pursue policies designed to make full use of the productive potential of the State in agriculture, mining, land settlement, forestry and other fields.

These are the principal references in the Speech relating to primary industry, and as my colleague, the member for Albert, pointed out earlier in the debate, this represents on the 1963 figures a production to the value of £140,000,000, compared with the State's secondary production of £189,000,000. It is disappointing that the rural portfolios are all held by one Minister and not shared by two, as was the case in the previous administration, but I accept the Premier's assurance that this is only a temporary state of affairs. I note that in the field of primary industry it is intended to provide research facilities and to conduct investigations, and in this context one field in which I hope the Minister will take special interest is the work being undertaken in South Australia by farm management

clubs. In this State about 18 clubs exist, 10 of which are functioning, and the others are in various stages of development. In Western Australia there are between 50 and 60 of these clubs and between 15 and 20 in New South Wales. That means a total of about 100 clubs throughout Australia. These clubs have progressed beyond the "curiosity stage". They have started to play a significant role in the study of farm economics. A club exists in my district—beyond it in fact, and takes in a group of 45 farmers in an area extending from Reeves Plains to Mintaro.

The ideal situation would be for each farm to be situated in a similar locality, conducting the same sort of farm enterprise. In the instance of this particular farm club, about 21 variations are involved. The farm management club adviser is a salaried officer employed on a full-time basis to make a physical and economic survey of each of the 45 farms. By careful comparison of the methods of farming and of the financial returns from each farm the adviser is in a position to give each farmer management advice. It is necessary for the officer to be well qualified, and this necessitates paying him a professional salary. With only a small number of farm businesses able to be adequately analysed, the annual cost to every farm club member is substantial. The Department of Agriculture's extension services, good as they are, have barely touched the fringe of the management aspect of rural enterprise, and I hope the Minister will take a special interest in this field of research.

I am very pleased that the Mines Department has carried out research into the old copper mine areas at Kapunda. These mines made an important contribution to the early development of South Australia. Indeed, they were important in fostering the early colony. Copper was discovered there in 1842, and between the years 1844 and 1877 more than 13,500 tons of copper were produced, with a value in excess of £1,000,000. Mining in those days at Kapunda was purely exploitation, and no systematic exploratory work was undertaken. It seems that an excessive influx of water into the mines in 1877 caused them to be abandoned. There is some evidence, too, that world prices for copper metal slumped at that time.

Modern methods of coping with underground water and modern mining techniques indicate that if copper is present in commercial quantities in the area (and there is reasonable probability that it is) then perhaps the mines can once again make a contribution to the State's

economy. A private organization is at present drilling at a site close to the town, and I understand that an extensive survey is to be made over the entire area mined in the early days. It is of interest to note that Australia has been forced to become a substantial importer of copper. A reply to a question raised in the Senate on April 27 indicated that Australian imports of copper and copper alloys amounted to nearly £4,500,000 for the six months ended December, 1964.

His Excellency's Speech refers to the continuing demand for electricity and forecasts that this may make it necessary to accelerate the plant installation programme at Torrens Island. I suggest that the operative word is 'will' and not 'may'. I am naturally pleased that the electricity reticulation programme in my district is nearly completed. The Robertstown S.W.E.R. extension gave a service to about 59 consumers at a cost of £21,000 and the Sutherlands scheme 86 consumers at a cost of more than £30,000. Virtually the whole of my district is now served with electricity, except for a group of farmers in fringe areas. I hope the Government will make it financially possible for these farmers to have this important amenity.

The completion of this work would have given great joy to the late George Hambour who worked tirelessly towards this goal of giving rural dwellers electricity. So keen was he that he became known in the district not as the member for Light but as the "Member for Electric Light". The work in the field of rural electricity in this State is brought home very forcibly when one travels interstate and discovers that farms connected to the electricity grid are very much the exception than the rule, and it stands to the credit of the Playford administration that it recognized the needs of rural people and met those needs.

I support the motion, and I hope this continuing dry spell will not financially embarrass the Government too much.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): On rising to support the adoption of the Address in Reply, first I must say that I was surprised this afternoon to hear the remarks of the ex-Minister of Works, the member for Flinders, particularly when he referred to the promises made by the Labor Party prior to the recent elections. He suggested that these promises would not be carried out. However, we would not need to do much to keep pace with the previous Government. I should like to remind the honourable member—and I am sure that he and most of his colleagues know it—that the ex-Premier was

widely known in this State as "Promising Tom". Actually the honourable member is trying to judge the Government on the Opposition's past record. I support the Leader's statement that he particularly congratulated the Premier on leading the Labor Party to victory at the recent election. The Leader said that it was a magnificent victory, considering the disadvantages associated with the gerrymander. When the results were known on March 6 it must have been a happy experience for the Premier. As the Leader said, it was a magnificent victory and a fitting reward for a man who has fought for so long with the odds against him.

I thank my colleagues for their efforts at the recent election and I say sincerely that I was proud to be associated with the Australian Labor Party in its defeat of the Playford Government gerrymander, which was a scheme designed to keep the Liberal Government in power against the wishes of most of the people. In other words, it was designed to suit the purposes of very few people. Is it well known practically throughout the world how the Playford Government has retained power in South Australia for so long. As the member for Gawler pointed out, the Leader said proudly during his speech that it had been suggested that his gerrymander was "the most pernicious, crooked, cruel and detrimental gerrymander that had ever taken place since the time of the Pharaohs".

Mr. Clark: And that is a long time ago.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, and the Pharaohs were in action for a long time, too. Most members will agree that the Playford Government will go down in history and long be remembered as the equal of, if not worse than, the Pharaohs. In fact, it makes the Pharaohs look like babes in arms. However, the Leader buttered us up a little then, for he said that his ex-Ministers would be only too happy to help the members who had recently received their portfolios in matters in which they might desire some background knowledge. That was decent of him and I am sure the Ministers also appreciate the gesture. Although I have confidence in the ability of the Ministers, there are bound to be some matters that will probably need clarification.

At this stage I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Speaker. I am confident that you will hold this office with distinction and I have no doubt that you will be recognized and long remembered as one of the fairest Speakers to ever occupy that high office. I also offer sincere congratulations to the member for

Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. I have no doubt that he will carry out his duties in an efficient and impartial manner. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, and the other members who have made their maiden speeches. I particularly support the remarks made by the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) in criticism of the building industry in South Australia. All members know that this serious problem is not confined to this State. However, the problem here should be our concern. The tremendous demand for house building is one of the main reasons for the problem, and because of the demand people are setting themselves up as building contractors without having the slightest knowledge of the trade. From what I have seen of some of the work carried out in both the metropolitan and country areas I doubt whether some of them would have the ability to drive a nail into a bar of soap. Having set themselves up as building contractors they call for tenders for subcontracting and, as all members know, they naturally accept the lowest tenders.

