

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 22, 1965.

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

PETITION: TRANSPORT LICENCE.

Mr. RODDA presented a petition signed by 131 residents of the Naracoorte, Keppoch, Padthaway, Marcollat, Willalooka, Kongal and surrounding districts respectfully praying that, if it is decided to reintroduce transport control, South East Freighters be granted a licence or permit to continue its service to the above-mentioned districts.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that a certain class of pensioner will now be unable to apply for travel concessions, although that privilege will continue to apply to pensioners who have previously had their applications accepted. This concession will now apply only to new applications from pensioners with a medical entitlement card. Will the Premier say what is the reason for this change of policy, and why about 20 per cent of previously eligible pensioners will now be denied facilities that would have been available to them in the past?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report on this matter from the Minister of Transport.

WHEAT.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have received a letter from a Mr. Pedler of Koolunga, which states:

You may remember that in late 1961 I wrote to you concerning the recognition of the wheat variety "Modesty" by the Department of Agriculture. I have here a letter from the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. David Brookman) addressed to you, dated October 31, 1961, in answer to my inquiries on this matter. In this letter it is stated that the Department of Agriculture "considered it necessary to test the variety for four or five years before recommendations could be made with confidence". I would like you to point out that it is now eight years that the department has been "testing" this variety, and as yet I have not received any written or official decision as to what they have arrived at concerning this wheat, and it is to this effect that I would ask you to obtain from the Minister of Agriculture, or through him, as I would then have it officially what the department has decided about it.

I understand the wheat commonly known as "Modesty" is widely used throughout South Australia by many farmers, with satisfactory returns, but Mr. Pedler has evidently received no word as to its being a recognized variety. Will the Minister of Agriculture investigate this matter and satisfy Mr. Pedler on this point?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be pleased to do that.

SCHOOL OVALS.

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education say what assistance is given by the Education Department to provide and develop sports and recreation ovals at schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Government's present policy in regard to the development of school playing fields is as follows: (a) The Government provides the land and meets the full cost of all necessary ground formation and grading, and any necessary fencing. (b) The reticulation and grassing of the oval is a matter for the school council or school committee, and the Government is prepared to subsidize on a pound-for-pound basis all costs involved in this reticulation and grassing. (c) The continued maintenance of the oval is the responsibility of the school council or school committee, although certain items such as tractors for cutting the grass and manures may be provided on a subsidy basis. Over the years it has been found that this arrangement works well, and there has been close and friendly collaboration between school councils or committees and the Education Department in the development of these grassed ovals as well as in many other aspects. However, it is realized that considerable difficulty may be experienced by councils and committees in meeting their share of expense for these projects in the case of new schools. The Minister in special circumstances such as these may authorize the payment of £500 towards these projects as an ordinary departmental provision and at the same time make an arrangement with the school committee that it reimburse half the cost by contributions spread over five years at reasonable interest.

GRAPES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last year the Prices Commissioner's report relating to wine grape prices was tabled and ordered to be printed in February, 1964. Will the Premier be good enough to table the Prices Commissioner's 1965 report on wine grape prices and have it printed as a Parliamentary Paper?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Any report in respect of prices submitted by the Prices Commissioner will be printed in *Hansard* or elsewhere. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

SALISBURY DRAINAGE.

Mr. CLARK: Honourable members will know that in the Salisbury council district great problems have been created by rapid development. I understand that the Minister of Works and the Minister of Local Government have been invited to visit the area and inspect the problems. One of the problems that I believe the Ministers will be asked to investigate is that no drainage outlet previously existed in the area and surface water was dissipated over various paddocks. The council considers that it has carried out much development on drainage construction in relation to the comparatively small number of ratepayers, and it is finding the economic burden too great to be able to continue without financial assistance. It is also considered that this area has suffered more than others because of the inadequacy of the Town Planning Act and because subdivision roads are now deteriorating to such an extent that they need complete reconstruction. The council is most anxious that, if possible, the two Ministers visit the area and see at first hand the problems there. Will the Minister of Works say whether any date has yet been arranged for this visit? If it has not, will he confer with his colleague, the Minister of Local Government, to see whether a visit can be made to the area, possibly after the House rises at the end of this month?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As indicated by the honourable member, I have received a letter concerning this matter. I think this is the appropriate time to say that, as a result of negotiations between councils and the previous Government, the formation of a metropolitan drainage committee was considered, and councils' opinions were sought. Most councils favoured setting up this committee, although a few queried financial aspects. Cabinet has referred this matter to the Minister of Local Government, who is seeing whether such a committee can be formed. This matter does not come within my jurisdiction, but the department with which I am concerned, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, could be affected considerably by stormwater drainage systems. I shall be pleased to speak to the Minister of Roads and Local Government and

to see if we can arrange a date to visit Salisbury as requested. I should be grateful if the honourable member could accompany us on the inspection, to which I shall endeavour to bring some of my officers so that we may have all the facts.

MILLFIX SERVICES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: A short time ago at Murray Bridge a firm, registered under the name of Millfix Limited, purported to fix mills in my district and, on the payment of a deposit, to enter into a 12 months' contract to maintain all these bores and windmills. This appears to have been a racket. Some farmers paid deposits and entered into contracts but, when they called upon Millfix Limited to do a job, the requests were ignored although the deposits had been paid. Action was then taken to see whether the farmers could recover their deposits. I have handled some cases on behalf of my constituents, with no result at all. When action was taken through other channels to call on this person's address, there was no answer at the door although it was ascertained from neighbours that he was still at home. Apparently the bird has flown. This is a serious case where many deposits have been collected by this bogus company. Other people have been caught by this organization.

Mr. Nankivell: I have been caught, too.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Attorney-General bring down legislation to protect people against these bogus conspirators who are doing this type of thing in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The kind of racket outlined has caused me concern. I have already answered in this House a question concerning people who are doing this, purporting to undertake roof and house painting in South Australia. In the particular case mentioned by the honourable member for Ridley we checked and found that the individual concerned had registered a business name of Millfix Services and, consequently, could not be prosecuted under the Registration of Business Names Act. On the face of our information, no criminal proceedings are open to us that would indicate that we could obtain a conviction; but the particular racket is, of course, undesirable. How far we can go in protecting people against unscrupulous characters it is difficult to say. In Western Australia there is legislation in regard to door-to-door salesmen that goes a stage further than our legislation, which is confined to book salesmen. It

may be possible for us to look at that legislation to see whether we can extend the provisions of our legislation to cover the people who are covered in Western Australia. I have obtained a copy of the Western Australian Act and, as soon as any decision is taken on the matter, I shall inform the honourable member.

HENLEY BEACH PUMPING STATION.

Mr. BROOMHILL: The residents of East Street, Henley Beach, have complained to me about objectionable odours from the Engineering and Water Supply Department pumping station at East Street. Is the Minister of Works aware of these complaints and, if so, will he say what action is contemplated by his department to correct the situation?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am aware of the complaints, which have been brought directly to my notice by the residents of the area and also by the honourable member. I raised the matter with the department and the Engineer for Sewerage has intimated that the source of the trouble has been traced to a sewer manhole on the north side of the pumping station on the department's property. The cause is a blocked vent adjacent to the manhole. Action is being taken to clear the blockage today.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Wednesday, in reply to questions, the Minister of Works indicated again in the House his opposition to fluoridation in South Australia, as he did last year when, as a member of the Select Committee inquiring into this matter, he dissented from parts of its report. From my understanding of what he said on Wednesday, I believe that he opposes fluoridation mainly because of the expense. Soon after the last election there appeared in the *Advertiser* on March 15 a report about the appearance of the Premier on a television programme entitled *Meet the Press*. Part of that report stated:

The A.L.P. had a special committee inquiring into fluoridation, and the Government would be guided by its report. If that report determines that there shall not be any alteration, there will not be, he said.

The "he" referred to the Premier. The report continued:

If it indicates there should be an alteration, and the State A.L.P. Convention endorses it as policy, we would have to accept it.

Can the Premier say whether the remarks by the Minister of Works last week meant that the committee had come to the conclusion that the Government should do nothing? If that is so, who were the members of that committee

and will its report be made public? If it has not yet come to a conclusion, can the House take it that the Minister of Works was expressing merely his own view, which may subsequently be overridden?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have nothing to reply to on this question. If the honourable member wants further information I suggest that in his own interest he place the matter on the Notice Paper, so that we may understand what he really wants.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I must confess I was practically thrown by the Premier's strange attitude in refusing to answer my question. I have never known a refusal in such circumstances in this House before. It appears to me, on reflection, that perhaps I misdirected my question, and that I should have directed it to the Premier's Deputy, the Minister of Works. I therefore ask the Minister, without explaining the purport of the question again (because I think the Minister was listening), whether his answers to the question asked of him in this House last Wednesday on fluoridation meant that the Australian Labor Party committee on this matter had concluded that the Government should do nothing. If they did mean that, who were the members of that committee, and will the committee's report be made public? If they did not, can the House take it that the Minister was expressing merely his personal views, which may subsequently be overridden when the committee's report is received?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will realize that he is out of order in reflecting on an answer to a question. The Premier asked him to put this question on notice.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order to say that I did not, with great respect, reflect on the answer: I merely expressed my surprise at the way I had been treated. I therefore suggest that I was not out of order in asking this question again of the Minister of Works. I suggest I am entitled to some information on what is a matter of great public importance, and I respectfully ask you, Mr. Speaker, to allow the question. The Minister is obviously prepared to reply.

The SPEAKER: The Premier asked that the question be placed on notice. The honourable member has now asked the question of another Minister, and it is entirely up to that Minister whether he desires to reply or not.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think I can answer the honourable member's question, and if I omit or forget any of the details I shall be happy to be reminded. The Australian

Labor Party set up a committee, of which I was a member, but I should not like to name the other members, for fear that I omit some or get their names wrongly.

Mr. Millhouse: Are they members of Parliament?