The house builder is charged top prices for second-class work and third-class materials. In many cases most of a person's savings are used in building a house. Subcontractors mostly have other jobs, and their building work is more or less a sideline. What happens is that if someone wants foundations put down a subcontractor dashes out during the weekend and puts them down. This causes early cracking in the walls of the house. Then some other person dashes out and puts in the outside or inside walls. Most of the inside work is done at night. This is how the building trade is being conducted now and it is urgent that the matter be examined soon. I will support any investigation into it, because it is a problem for people who have to spend their life savings in the building of houses. It would not be fair to condemn all building contractors and I do not want to do that, because I know there are some who are honest and competent. On the other hand, all of them are not so competent and honest and an investigation into the qualifications of some builders is an urgent matter.

Regarding the Governor's Speech, on this occasion I find myself in a somewhat different role, but, having studied it, I have concluded that it is by far the best speech the Governor has ever made in opening Parliament. Even if I were a member of the Opposition I would have no hesitation in supporting everything in it.

Mr. Ryan: You would be prepared to put that statement in writing, wouldn't you?

Mr. McKEE: Yes. His Excellency said:

Since taking office my Ministers have devoted their attention to many of the problems confronting the State.

They have done so. This afternoon the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) said that the Ministers were sitting in their offices, but I think he knows that most of them have travelled the State extensively. When I was a member of the Opposition, by way of questions in the House and by letters that were not acknowledged, I invited the Minister of Education to visit Port Pirie, but he did not at any time do so. If he did, it was without my knowledge, and I doubt that he did this. Since my Party has been the Government Party, the Ministers have travelled more extensively than members of the previous Cabinet travelled.

Mr. Hudson: They have set a high example.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. I think members opposite will think twice before again accusing our Ministers of not doing their job. Every member of Cabinet has been to Port Pirie and surrounding districts since my Party has been in office. I notice the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) laughing; he is worrying about the deep-sea port in his district. The proposed changes to existing legislation are long overdue. I was pleased to hear that steps would be taken soon to effect some urgent changes in the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. This department has an important function, and no doubt as our population increases its responsibilities will increase. It is, therefore, pleasing to know that it will be brought under the control of a Minister who has had wide experience of most of the problems administered by it.

One of the matters I was pleased to note in the Governor's Speech was that a scheme for constructing an oil berth remote from the centre of Port Pirie had been submitted to Cabinet for consideration. For some time this matter has caused great concern to business people in the town, to those associated with the activities of the waterfront in Port Pirie, and to me.

Mr. Ryan: You would know, as the member for the district, that that was important.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, and I think the honourable member, who is a member of the Waterside Workers' Federation, realizes the difficulties and dangers associated with the handling of fuel. If a fire occurred at the existing oil berth in the centre of the town a major disaster could result. Because of this danger, I hope this matter will be regarded as urgent.

It is also pleasing that the railways have received a mention. The railways system in this State has been allowed to run down; I know that members opposite will agree with that. I do not think one session has passed since I entered this House without some complaint being made by members opposite when they were previously members of the Government Party. I am sure they will be pleased that this Government will do everything possible to bring about changes in railway travel. This will be heartening news to country people who use the railways, and will also encourage people to travel on trains.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think you will succeed?

Mr. McKEE: I think so; in fact, the changes can be seen already. Proposals to review and improve legislation relating to the education system will also be welcome news to those already engaged in the profession, as well as those considering entering it. The proposal to supply free school books will, I have no doubt, be carried out, and it will be a great relief to the many people who have small children attending school.

Mr. Hall: When will it be carried out?

Mr. McKEE: In due course, and probably much sooner than the honourable member expects.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The Party opposite had 32 years to do it.

Mr. McKEE: That is so. The member for Flinders this afternoon criticized the Government, yet it has been in power for only three months, during which time the House has sat for only three weeks. It was surprising to hear an ex-Cabinet Minister expecting certain things to be done in such a short time, as he knows that legislation is necessary. He was a member of Cabinet for many years, and for half an hour today he rapped up his ability as a Minister.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Perhaps they had a high regard for our ability as compared with theirs.

Mr. McKEE: It has scared them, I think. I am pleased that steps will be taken to improve industrial legislation, which the previous Government had 32 years to improve. Another matter in which we are lagging behind other States is workmen's compensation. When the legislation is amended, I hope it will include cover for travelling to and from work, which is important to a shift worker. In my district are many men who go to work at all hours of the night in all types of weather. Because of the increased num-

ber of motor vehicles on the roads there is more danger and fatalities occur. Under the Playford Administration, no compensation was paid to workmen while travelling to and from work. I hope that this provision will be included in amendments to be made to the Act. We have heard much about the Gidgealpa field in the last 12 months, but it appears that there has not been sufficient evidence yet to enable a prediction to be made about its future. I have never visited the field but, from reports I have heard, it may not be a bonanza, and I do not think we should be too enthusiastic about it.

Mr. Quirke: You have seen much country that looks like it.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, and it is a pity that one cannot see underneath. That is the unfortunate thing about mining or anything that must be extracted from under the ground.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. McKEE: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the honourable member for Flinders has just returned to the Chamber. He said that seven out of 10 Government members were union officials prior to coming into this House. Well, for the information of the honourable member, and so that he may correct his statement before it goes to *Hansard*, I remind him that of the 21 Government members in this House, five were officials in the trade union movement.

Mr. Ryan: Perhaps he thought we would not notice that mistake.

Mr. McKEE: Well, I think it is obvious that the honourable member did not know the position, and I want to put him on the right track. He spoke of the selection of candidates, but he omitted to mention how the selection of his Party's candidate for Yorke Peninsula was carried out. I shall not go into that matter now, but the honourable member knows what I am talking about.

I am pleased to report that Port Pirie, after many years of stagnation, is beginning to come to life. Houses are being built all over the city, and the Government is busily engaged in a heavy building programme. The new technical school is nearing completion; a new primary school has been commenced; a new railway station and a new police station are being built; and the St. John Ambulance Brigade is building a fine new ambulance station. Work is continuing on the wharves. In addition, we have had the recent announcement regarding the construction of a new oil berth, which seems to be worrying honourable members opposite. All this activity indicates a good future for Port Pirie.

Mr. Jennings: I think all this is indicative of good representation, too.

Mr. McKEE: I agree entirely with the honourable member. I think all honourable members will agree that the decision of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters to expand its activities at Port Pirie will be of great benefit not only to Port Pirie but to the State generally. I also think they will agree that this progress is due to the impending standardization of the gauge from Broken Hill to Port Pirie. Apart from the defeat of the Playford Government, the standardization of this line will be the greatest thing ever to take place in this State.