Mr. Ryan: What difference does that make?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Are you going to debate the question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Works.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: They were not at the time all members of Parliament, although some were. After long deliberation, and after collecting evidence from many people, the committee recommended that it be permitted to refrain from making a direct recommendation, as the evidence taken revealed a great difference of opinion among witnesses. When I previously expressed my views they were my personal views. As I indicated, Cabinet has not considered this matter but, if it makes a decision contrary to mine, I am then obliged to accept the majority decision.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I greatly appreciate the frank way in which the Minister answered my question and thank him for his courtesy in doing so. Arising out of his answer, I now ask whether he intends to take the matter to Cabinet. If he does, when is this likely to be done and when will Cabinet give a decision?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not intend at present to take the matter to Cabinet.

PORT ADELAIDE GIRLS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of May 27 regarding the replacement of very old and obsolete wood stoves by strip heaters at the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School? The stoves are dangerous, and because of the overcrowding at the school some casualties may occur.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When the honourable member asked his question I stated that I could not accept responsibility on behalf of my department alone, because it did work for other departments only at their request. I have checked the files and I have found that it is admitted by the Education Department that this matter was delayed because of some pending alterations and that it was overlooked. However, now that the matter has been brought before the department again, and there is evidence of overcrowding at the school, the heaters seem desirable. While I propose to approve the installation of the ray heaters (which I am assured will be carried into effect

promptly), I point out that it is not the policy of the department to do away with the ordinary wood stove heaters while they are serviceable. The department wants them to last as long as possible to save expense, but because of the circumstances at this school I assure the honourable member that approval will be given and endeavours made to have the matter attended to promptly.

ABORIGINAL FAMILY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: For two years I have been trying to obtain a house for Mr. and Mrs. Charles Walker of Meningie. Mr. Walker is a half-caste Aboriginal and his wife is a white woman. They live in a small house on the outskirts of Meningie township. The Housing Trust has not accepted them as tenants. However, they do well in the circumstances in which they live. I took Mrs. Hunt-Cooke of the Aboriginal Affairs Board to visit these people, and we were accompanied by Mrs. Angus of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. Mrs. Hunt-Cooke considered that these people did very well in the circumstances. The request was repeated to the Housing Trust that they should be considered as suitable tenants for a rental house. They are pensioners, so they would be able to pay the rent. However, the application was again refused. The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, at my request, visited these people about a month ago, and he has been able to form his opinion on this matter. Can the Minister say what action he has taken since he visited these people, and whether he considers there is any possibility of their getting a Housing Trust house?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I visited the Walkers' house with the Director of Aboriginal Affairs, and my own view was that they were people who could be satisfactorily housed in a Housing Trust house. However, that decision depends on the assessment of the trust; it is not prepared to accept outside assessments to assist it to make determinations. Immediately after being at the house, and after examining the file of the correspondence with my predecessor, I made further representations and I am hopeful a favourable reply will be received, but as yet I have not got one.

UPPER MURRAY SEWERAGE.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works say what priority has been given to Upper Murray towns in respect of sewer installations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Speaking from memory, I saw a report where the committee that has the authority to investigate the

installation of country sewers, and recommends the priority in which they should be completed, visited Barmera, Berri and Renmark in December of last year. Although the committee fully appreciates the difficulties experienced by these towns, it is of opinion that it will be at least five years before any sewerage services can be undertaken.

PARLIAMENTARY VISIT TO FAR NORTH.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understand from the Premier's statement recently that a Parliamentary visit to Woomera has been arranged. I appreciate the arrangements that have been made, but there is a problem that is almost more urgent than anything that happens at Woomera. I refer to the drought in the North and North-East of the State. Would it be possible for members from both sides of the House to see the conditions prevailing there at present? At different times honourable members go to the Far North areas, but it is extremely difficult to do so. The situation there has considerably worsened recently and the number of store cattle coming down and their condition provide clear evidence of this. Will the Premier consider arranging a visit by honourable members to enable them to see the conditions in the North and North-East, possibly by a combination of air and ground travel?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The visit to Woomera was arranged entirely by the Commonwealth Government, although I did make some representations. I understand that the Commonwealth Government will make the necessary arrangements. I am prepared to take the other matter to Cabinet for a further consideration of the suggestion.

GOVERNMENT TENDERS.

Mr. LANGLEY: It was brought to my notice recently by a large electrical contractor that tenders had been called for the electrical installations in the new public buildings at the side of the Reserve Bank. The successful tenderer will be announced shortly. Included in the tender is the supply of the light fittings specified by the department. As prices tendered could be very close, can the Minister of Works say whether preference will be given to tenders from South Australia for both the installation and supply of fittings? I understand tenders have come from other States.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Some days ago the honourable member spoke to me about this matter and I have had inquiries made.

The types of fitting to be installed were specified and I have been assured by the department that it did not prejudice any South Australian, and that it did not prohibit the use of South Australian manufactured articles. It is Government policy that, wherever possible, South Australian manufactured goods are to be given preference. South Australian firms have tendered for this job and, undoubtedly, there are tenders from other States. No decision has been made at the moment, but I assure the honourable member that preference will be given to South Australian manufactured materials, if possible, and that the specifications did not in any way prejudice South Australian tenderers.

EGGS.

Mr. HUGHES: During the last few days I have received several telephone calls and personal approaches by constituents regarding information about the plan of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities. I have no doubt that I convinced the people concerned that the plan would be to their benefit but, nevertheless, will the Minister of Agriculture say what information is available to egg producers regarding the introduction of this plan?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Last week I had included in *Hansard* a statement by the Minister for Primary Production (Mr. Adermann), which all honourable members have probably read by now. I have arranged with the Chairman of the Egg Board (Mr. Anderson) to provide all the relevant information to as many people as possible. He has presented me with a voluminous statement setting out an introductory letter to the producers, and then information about the bird levy and how it will apply. The document contains also instructions to producers as to how the levy should be carried out, and a calculation, based on the rates, as to how it will apply. This tells the producer how and when he should send the money in. Producers are also informed of the variation of grade and weight standards, and finally a notice appears to the effect that as from Monday, June 28, 1965, producers consigning their eggs to one of the Egg Board's grading floors will not be required to pay the pool levy, although a deduction for handling will still be made on their account sales. I appreciate the honourable member's concern because many others have asked whether this information would be available. A copy of this document will be circulated to all honourable members so that they can then inform their constituents

of the requirements, if they wish to do so. Apart from that, however, the document will be made available to all people in South Australia handling eggs.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the new egg grading regulations were introduced at the request of another State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I understand that the new regulations were made at the request of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities, and that they are standard throughout the Commonwealth.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will C.E.M.A. be the authority to administer the new plan, or will it be the Commonwealth authority organized for export marketing?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: When giving my reply I said that I understood it was C.E.M.A. that suggested that all grades of eggs be standardized throughout Australia. Does that answer the Leader's question?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Yes.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. HALL: As my question involves Government policy and, I believe, a Cabinet decision, it is directed to the Premier. An announcement was made by the Attorney-General in this morning's *Advertiser* regarding justices of the peace. The Attorney-General was reported as having attacked some justices of being incapable of carrying out their duties and others of holding their positions only for social status. As indicated, I believe there is to be a new system of appointing justices, but I have heard that pending this announcement no appointments have been made except for departmental convenience. As at least one and possibly several places in my district are awaiting new appointments so that court work can be expeditiously carried out, will the Premier say whether the Government intends to continue the policy of giving preference for departmental convenience in the appointment of justices?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think the honourable member has given a reasonable summary of the press statement and what Cabinet has decided. If he desires any further information, I shall have to consult my colleagues and, if necessary, advise him later.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I heard on the wireless this morning and subsequently read in the paper the Attorney-General's announcement about the two classifications that he proposes for justices of the peace in this State. To the best of my belief, there have been no appointments of justices of the peace since about November last.

It is understandable that the present Attorney's predecessor should not desire to make appointments shortly before an election. Three months or so has elapsed since the present Attorney-General took office. Can he say how long it will be before he is in a position to make recommendations about appointments as justices of the peace? It is a matter of extremely great interest and, perhaps, importance to many people.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some appointments of justices have been made since the election but, for the most part, it has been where either State or Commonwealth Government departments required urgent changes in their personnel who held commissions as justices of the peace. Upon assuming office I undertook a survey of the outstanding applications for appointments. Some of them went back a long time. On a number of old applications no decision had been made. I found that the task was a difficult one, because on the information available to the Attorney's office there was no way of assessing the overall need for justices in various areas.

As a result, a survey of all justices in the State has been undertaken to ascertain their whereabouts and their present state of health. We wanted to see whether they were able to do the work normally assigned to justices. This is necessary because some of the lists of justices held by police stations do not accurately supply information as to the state of health of the justices who may be called on. This survey is currently proceeding, but will take some time to complete. If any honourable member finds that there is a position that requires urgent attention in his district, because people are not getting a service, I should be grateful if the member would make representations to me on that matter. It may be necessary to make some appointments of justices before the final result of the survey is to hand. When it is to hand, as was announced by me yesterday after the approval of Cabinet, we shall endeavour to establish quotas for justices in various areas, and, thereafter, the basis of appointment will be a vacancy in the quota. We want to maintain a proportion between the number of justices and the number of people in the State. We do not want to get to the position that obtains in other States, where the number of justices is so vast that the value and distinction of the office has lost its point and purpose. That is why the survey is being undertaken. I appreciate the honourable member's question, and I repeat that, if any member knows that

people are not getting a service in an area, and he refers it to me, I will take it to Cabinet and obtain a decision.

MARGARINE.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Agriculture tell me the present quota of margarine for South Australia, to whom it is allocated, and whether the Government intends to increase the quota?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I think from memory the present quota for margarine for this State is about 550 tons. This quota is allocated to Unilevers, which I believe has one of the smallest quotas in Australia but the only quota in South Australia. The Government has not yet considered increasing the quota, although there has been considerable pressure from three separate margarine makers for an increase. They have stated their case, and I have listened to them without committing the Government in any way. I understand there is a big demand for margarine known as poly-unsaturated fat, for which there are different trade names. Yesterday I saw a large advertisement in the *Advertiser* stating that it was intended to supply this in South Australia. This is not without my knowledge, but it is certainly without my blessing. If this is illegal and any action can be taken, the firm concerned will have to take the consequences. I understand that a High Court decision is pending on whether manufacturers are permitted under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution to trade in States other than the State in which margarine is manufactured, but I do not intend to comment on that. At this stage, what further action the Government will take depends entirely on departmental investigations into what has transpired.