I believe that from the point of view of defence (which is a big issue at this moment), and also from the point of view of tourist potential as well as the development of the Far North, the Commonwealth should be urged to take immediate action to extend the railway from Marree to Darwin. Although I certainly hope it never happens, if we were attacked from the north the defence of Australia could well depend upon this vital rail link. It would also be of tremendous assistance in the movement of stock. As we all know from press reports, that area is very dry at present, and an extension such as this would be of great benefit to the people interested in the beef industry in the north. Honourable members opposite claim that this Government is not interested in the man on the land, but that is not so. The beef industry is very important to South Australia, and it should be considered. Valuable time should not be wasted talking about the cost, from where the cash is coming and who is going to pay for it. The Commonwealth Treasurer has warned that several million pounds will have to be found to enable conscripted, voteless boys to fight a foreign war. I am sure people of this country would prefer to see the money spent on the country's development rather than in having these boys fight this foreign war.

Mr. McAnaney: Weren't the young people in favour of it?

Mr. McKEE: I am talking about those who have been conscripted without having the right to say whether they agree with it or not. They are not old enough to vote but they can be sent to war. For both national development and defence this railway line should be extended without delay. The Government should assist decentralization by decentralizing some Government departments, especially the Motor Vehicles Department. The present sys-

tem is an inconvenience to people who live hundreds of miles from the metropolitan area. I have mentioned this on many occasions as, although I live only 150 miles away, people in my district have often complained that their registration forms have not been returned on time and they have to obtain temporary permits. It should be necessary for a person, when registering a motor vehicle, to produce that vehicle, as this would make it easier for the police to trace stolen motor cars. I understand that South Australia is the only State where the motor vehicle does not have to be produced before it is registered. The registration of vehicles could be handled at police stations in various country areas with the vehicle being produced at the time. I read the Governor's Speech carefully and I am satisfied that it is the best speech he has made. When the proposed changes are effected many sections of the community and the State generally will benefit. I have no hesitation—and would have none even if I were on the Opposition benches—in supporting every measure in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the Address in Reply and thank His Excellency for performing this important duty. The honourable member for Port Pirie said it is the best speech the Governor has made of any that he has heard. I correct him. The Governor made a splendid effort from indifferent material, and it is to his credit that he was able to do that.

Mr. Jennings: He has had some experience, hasn't he?

Mr. QUIRKE: I have heard the Governor to much better advantage. He is a man who can make speeches on a multitude of subjects, and each speech is the result of careful thought and consideration. He is a remarkable man and his life has been devoted to the service of his country. His rank, which is not easily obtained, indicates his qualifications as a military leader. His battle honour ribbons indicate the wide-flung perimeter of his service to the country. I, with other members, support the suggestion that he be invited to serve another term. By accepting such an invitation, he would confer a great benefit on South Australia. We have been fortunate in the choice of Governors in recent years and His Excellency is not the least loved of the Governors who have occupied that high office. I wish him well. If he decides not to remain here, then I know that wherever he goes his ideal will be to continue to give service to his fellow man, as he has spent his life in such service.

I can imagine His Excellency as a military leader, having as his first consideration the welfare of the men under him. Although his regiments have had to engage in battle and has borne losses, I am certain that a man of his sympathetic inclinations would grieve deeply the loss of any man under his command. If he does not wish to stay here, then I hope he has a happy future.

Then, we have the departed former members of Parliament to whom reference has already been made, the members who have been caught up by the grim reaper. Each and every one of them gave of his best. From my experience as a member of Parliament anyway, South Australia has been well served by its Parliamentarians, and, in saying that, there are no Party implications at all. Everybody, irrespective of Party, who has come into this place in the 24 years of my presence has, in my opinion, given sterling service, and I hope that those who have departed have gone to an eternal reward to their everlasting benefit and I trust that all of them are today occupying a sphere that is a great and just reward for the service that they undertook when they were members of Parliament, fathers of families, and so on. I have grieved at the passing of everyone of them, because all have been personal friends and one does not like to have the experience of losing people with whom one has been long associated and learned to like. It is impossible for that to happen without individual members suffering a sense of loss. I trust that their families by now are fully reconciled to what has happened and that they are happy and contented in their lot.

Of the new members, the honourable member for Barossa takes precedence, as she spoke first to the Address in Reply. It is usual to give new members that distinction. She carried out her duty remarkably well and with distinction; and gave us every indication of being a valuable member in this House. She had something to say about gerry-built houses, and although I have not seen the type of house to which she referred, I do not deny they exist, because such a multiplicity of people are engaged in the building trade that it is inevitable that some shortcomings will be found. We have about 60 Housing Trust houses in Clare, but I have not heard complaints about one of them. Other builders have constructed houses there which are of the excellent standard to be expected from good tradesmen. Our own local tradesmen, whether they build houses or other edifices, work magnificently, and are tradesmen and craftsmen in the true sense, whose work is a credit to them.

Mr. Jennings: How much subcontracting is done in your district?

Mr. QUIRKE: Very little. Usually, a country building team practises all the trades, as the honourable member will know, and it is not unusual to find that the plumber is also an excellent carpenter. Such men can build the whole house, and although this may not seem ethical, according to trade union ideas, it is extremely valuable to have such people, bearing in mind the shortage of labour confronting us these days. If the member for Barossa says that a need exists for an inquiry into the activities of people who foist substandard buildings on their unsuspecting purchasers, then they should be checked, and I am all in favour of that.

Next we have the honourable member for Glenelg. I know it was his first speech, and, indeed, he was heard in the usual ghastly silence which is the tribute paid to a member making his maiden speech. I thought that he was a little unhappy about that, and that he might have benefited from a few fiery interjections. Indeed, once or twice I was tempted to gauge his worth by making some, but then I should have broken the code. However, that is the last occasion on which he will receive that consideration, and I think he knows that. He spoke—or read—well; not many people read well but the member for Glenelg can. One would almost have thought he was making a speech. He was quite good, although I did not agree with much of what he said. His pleasant little history concerning a former notable South Australian gentleman was delightfully entertaining, but the rest of his remarks were disappointing. However, I shall expect the honourable member to light the fiery torch of his economic knowledge at a later date, when I shall look forward with pleasure to hearing him.

The honourable member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) made a creditable maiden speech with a little nervousness, and he read his speech, too. The honourable member follows in the footsteps of one of the most valuable members that we have had in this House during my time here—a member with a vast knowledge of industrial conditions and awards and of the intricate system of arbitration. The former Government was never ashamed of asking, or timid in asking, the former member for West Torrens (Mr. Walsh) for information; he readily gave it on every occasion. The new member for this district follows a master in his craft. He is young and has plenty of time to emulate his predecessor's record and value, and I hope that

he will. As he is young and bright, I believe that if he applies himself he will do that.

Then, there is our stalwart friend, the honourable member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst). I like him; he does not need any advice or introduction at all. He stood up flat-footed and said what he had to say very effectively. That is very good, indeed. On this side the honourable member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) performed worthily and he, too, will be an asset to the House. I congratulate all these new members on their entry into this place and I know that their services will be rendered ungrudgingly to the best interests of the State.

When I entered this House 24 years ago it was the exception rather than the rule for any member to read his speech. In fact, although nothing in our Standing Orders directly prohibits the reading of speeches, there is a condition that states that, where nothing exists in the Standing Orders to govern a contingency like this, the Standing Orders of the House of Commons shall be the guide and the deciding factor, and reading speeches is prohibited in those Standing Orders. It is not unknown for a member reading a speech to be asked to table the document from which he is reading.

Mr. JENNINGS: Do you remember the occasion concerning the Liberal Senator?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, I remember that well. That was the great old man from Newcastle, Senator Ashley. Another honourable Senator asked the President from what document the Senator was quoting. The Senator took no notice of that and so the other Senator promptly asked that the document from which the Senator was reading be tabled and his speech had thus to be laid on the table. That can be done, and it leaves one like Mahomet's coffin—suspended between earth and Heaven.

Mr. CASEY: You have used that quotation before.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and I will probably use it again, as it is apt. I can appreciate members being nervous; I was nervous myself, although that may seem strange now, but I was determined that I would not read my first speech, and I did not. However, I had little cards hidden in my hand with notes on them, which were just as good. Any member who has been in this House for many years will know that if one continues to read speeches one finds this a difficult habit to get out of. Even if one has to shut up before one has finished, one should get up and make the attempt. Every member has gone through that, and nothing will be held against any

member for it. The member for Enfield will agree with this, although I never knew him to have any nerves about the matter, either.

I ask members to make the debates more entertaining and interesting. Without any disrespect, I say that not everyone can read well; one can sometimes read a speech that sounds like an unrehearsed recitation, and that is not good. Members should get out of that habit; they should get up and use the voices they were given. Sometimes they get up and mumble in their beards, and that is not good. As I have said, when any new member enters the House every other member is prepared to assist him. I have done that many times, irrespective of Party. If any member wants to know any point on which I can assist him, I am prepared to do so. I do not expect, however, that with the talent we have here much assistance will be needed.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to your high office. The position of Speaker is a position that has the highest status in any State in the British Commonwealth in which there is democratic Government. You know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a small booklet that you can get (I think we have them here) called *From the Speaker's Chair*, which contains the following:

The Speaker shall be a man of commanding appearance and personality—

Listen to this one—

well versed in the use of arms, and that he carries with him his spiritual sword and his physical sword.

You are supposed to have one in each hand, Mr. Speaker! The spiritual sword was a little one, and the other was a physical sword, which was a real one. This little coloured piece of carpet in this Chamber, as I was told when I first came here, marks the Speaker's domain. When one steps on to that one has to recognize the Speaker. It was laid down years ago that these little coloured pieces of carpet should be three swords lengths apart, the reason being that the old Parliaments had no power; they could only recommend to the King. The Speaker used to sit there, but members of Parliament used to get heated. There was no Government and no Opposition, and when a division came those members who were in favour of the proposal went to the right-hand side of the Chair and those against went to the left; but before that stage was reached there would be a clash, and therefore it was necessary to have that space between the two contending swords so that the Speaker

could jump into it and with his physical sword throw up the weapons of the intending combatants. I hope we never come to that, because it is a bit late now for you, Mr. Speaker, to learn swordplay or any other form of armed combat. The title "Speaker", of course, comes from the time when the occupant of the office had to take messages to the Sovereign and pray: "We, your servants, humbly pray." He became the Speaker for Parliament, and that title has remained ever since.

Mr. Coreoran: A most unenviable task in those days.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, he never knew but that he would be shot into the Tower. Then we have the time when Cromwell dissolved the Parliament and removed the Mace. The Mace was a fearful instrument of destruction. It was an iron ball with studs on it, and it was the symbol of authority. Usually the old kings went into battle armed with a mace, because wherever that mace was it was the centre of the battle. It is an ornate thing now, and I think if I got cracked on the skull now only the Mace would be broken. We have the story of the blacksmith and the much polished knights in their gold armour:

Gold is no match for iron, the doughty blacksmith said,

As with his ponderous hammer, he cracked the foeman's head.

I do not think the present Mace could crack my head. However, its original use was as a weapon of offence. It is now a symbol of authority of the Crown here today. Mr. Speaker, all these things together are part and parcel of your very high office. I appreciate the fact of your occupying that high office. You were here when I came into the House, and I have always had the greatest respect for you, and your devotion to your job, your district, and your fellow man, and I know you will carry out your duties impartially as the Speaker of this House.

In agricultural shows and on racecourses there are prizes for sires' progeny. Well, there are the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), the honourable member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford), the honourable member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott), and you, Mr. Speaker, who today are the fathers of the House; but now you, Sir, in your ascendancy, become the patriarch of the House. When you look over your family (because both sides are there) you will see a mixed brood with divided allegiances. Your long period of family raising must cause you to

wonder at the division and where you went wrong. However, notwithstanding those divisions, all here have elected you unanimously, and you will go down in recorded history as the Speaker of this House for the time that you occupy the Chair. You will also go down into history, I know, as one who appreciated his office and served with distinction and honour.

I congratulate the Ministry and wish each member of it well in the new Administration. The people have made a decision and we do not grumble at it but, of course, it is Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's Opposition. Neither side asks for quarter nor expects to receive it, because that is the way the game is played, but fairly. The Premier came into this House the same year as I did, and I congratulate him on the high distinction he has attained. We know that all members of the Ministry today are good men, capable of carrying out the heavy duties that have fallen on their shoulders.

However, I enter a plea for the Minister of Lands. I occupied that office and know what work is entailed. With his present portfolios of Land, Irrigation, Repatriation, Agriculture and Forests, he cannot do the job without riding himself into the ground. He will try: he has tenacity, but do not expect him to do it, because if you do, you will not have him long. I say that from experience. As the honourable member for Flinders said, as a Government the Government does not have a good picture in the country. All country interests embodied in his portfolios are jammed together under one man. I know it is intended to relieve him of some of his duties, but lift them from his shoulders as quickly as you can.

Apropos of that, I draw the attention of the House, if it is necessary to do so, to the weather conditions existing today. Yes, it is good weather to live in, but not good weather to live in in the country and worry about it, and all the agricultural areas are seriously worried today. I looked at the weather map tonight and nothing indicates alleviation of the existing conditions. Apart from 1914, conditions in the northern areas of the State are probably as bad as they have ever been.