FITZROY LAND.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister who represents the Minister of Health in this Chamber aware that some time ago a department under the control of the Minister of Health purchased a block of land on the north-east corner of Fitzroy Terrace and Braund Road, Fitzroy, for some purpose connected with the department? Will the Minister inquire and inform me for what purpose this block is to be used and when the project will be put into operation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask my colleague for a report.

BOXING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question relates to a report in today's *Advertiser* that boxing in Victoria will be brought under the control of that State's health authority. The report states that the Victorian State Cabinet has authorized the department to prepare standards for the medical supervision of boxers before and after bouts, of gloves, bandages and other pertinent matters. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague, the Minister of Health, whether he has any similar plans to control boxing in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware, at the moment no professional boxing takes place in South Australia. However, I will see whether we can get a punchy report for the honourable member.

CIVIL DEFENCE.

Mr. RODDA: A weekend newspaper contained an article on civil defence. It was stated that, if Adelaide came under atomic attack, the seat of Government could be taken to Murray Bridge, and control centres would be situated at Mount Barker, Nuriootpa and McLaren Vale. Also in the article the Deputy Commissioner states that no arrangements have been made to organize in the South-East. I have been approached by a number of people from the South-East, some of whom have attended the civil defence school at Mount Macedon. They have indicated to me that they will give their utmost co-operation to any moves made to set up an organization for this important purpose in the South-East. They have expressed concern that, arising from what they have learnt at these courses that they have attended, the provision made at the places listed could be highly dangerous in an atomic attack. Will the Premier and his Government look at this matter to see whether the areas listed are the safest places in which to set up such organizations under an atomic attack?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague the Chief Secretary is responsible for civil defence. This question has arisen through the Deputy Police Commissioner being the officer more or less in charge of civil defence in this State. I am prepared to obtain a report from him and his department to see what is involved and what can be evolved.

FETTLERS.

Mr. CORCORAN: I refer to a report that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* stating that five fettlers had been killed in a collision

between a coal train and the motorized trolley on which they were travelling near Gladstone in Queensland yesterday. Because of this, will the Premier inquire of his colleague the Minister of Transport what measures are taken in this State to prevent similar accidents here?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to obtain a report from my colleague but my understanding of the position over the years has been that persons engaged on the permanent way in this State (I speak only from memory but I think I am reasonably accurate) should know the time table and should not travel on any section of the line within 10 minutes of a train's being expected. The only problem about this is that it appears that they are not provided with watches. However, I will obtain a report on the matter and make it available to the House as soon as possible.

MILK REFRIGERATION.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of May 20 regarding milk refrigeration?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have received a letter from Mr. Gale, the Chairman of the Milk Board, which reads:

1. A regulation under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act made on June 28, 1962, states:

"Every person holding a milk producer's licence who requires milk to be collected from his premises in bulk shall supply or have available on the premises specified in such licence a tank or other receptacle (hereinafter called 'a farm milk tank') of such dimensions and constructed of such material and in such manner as the board shall approve for the purpose of storing milk in a manner which will enable the same to be collected in bulk by means of tankers."

The Milk Board is not taking any steps to require a producer to install a bulk farm milk tank; this is considered to be a matter between the producer and the factory concerned. The board has decided, however, that in future where it is intended to introduce bulk tank collection approval will be given only for a refrigerated farm milk tank which complies with Australian Standard Regulation N.46. This decision does not in any way affect the unrefrigerated farm milk tanks already approved and in use by suppliers to the Jervois factory nor with the twice daily pickup as carried out in that area during certain months of the year.

2. The insistence on the future provision of refrigerated farm tanks is part of the board's overall scheme to ensure milk quality at all times during the year. The board is not satisfied that this can be done effectively with the unrefrigerated system referred to above.

3. Despite the relatively high capital cost of refrigerated bulk tanks, this system of bulk collection offers the greatest potential, both in

economy of operation and protection of milk quality.

The honourable member also asked me to give some thought to the Victorian situation. I have had a letter sent to the Victorian Milk Board to see whether I can obtain some information about the position there, but as yet I have not received a reply. However, the situation to which the honourable member refers is one that I am still having investigated and I intend to have a conference in my office with the two factories concerned and the Milk Board at the earliest opportunity.

HOUSING FINANCE.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to my question of May 27 regarding the voluntary savings scheme being approved for the Home Savings Grants Scheme?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Commonwealth Minister for Housing has advised that the basic principle of the Home Savings Grants Scheme was to recognize only savings in identifiable accounts at approved institutions. He considered that the admission of the voluntary savings scheme, which is only available to State Government employees, would mean that a multitude of similar schemes operated by private employers for the benefit of their employees would have to be similarly recognized. This would be a departure from the Commonwealth's basic policy in its Home Savings Grants Scheme, which was to confine acceptable savings accounts to those institutions where the bulk of personal savings were accumulated and which provided a significant proportion of the funds available for housing. The Commonwealth Minister was not prepared to recommend to the Commonwealth Government that moneys accumulated in the voluntary savings scheme be recognized as acceptable savings for the purposes of the Home Savings Grants Scheme.