Mr. Casey: Do you think it would do any good to bring down aborigines with rain stones?

Mr. QUIRKE: When I was travelling in the interior I asked one chap north-west of Birdsville, who was sitting with a piccaninny and a pup, when it was going to rain, and he said "Two or t'ree days, but over there, not here?". Two days later, when I was in

Innamincka, it rained heavily. I have a divided loyalty on that question. However, conditions are so bad that that idea is worth trying. We could bring rain stones down and do it ourselves, but no-one would believe it here. Conditions are bad, but the implications are worse. It is completely wrong to think that primary production, with the massive crops that have been grown (two record wheat harvests), is in an affluent condition today. It is not. The overdrafts held by the farming community today are possibly higher than ever before. They have been incurred mainly by purchases that have been made from secondary industry. Overall, the price of wheat barely returns the cost of production and wool is not returning the cost of production. One can ask any country bank manager about that. If a drought eventuates (and I am no Nostradamus, nor do I attempt to be a Job's comforter) one of the greatest catastrophes to hit South Australia could result, and the Government would have to bear the brunt of it.

The money that comes from primary production increases each year but the sum that has been borrowed against that production must be deducted from that and it is the difference between what the producer receives and what he pays off his overdraft that he has left, if anything is left. The balance of the money goes out of circulation. If a drought occurs, the producers will not be in that position. What will happen then? As we all know, every one of the valued secondary industries in South Australia is working on three years' credit. Various finance companies supply the necessary money, which has to be paid for at a heavy rate, but production is mortgaged three years ahead in this country. I fear what would happen in this State if we had another 1914, a black drought, although this is hardly likely because the conditions are so vastly different. Conditions in New South Wales are bad. They are good in the southwest of Western Australia but extremely bad over parts of Queensland and right through the centre. Usually, when we have a dry year here, it is a dry year only for South Australia and does not extend beyond. However, I fear this Australia-wide dry spell. If it develops it could become necessary to declare a wholesale moratorium on the debt structure of this country, because we in this country live from crop to crop. If our production goes down (and we have been perilously close to that previously) we might even have to go to the extreme of importing wheat. I hope that never happens, but it could.

Mr. Jennings: Is Douglas Credit the answer?

Mr. QUIRKE: No, nothing of the sort. The honourable member is being facetious but, knowing his style, we will forgive him. I am painting a bad picture and I hope to God it never happens. However, it may happen, because the whole economy of this country in relation to primary production is poised precariously. No doubt about that!

Another important aspect is that if China and Russia, particularly China, came out of our wheat market, we would be in trouble, but there would be a surplus, which is much better than a deficit. That, however, is on the cards. Our salvation in that respect is that it is not in recorded history that a Communist country has ever learned to feed itself. They can organize nuts and bolts and process work and turn out a lot of material like that, but they cannot make the crops grow without the natural agencies that determine whether they will grow and to what extent they will return. That is why primary production can never be regimented, and must be of an individual nature. I once made a statement in this place (and the Leader of the Opposition subsequently quoted me) that the best fertilizer on a farm was the farmer's footsteps, and that is why South Australian farmers are the best in Australia. That statement does not have to be qualified in any way; our farmers are individualists, who decide their own destiny and who study the needs of their soils. Over the last 25 years, since we met with the impact of economic conditions and with the massacre of our soils in growing wheat, the greatest contributing factor in bringing about the salvation of our soils was when wool prices increased so greatly that it was not necessary to grow so much wheat.

Some farmers abandoned wheat production altogether and their land benefited. We are still enjoying those benefits, as well as the benefit of increased knowledge of agricultural methods and the needs of different types of soil. Gone is the day when a farmer with a paddock of 200 acres expected a uniform yield. When we look down on a paddock we often see the different soils, and it makes a beautiful picture, something resembling aboriginal paintings. Of course it is well known now that, because of the different soil characteristics in even five or ten acres of land, production cannot be uniform. I well remember the 1914 drought. I was a boy then only 16 years of age and I worked in Adelaide. In order to keep my job I was sent to Salisbury every day to cut chaff in the mills there. No straw shed was left within miles of a chaff-cutting plant;

the straw had to be taken out and labelled, which, indeed, was authorized by an Act passed in this House. The bags had to be labelled "straw chaff" and molasses mixed with the chaff for stock feeding.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You could put iron roofs back on the shed for the price you got for straw.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes: In those days straw chaff from South Australia was sold to New South Wales on trucks at £14 a ton. It was only mechanical feed, but it was an agency for filling up the large stomach structure of stock, apart from the nutriment they received from other additives, primarily in the form of molasses. That storm was weathered, but it left its mark. History has a habit of repeating itself, but I hope that we never have a repetition of conditions in that period. I doubt whether it is possible because of what we have learnt since. The different applications to the soil would never allow such a repetition. I ask honourable members to do some praying for rain, even if the wind is in the east.

I now come to the Railways Department. I think it receives between £3,500,000 and £4,000,000 a year by way of subsidy, in order to make good its losses. It always amuses me to read in the Auditor-General's Report that the department made a loss of so much but after allowing for the subsidy of £3,500,000 it made a profit of £450,000 or something like that. I wish that I could run my accounts in that way. When talking about co-ordinated services, I think the Premier said somewhere that he would get another £1,000,000 in revenue for the department. That sum can come only from freights, and the only place that the revenue can be raised is the country. There are a few tram-lines around the city, but the Railways Department gets only a small fraction of its revenue from them. All the revenue will come from country areas. The man in the country who buys goods that come by rail pays one freight rate and if he sends the finished product to Adelaide he pays a larger freight rate. A neighbour of mine sent 21 bags of peas to Adelaide to be cleaned and when they had been cleaned the freight rate for their return (from memory) was nearly double the outwards freight because they had been processed.

I make the point that whatever the Government does, the burden of increased freight payments will fall on the country inevitably because there is no other source of revenue. Any attempt to use the railways and not road

transport in the carriage of goods will not solve the problem. It cannot possibly do so. This State will have non-paying railway services as long as we have the existing population. The railway to Pinnaroo has never paid. It was never expected to pay, but its value was in the development it helped in the surrounding country. This applies to all the lines that have branched out in South Australia. Their value is in the resultant development. I have no inhibitions about the granting of a subsidy to the Railways Department because it is right and proper that all the people of the State should carry the burden and this includes city as well as country people. Country people pay the freight rates and part of the subsidy, and it is right that city people should contribute to the subsidy. That is a fair and reasonable proposition and I do not think any legislation the Government introduces will alter it.