UPPER SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that the Electricity Trust is using its gang from Murray Bridge to construct what is known as the Wynarka single wire earth return service. This is a good move. Can the Minister of Works ascertain whether the construction of the Parilla s.w.e.r. service could be undertaken by the gang at Lameroo so that the Electricity Trust connections along the Pinnaroo line would be completed by the same date?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall ask the Electricity Trust to consider this matter, and shall inform the honourable member of the reply when I have it.

WATER CHARGES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Recently, it was announced that alterations would be made to water charges and to the minimum charge for a service. Can the Minister of Works say, first, whether the new price of water will apply to all districts? Secondly, will the new minimum charge for a rating on a block apply to all areas? Thirdly, what is the justification for charging a block, which does not receive a service and consequently does not involve any cost for pumping water, the same minimum charge as that for a block which has a water and sewerage service? Lastly, will the House have an opportunity to consider the proposed alterations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The answer to the first question is "Yes". Secondly, the minimum charge applies to all districts. Thirdly, it is considered that it costs as much to take a service past a vacant block as it does to supply a service, so that these charges have been altered. Previously, I think, it was £11 as a minimum for a service, but it was considered that the charge could be reduced, so that for people in humble cottages the charge was reduced to £8.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Your previous statement indicated that it was costly to pump water and this was given as a reason for the increased charge, but it is not necessary to pump water for vacant blocks.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am trying to answer a question and do not intend to enter into a debate. That is my reply, and the decisions were made on that basis.

RELIANCE SHIPPING COMPANY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently relating to the activities of the Reliance Shipping Company?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Commissioner of Police has inquired into the activities of the Reliance Shipping Company. The report indicates that the Reliance Shipping Company is registered as a business name only in this State. Investigations have revealed that this is a section of an organization operated by an individual in this and in the Eastern States. The parent company, also registered as a business name in this State, is known as the Chowilla Timber Supply Company. The report from the Commissioner of Police indicates that there appears to be profit potential in the Chowilla timber scheme. The person operating these organizations has blamed delay in interest payments on his accountants or his clerical

staff. The following is the text of a telegram received from the person conducting the activities of these organizations:

I have noticed by the press that certain of my business activities are the subject of investigation and I hereby wish to state that I am prepared to come to Adelaide within 48 hours notice to place before you or any unbiased expert the correct information you may seek. This offer has been made to the police many times and refused. Should you desire me in this matter I can be contacted at Chowilla's Darlington Point Sawmills, N.S.W.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry in another place, seen the eighth annual report of the President of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and noted the suggestions in the report that it might be advisable for the commission to supply personnel to conciliate in disputes regarding over-award payments? Does the Minister endorse this view and is he prepared to make State arbitration officials available to conciliate in disputes concerning payments in excess of minimum rates fixed by the State wage-fixing tribunals and invite disputing parties to submit any claims for over-award payments to any personnel appointed to conciliate in such matters?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Labour and Industry, and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

INDUSTRIAL COURT.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry an answer to my question of June 16 as to whether his department has considered appointing a Deputy President of the Industrial Court?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Minister of Labour and Industry informs me that the appointment of a Deputy President of the Industrial Court has been under consideration by the Government.

COMPUTER.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that the Government is purchasing and will shortly be installing a computer of considerable dimension to assist various Government departments in their billing and accounting sections according to the latest developments in business administration. Will the Premier say what progress has been made in installing the machine, when it will operate, what the ultimate cost of the project will be (realizing

what savings it will effect), and whether competent staff of the Public Service is being trained to operate the machine?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report on some of the questions asked by the honourable member. However, I would have expected him to know that the previous Government arranged to purchase this machine, and it would have known the cost. I will do my best to supply the information.

WALLAROO.

Mr. HUGHES: Certain problems in my district require the first-hand knowledge of the Minister of Works and Marine, which can be gained only from an inspection by the Minister. Will he therefore consider visiting my district soon so that I may discuss these problems with him on the spot?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member certainly has one or two problems in his district that he has brought to my notice, and I think he will be pleased to hear that, after discussing these with departmental officials, I have decided to visit the district. When the time is arranged, I shall be happy to advise him so that he will be able to accompany me and my officers when we make an inspection to gain first-hand knowledge of the district's problems.

WATER STORAGEES.

Mr. CLARK: I am sure that every member has been delighted and thrilled by the bountiful rain we have had in the last 48 hours. Can the Minister of Works inform the House how much rain fell in the reservoir catchment areas and what the present holdings of the reservoirs are?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We all deeply appreciate the recent rains, which I hope will be followed up with further substantial falls. The rain that fell in the Mount Bold area was 91 points, at Happy Valley 70 points, at Myponga 69 points, at Millbrook 73 points, and at Thorndon Park 73 points.