I want to refer to the staffing of hospitals. Recently in the Clare hospital the position was that with 30 occupied beds there was one double-certificated sister (the matron) and the rest of the staff were probationers, not one of whom had had over two years' service because when a girl joins a hospital she serves for only two years. When she is becoming useful she must leave. Therefore, the hospital has perpetually probationers with under two years' service and with only one certificated sister it is working under a great handicap. That is not an isolated case—far from it. I do not know the answer to the problem, but we shall have to get an answer or, in the conditions that can arise, some hospitals will close, and we cannot afford to have any one of them close.

When I was a member of the previous Cabinet, I took a great interest in the preservation of our indigenous fauna and flora and, without being egotistic, I think we did some good work. I am glad that my successor in office is prepared to continue that work, which is essential. We are wasting one of the most impressive and instructive assets this country has. Our marsupial life is known the world over. It is probably a link between the reptilian age and the coming of the mammals.

Mr. Casey: How far are you going back?

Mr. QUIRKE: That is not directly known, but it is probably about 200,000,000 years, which is a mere bagatelle in geological times. When the kangaroo's joey is born it is about as big as the top of the thumb, the reason being that it is a non-placental mammal. The echidna and the platypus are also non-placental mammals between the egg-laying reptiles

and the placental mammals. This is the only country that has them. If we do not take more care of one of the most precious things we have in this country, and if we allow the destruction of these animals to continue, we shall be damned for ever by the rest of the world and by historians of the future.

Mr. Casey: Do you agree with statements that have been made that we are likely to exterminate the kangaroo?

Mr. QUIRKE: If every kangaroo is shot on sight, that is inevitable. If we have reserves and they become over-populated, they must be thinned out. This may have to be done with koala bears.

Mr. Casey: This is being done in America with the buffalo.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but we have not got to that stage. We still look on the kangaroo as a pest, which it can be in some areas, but we should always have regard to its value. If we wipe out the kangaroo or any of our marsupials we shall be greater predators than the lion or the tiger. These creatures are inoffensive and have no means of defence. We have no carnivorous animals other than the wild dog, so this continent must have been separated from Asia before the coming of the big cats; otherwise, we would not have these defenceless animals. They were common all over the world, although, from the fossilized remains found in the lakes in the north, it is probable that they were much bigger. However, these are the small ones—direct descendants. In my administration of this matter I found that many people said, "Well, what is a kangaroo?". There may come a time when we will harvest kangaroos by maintaining them in areas not suitable for sheep or cattle. Kangaroo meat is a protein, and the scarcest food item in the world today is a protein. People are talking about getting it out of the sea and processing it, or growing it in the form of yeast. The one thing that hundreds of millions in India and China lack, and the thing that other underfed and under-nourished people lack, is protein.

Mr. Casey: I thought they were short of food in general.

Mr. QUIRKE: The very meaning of the word "protein" is "first". The Greeks used it as "I am first". A person can have any amount of carbohydrates and other things, but if he does not have any protein he may go thin.

Mr. Ryan: You have had plenty of protein, then.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and while it is here I intend to have it, too. It has now been discovered, of course, that one does not die from protein eating: one is more likely to die from carbohydrate chewing. Therefore, I have cut down on carbohydrates and eat proteins, for they are much nicer, anyway.

Mr. Casey: What about drinking?

Mr. QUIRKE: That is a necessity, for unless a person drinks he will dehydrate himself. Of course, there are nice drinks and awful nice drinks. Some such drinks usually are handed out in tuck shops at schools.

Mr. Casey: What about citrus juice?

Mr. QUIRKE: Now the honourable member is talking. I would back citrus fruit against pasteurized milk any old tick of the clock. We have put much money into soldier settlement on the Murray River, in the South-East, and on Kangaroo Island, but of all of it the settlements at Loxton and Cooltong are in the most precarious position. They are getting returns for their products, but in some instances it is barely enough to enable them to keep their water rates covered and to live. I got into much trouble about this matter through an action I took. I shall not go into that, except to say that it was effective action.

Mr. Casey: Has it solved the problem?

Mr. QUIRKE: No, not yet, but it effectively demonstrated what I was trying to get at in the way of marketing fruit. The oranges that are exported range from quite good to reasonably good, but there has been complete ineptitude in the marketing of oranges in Australia. We have examples of a grower getting 2s. for a case of oranges when the case alone has cost 4s., and to me that is just economic stupidity. Other methods must be tried. We must merchandise our fruit. A Bill to be put before the House by the member for Ridley provides for the setting up of a board. However, the main essential is to have somebody, such as a manager, to merchandise the fruit. If a man were paid £15,000 a year tax free, he would not be getting a cent too much if he sold the oranges, and I am perfectly certain it can be done. We have only to look at the Golden Circle pineapple people, whose product can be found in any tinpot store up through the North: there is no place where one cannot get the Golden Circle pineapple products, both the juice and the tinned fruit. The man who is responsible for that knows his merchandising and we want the same type of man attending to the merchandising of citrus fruits. He could be paid £15,000 a year, but that would be a bagatelle compared with what is lost.

Mr. Curren: Do you mean canned juice or oranges?

Mr. QUIRKE: The canned juice.

Mr. Curren: They are different products.

Mr. QUIRKE: The product in the can comes from the oranges, and it is the oranges not suitable for selling that go into the cans. The canned straight orange juice can be broken down. I have spoken to people in this business and they have told me that they could sell cheaply to children at schools diluted oranges in the Tetrapak, and get rid of most of it. This has not been tried, but it should be. There is not a single avenue of possible sale that would not be tried under the administration of a good man. On the West Coast greengrocers have for sale shrivelled oranges at 6d. each, for which probably the grower at the Adelaide market received 2s. or 3s. a case. The honourable member for Chaffey knows that is correct. I took drastic action and said I would reduce the price of oranges in Sydney by 6s. or 8s. a case. An orange-buying spree was initiated in Sydney and in the following week prices went up and up. The oranges, which were discards, went to Sydney. There were 400 tons of big and juicy oranges. These oranges sold at 10 for 2s., and as people in Sydney had not seen anything like it for years they quickly purchased the oranges. That is merchandising. The oranges returned 5s. 8d. and 6s. 8d. in bags for the equivalent of what is in a case, 48 to 50 lb., according to the size of the oranges that had been graded. This sort of thing needs looking into.

I will never rest under any sort of system which has a settlement like Loxton—tremendously expensive to install, expensive to operate, with hard work entailed in its operation, and with a miserable return for the work and the expenditure. It wants drainage. I remember when the Land Settlement Committee looked at Loxton for the first time and discussed ways of developing the area. I spoke then about seepage. As everyone knows, three problems are associated with irrigation. The first is to put the water there: a simple engineering problem. The second problem is to take it off in the form of seepage, a much more difficult and expensive procedure. The third problem is what to do with the effluent when it is taken off, as it could be heavily saline, although not always. Such conditions existed at Loxton and we set to work to remedy the position and we had the machinery ready to do it. I know the present Minister of Lands will continue the work.