As regards metropolitan reservoir storages, at this stage last year Mount Bold reservoir held 2,436,000,000 gallons compared with 3,697,000,000 gallons yesterday, June 21; Happy Valley reservoir last year held 2,846,000,000 gallons compared with 2,519,000,000 gallons yesterday; Clarendon Weir held 57,000,000 gallons last year, and 69,000,000 gallons yesterday; Myponga reservoir last year held 2,884,000,000 gallons while yesterday it held 2,759,000,000 gallons. Millbrook

reservoir last year held 431,000,000 gallons compared with 618,000,000 gallons yesterday. Hope Valley reservoir last year held 546,000,000 gallons, this year 458,000,000 gallons; and Thorndon Park reservoir last year at this stage held 136,000,000 gallons compared with 127,000,000 gallons yesterday. Those are the figures for the main metropolitan reservoirs. The catchment was only minute. It will be appreciated that a substantial fall has to occur before a great run-off is effected. The increase is about 18,000,000 gallons for the total catchment for the reservoirs.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: In view of the very beneficial rains on Eyre Peninsula from an agricultural point of view, can the Minister of Works say whether any water was caught in the Kimba catchment area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have no figures for Kimba particularly, but I will obtain them. My limited experience in regard to catchments leads me to believe substantial rains must occur to allow an appreciable run-off. The honourable member will agree that the area to which he refers absorbs water rapidly and that much rain is required before a run-off occurs.

Mr. Bockelberg: They have some well prepared runs.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, but I think any intake in that area from the general rains we have had would be limited.

TEA TREE GULLY HOSPITAL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When recently the Minister of Health was asked when the Tea Tree Gully hospital would be ready for occupation, he answered in these words, "Your guess is as good as mine." That seems to imply much vagueness about the proposal and, as I understand that a hospital that was being built was discontinued after the election, will the Premier take up with the Minister of Health the recommencement of the previously proposed hospital so that the people of that area will at least have some hospital facilities available to them in the reasonably near future?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A further explanation is needed. As the Government has been questioned on many matters arising from the election campaign, I desire to indicate firmly that the Government is still prepared, and is endeavouring, to honour its election promises in respect of two major hospitals. One was to be a general hospital somewhere in the Tea Tree Gully or Modbury area, the other was to be a teaching hospital erected on a site

as near as practicable to the university at Bedford Park. I say that broadly. In regard to the former, I hasten to assure the Leader of the Opposition that the site selected did not meet with Cabinet approval, but negotiations are proceeding to find a suitable site for a general hospital in that area. As soon as a suitable site has been found, the matter is expected to be referred to the Public Works Committee as the cost will exceed £100,000. As soon as possible thereafter the work will proceed. I assure the honourable member that the Government is mindful of this promise and that it intends to honour it as soon as it is humanly possible to do so.

UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Works say when a reference will be sent to the Public Works Committee regarding the construction of another bridge across the Upper Murray River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter has not been considered as yet by Cabinet. The honourable member will appreciate that we are conscious of the need for another bridge. However, other circumstances must be considered. As the honourable member has raised the matter I will bring it forward for discussion by Cabinet and inform him of the outcome.

OODNADATTA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Works a report on the proposal to increase the water supply in the township of Oodnadatta?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have not got a prepared report, but I am fairly sure of the facts. I thank the honourable member for the great interest that he has shown in this matter and for the work that he has done for his constituents. The position is that, because of the work done by him, I have been able to approve a scheme costing about £6,000. The work will be commenced in September and every endeavour will be made to have the scheme operating next summer.

SERVICE PAY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question concerns service pay, which matter was discussed during the debate on the Supplementary Estimates. At that time I drew attention to a number of anomalies that had arisen as the result of Cabinet decisions. The Premier said that these anomalies would be examined and that in due course I would receive some information concerning their treatment. Since then I have received a copy

of a circular that has gone to all departments. However, it does not deal with the anomalies that have arisen, and I have not seen a subsequent statement dealing with them other than one statement to the effect that the service pay will not be available retrospectively to employees of the Municipal Tramways Trust and that it will be available to them only as from next financial year. I assure the Premier, from my personal knowledge, that there is much discontent in various Government departments where some employees are receiving service pay retrospectively while others, working next to them, have had no service pay, retrospectively or otherwise. I assure the Premier that in the Government service at present there is much disappointment that the retrospective pay was not brought in without creating many anomalies. For example, one anomaly causing concern is associated with a person in charge of other people receiving a lower rate of pay than those he controls. I know that the Premier knows something of these anomalies. Can he say whether action has been taken to correct them, whether it will be administrative action, or whether it will be done through a tribunal? If the action is to be through a tribunal, will it have the power to make the payments retrospective?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is not possible for me to know what recommendations will be made by a tribunal. Service pay was of paramount importance in the Labor Party's policy prior to its being elected to govern this State. To the best of my knowledge that policy has been honoured. It provided for service payments to weekly and daily paid employees, as from January 1 of this year. However, we went further than that. When the matter was introduced it was stated that service pay would be paid up to the pay period finishing about March 28 or 29, and from the next pay period service pay would be included for overtime, etc. To the best of my knowledge that policy was implemented, and provision was made for it in the Supplementary Estimates, which were approved by the House.