I appointed a committee to investigate the citrus industry in South Australia. It is under the able chairmanship of the Director of Lands, and there is probably no more able Government administrator in this State than Mr. Dunsford. He is an extremely able man and I look forward with much interest to seeing the report on the citrus industry. Associated with the problem is uniformity of control, and that is envisaged in the Bill to be introduced by the honourable member for Ridley. The findings of the board could give a uniform price and a uniform distribution of oranges that would enable the grower to reap a profitable return. The absolute minimum needed to return just bare cost, with no profit for the grower, is 10s. a case. He is not receiving it for the oranges marketed in Australia, although he can receive it from those that are exported. I hope that those things will be remedied soon.

Fluoride in water has been mentioned. Where is the honourable member for Mount Gambier? If he agrees with fluoridation, I do not know how it is proposed to fluoridate the Blue Lake. I think that would be an interesting chemical experiment, but I hope that that form of mass medication does not come to pass. I do not think anything would happen to the children's teeth if orange juice from the honourable member for Chaffey's district were distributed! It is well known that those money-spinning canteens or tuckshops attached to schools are causing children's teeth to rot in their heads. There is evidence (and honourable members can get it if they wish to) that in Western Australia deliberate experiments were carried out at two schools with comparable numbers of children. One school supplied good protective foods in the canteen, and at the other the youngsters were able to buy what they liked. The school that sold the good food made a profit of £200 or £300 over 12 months and I think the profit made by the other school was about £4,000. The urge is to get as much money as possible out of the canteens, because that money is then subsidized by the Government. However, the parents and others probably make nothing out of it, through having to pay dentists' fees for the treatment of youngsters' teeth maimed through the intake of sugary rubbish and soft drinks. There is a well-known soft drink—I will not name it—that is carted all over the country and I am distressed when I see youngsters having a bottle of that and a hard baked pastry for lunch. Why don't they give the youngsters laudanum and do the job quickly?

Mr. Casey: Do you suggest some oranges and a cheese sandwich, an Oslo lunch?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and the youngsters get to like it. I hope we will never get down to that form of madness whereby we put in the water the stuff which does such damage. I do not know what it does to the steam boilers, or if descaling the inside of the boilers would require more time when fluoridated water had been passed through them than would be the case where ordinary water was used. We have this idea that is prevalent of mass medication. However, do not think that I am against the idea of poliomyelitis injections and things like that.

Mr. Casey: That would be mass medication, really, wouldn't it?

Mr. QUIRKE: It is, but there are forms and forms of it and putting this stuff in the water is only effective for a short period of a child's life, anyway. Anyway, the youngsters do not drink the water, and so it becomes a sheer waste. If honourable members write to our Health Department for the comparable figures for Pinnaroo and Lameroo they will see much the same thing, where the dental caries of the lolly-eating school are immeasurably greater than where the parents provide the food for the children themselves, and where they are not allowed to eat sweets. We all know that sweets form an acid on the teeth, which bites into the enamel, and an oxy-acetylene flame would be not less effective for this purpose. If what I have said tonight is noised abroad, I shall be inundated with protesting fan mail, which usually happens when one speaks on these subjects. I never reply to it, so it would not make much difference if I never received it.

The distressing and continued conflict between capital and labour is of the utmost importance, for it is increasingly damaging this country. I am not taking any sides, because I believe there is blame on both sides. However, it is interesting to trace history back to the industrial revolution where the small home industries were destroyed in places such as England, and where machines came to be used generally. Even in those days the idea existed of smashing the looms to make more work for everybody, which, of course, was not successful. Then came the age of steam when all sorts of mechanization was applied to production. The more mechanization applied, the richer grew the few and the poorer grew the many. By our own library door in the corridor we have the statue depicting the "Song of the Shirt", which is a grim reminder of the days when poor unfor-

tunate women were paid 3d. and 4d. for the full fabrication of a man's dress shirt. If even one slight fault existed in the fabric—and in some cases even if no fault existed—the victimization was such that out of perhaps one dozen shirts two were classed as being "faulty" and only 10 would be paid for. Then in the 1840's with the rise of Marx and Engels the idea existed that the way to remedy everything was to socialize or nationalize the machine, or whatever the term is that we use these days. The idea was that everything be distributed amongst the people and that a bureaucracy in complete control be set up, so that everything in the garden would be lovely. Although it did not work out that way, honourable members opposite might agree with me that the present contending factions in industry are a direct relic of those days. I listened to honourable members today referring to "the boss" and "the employer" who victimized the people in all circumstances. They do not, however; we know that.

Mr. Ryan: You would agree some do.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, I cannot deny that. We do get the employer who seldom, if ever, makes any approach to better the conditions of his employees. Nearly always the employees have to make the approach and their claims are resisted.

Mr. Clark: All this is a legacy from those old days that you have been talking about.

Mr. QUIRKE: It is a direct relic of those days and it is time it passed into the limbo of forgotten things. In some parts of the world this is happening. The great electrical industry of the United States of America is a prime example of this. At the end of the year a balance-sheet is presented and the employees' representatives sit around the table with the employers' representatives. Both parties can have their accountants present, and the result of the year's working is laid down. So much is allowed for the maintenance of the machines, which must be maintained; money is set aside for the shareholders to receive their share; so much is placed in reserve; and the rest of it belongs to the workers and is given to them without any qualms at all. Each side accepts that negotiation. Irrespective of whether or not that is the right picture, this constant contention that we have today is no good to this country. I shall refer to the waterside workers but I do not want honourable members to think that I use them as an example because I deery their whole activity. They are asking for a pension scheme.

Mr. Ryan: Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. QUIRKE: There is nothing wrong with it.

Mr. Ryan: They will not get it from the employers unless they ask.

Mr. QUIRKE: There is nothing wrong with that if the industry can stand it. The honourable member says that they will not get it from the employers unless they ask. In my opinion the employers have to wake up to that sort of thing, and the subversive elements using some of the trade unions today to their own ill ends have to be told where they stand. The way to kill the subversive intrusion into the trade unions is to do exactly what I have said and then its power would be lost.

The honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) referred to the sending of young men, who do not have the vote, to Vietnam to fight. All right, they will go there, but men have been doing that throughout history. What is the reason for it? Without going into the domestic position, in this area there is an aggressive force attacking another part of the country. People say that the Americans should pull out of Vietnam and everybody would be reconciled and there would be good feeling. However, the prime motive in Communism is the domination of the world and if there is a withdrawal from Vietnam today it will be over-run and then Malaysia will be attacked on two sides, from the north and from the east. I do not think that Indonesia would stand without help and then they would be on our doorstep.

Mr. Ryan: Does that have anything to do with the right of these people to vote?

Mr. QUIRKE: They have the right to vote. When I was 18 I had the right to vote, but when I was in France I could not exercise that right. I would give these young men the right to vote. We can be in danger in South-East Asia, because the sworn intention of Communists is to dominate the world. We may still be forced out of Vietnam, and if we are the next country on the list will be Malaysia, which will be attacked from the north and the east and, without considerable help, that country will go too. Then there would be Borneo, after which they would be right on our doorstep.

Mr. Ryan: But you do not know whether the Government or Opposition will change that quickly, do you?

Mr. QUIRKE: No, and the same sort of thing happened in France, when Governments fell once a week and the Cabinet was reshuffled and sent back again as a new Cabinet. The

only bulwark that France had in those days was the sturdy peasant, who did not care how many times the Government fell. He went on and on in his own way and maintained the supremacy of the country despite the fall of Governments.

Mr. Hudson: The civil servant did the job there in the past.

Mr. QUIRKE: We know that he maintained it, but the peasant went on and maintained the stability of the country despite the political chaos.

Mr. Ryan: But the average person had no voice as to who would be the Government in France.

Mr. QUIRKE: They had an election about every five years.

Mr. Ryan: And 50 Governments in between!

Mr. QUIRKE: That is so.

Mr. Ryan: I hope you are not advocating that in this State.

Mr. QUIRKE: I think I may. I will conclude on a matter that I think members have heard something about recently—grapes. Do members know anything about that subject?

Mr. Ryan: We have heard a lot of sour grapes this afternoon.

Mr. QUIRKE: I heard some comments about a speech made earlier by the Premier, and I got a rude reply that I do not think was intended. He told me that I did not know what I was talking about and that the contract that had been arranged was the same as that arranged last year. That may be so, but nobody knows. No grower knows and, as I have canvassed representatives on the river, I know that they do not know either. This year 3,000 tons and an additional 500 or 600 tons has been processed by Penfolds Wines Pty. Ltd. This contract may be all right, but do not forget that large sums of money under the Loans to Producers Act, which is Government money, has been used. An item in relation to this money appears on the Estimates each year, when money is made available to the State Bank, which spreads it out mainly to the big co-operatives and others for building up the economy of these places, to purchase machinery, and so on. This is usually repayable over 18 years, and it is always repaid over that period. That money has been given to this holding co-operative, which is between the fruitgrower and Penfolds. This is the position—this is what I have been able to find, and nothing more, and I do not know if it is correct. I cannot for the life of me understand why the Government will not disclose the terms of the contract it made between the producers'

co-operative (which has just been brought in for the purpose) and the winery processing the fruit. It is only right that we in this place should know the conditions of that contract. I am putting things forward here, and if, as has been usual, notice is taken of what honourable members say in the Address-in-Reply debate, I hope I can get replies on this subject. I am not being belligerent about this, but as a member of Parliament I want to know, and everybody here should know.

First, arrangements were made to process 3,000 tons, and later arrangements were made for the processing of a further 500 to 600 tons. Now what are the conditions of this contract? Is it correct that the amount provided by the Government from the Loans to Producers Account provided for Penfolds' processing costs, 4d. a gallon storage, and £5 a ton to growers, plus cartage? Is that the contract? I do not know, but I have worried that information out a bit here and a bit there, and I would like to know more about it. Isn't that a simple question, and doesn't it require just a simple answer? What is there to hide? What reason can there be for hiding that information?

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That's not all the answer, though.

Mr. QUIRKE: No. I am only asking the conditions of the contract. For instance, how much a ton is charged as processing cost? Does the contract provide for a full extraction, first run of free juice, extraction from pressings, treatment of lees and leachings, and treatment for final spirit extraction? Any winery will tell you that these last items are worth £7 a ton. I know these figures, because I have been with them for years. Those last extractions are worth more to the winemaker than the £5 a ton first payment to the growers. Has any estimate been made of the final return to the grower? Well, probably there has been, but what is it? What is the expected delay before final repayment? Is there any check of extraction figures? One can extract anything from a ton of grapes of varying types from, say, 120 to 150 gallons a ton, and with all these other small processes like lees and pressings and things like that it can go much higher. What is the figure that is being paid, and what is the extraction? A person could not run a business on these conditions unless he knew the particulars. Will the Government give the House the final extraction figures, which should be available soon, segregated into brandy and S.V.R.? Is the 4d. a gallon storage based on stored brandy and/or

S.V.R.? What is the basis of final payment? Is it based upon a pre-determined figure or market price at the time of disposal?

I now wish to mention something to which I object most strongly. I have never had a greater affront in an election than the following statement that emanated from the present Government:

The Prices Commissioner has fixed recommended wine grape prices for this year's vintage, and this decision must not be interfered with by the Premier if Playford is still Premier on Monday.

The implication there is that the Prices Commissioner fixed the price, that it should not be interfered with by Playford, but that, if the Labor Party were elected, the price would not be interfered with. Now that is a filthy lie, and I say that as strongly as I can say it.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: We have had the proof of that already.

Mr. QUIRKE: It probably was instrumental, in some measure, in the election of the honourable member for Barossa and also the honourable member for Chaffey.

Mr. Jennings: Rubbish!

Mr. QUIRKE: It is not rubbish at all; do not worry about that. Playford could deal a blow to growers! Every single thing associated with the vast co-operative organization in South Australia, co-operative wineries in particular, has been built up with money advanced by the Playford Government through the Loans to Producers Act from the State Bank. That vast organization is the product of the Playford Administration over the last 25 years. Not a bit of it is exempted from that. Last year the Government gave the Renmark Irrigation Trust £1,300,000: gave it to the trust because the people of Renmark could not meet the cost of the rehabilitation of the obsolete pumping plant and the irrigation system. Half of this sum was for drainage and the rest was for installing two new pumping houses and new plant, and for rebuilding the whole of the channel system that will cost £1,000,000. Of the total cost, the Government gave the Renmark Irrigation Trust £1,300,000 while I was the Minister of Irrigation. This is the Playford Administration that is going to ruin the growers! That is probably the most damnable exhibition of political chicanery that I have ever known.

Mr. Nankivell: Would you call it vicious?

Mr. QUIRKE: That word is used from the other side of the House many times, but you could call it that if you like. That advertisement, which writes down the organization

responsible for it, stated that the growers would be ruined—"He could deal a death blow to growers" were the actual words. The growers have been sustained by the Playford Government through the organization that was built up to process their products. Like all things, it could bring its own retribution and I shall be happy on the day it comes. I shall leave a few matters for the Budget debate. I congratulate the Government on winning the election, and congratulate the Ministers and

the new members. I also congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment by this House to your present high office. We all know that you will occupy that position with honour, and with credit to yourself. I support the motion.

Mr. HUGHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, June 17, at 2 p.m.