I know some people are not satisfied with what has been done under this policy and that anomalies will occur. It is Government policy that such persons receiving salaries should approach the appropriate tribunal to have the matter adjusted. The Government will not make suggestions to salaried officers about service pay, as this matter was never mentioned in our policy. I believe that there are competent people among the salaried officers' group who should know

to which tribunal an approach should be made. After these matters have been considered and there are failures somewhere along the line we are prepared to consider what we think will be fair play in this matter. As a Government we have honoured an election promise, and we did not go beyond it in connection with the service payments.

FREE MILK.

Mr. CURREN: My question relates to the supply of free milk to school children in South Australia. Can the Minister of Education answer the following questions: What is the source of the funds used to pay for the milk; what is the total cost of the milk supplied in each of the last two financial years; what is the cost to the Education Department; what is the daily consumption during the current year; how many schools are supplied; how many are not supplied; and, finally, how many children are not being supplied with milk?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member.

UPPER STURT ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The other day one of my constituents, who lives on Upper Sturt Road at what can be called, I think, Belair or Sun Valley, contacted me to say that a rumour was circulating to the effect that the Highways Department proposed to resume 17ft. on the western side of the road, that is, on the side opposite the National Park boundary, along which Upper Sturt Road runs at this point. As it would severely interfere with the value of my constituent's property (and, of course, of many other properties) if a strip as wide as this were resumed, will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads obtain a report to ascertain whether, in fact, such a resumption is contemplated? If it is, will he inquire when it is likely that the land will be required?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will obtain a report from my colleague on this matter.

RAILWAYS.

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. Has a survey been taken to establish the percentage of road trailers travelling interstate *via* Murray Bridge that could be "pick-a-backed" by rail?

2. Has the South Australian Railways suitable rolling stock to undertake such an operation?

3. Would tunnel clearance be a limiting factor?

4. Could these tunnels be enlarged?

5. What would be the approximate cost of this work?

6. Has serious consideration been given to carrying out such work?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. A survey was undertaken a few years ago.

2. Yes.

3. Yes, together with other structures.

4. It is not practicable to enlarge the single track tunnels under traffic.

5. See reply to 4.

6. No.

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. Can any more overnight movements be made on the section of railway between Taillem Bend and Serviceton?

2. Would the installation of electric signalling equipment along this section allow more movements to be made?

3. Has consideration been given to the installation of such electric signalling devices?

4. If so, what would be the approximate cost and how long would it take to make the change-over from the present system?

5. Would the cost be justified?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. Not with the existing station spacing.

2. Yes.

3. Yes; studies are currently in hand.

4. Not known until the studies are complete.

5. See reply to 4.

HOUSING TRUST HOUSES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice): What was the average accepted tender price for all types of Housing Trust houses for each of the last five three-monthly periods ending May, 1965?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Chairman, South Australian Housing Trust, reports:

	£
1/3/1964 to 31/5/1964	2,378
1/6/1964 to 31/8/1964	2,669
1/9/1964 to 30/11/1964	2,220
1/12/1964 to 28/2/1965	4,063

(This applies only to 13 special sale houses of larger types all in the country.)

1/3/1965 to 31/5/1965 2,636

The above prices do not include items supplied by the Housing Trust such as baths, basins, etc.

SEAT BELTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is a proclamation to be made bringing into operation that section of the Road Traffic

Act providing for the fitting of seat belts in motor vehicles?

2. If so, when will the proclamation be made?

3. What date will be specified in the proclamation as that after which seat belts must be fitted?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This matter is currently before Cabinet and when a decision has been reached it will be made known.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WALLAROO INDUSTRY.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): Last Friday there appeared in the *Advertiser* a report of certain points made by various speakers in the Address in Reply debate on the previous day. The report stated:

The Minister of Works (Mr. Hutchens) said United States interests would purchase land at Wallaroo for industrial purposes if a natural-gas pipeline was laid from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. The interests had recently renewed for a few months options on land owned by the Wallaroo Rifle Club and that of a nearby farmer. Mr. Hutchens said Dinning Foundries Pty. Ltd., of Croydon and Port Adelaide, had taken over a foundry that had closed at Wallaroo last year and in an extended programme would do part of its work there.

The Minister of Works has not as yet spoken in this debate, and I inform the House that I was the person responsible for having said those words in the debate last Thursday, as I do not want the Minister to be involved in years to come as a result of this report. I ask that the report be rectified.

ELECTRICITY TRUST FUEL SUPPLIES.

Notice of Motion, Other Business: The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford to move:

That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be set up to investigate and report to Parliament on what action should now be taken to ensure that adequate supplies of fuel are made available to the Electricity Trust of South Australia to enable power charges to be maintained on a competitive basis with those applying in other States.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That this Notice of Motion be postponed and taken into account after consideration of Orders of the Day, Government Business.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): If the Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to recognize the normal practice in this House, I am not prepared to accept this motion until the appropriate time. He has the opportunity to make this an Order of the Day for a Wednesday afternoon. He is

well acquainted with the practice in these matters, and if he wants to test the House today he is at liberty to do so. This is not a threat. He is no different from any other private member, and time will be made available for private members' business when the House has completed the Address in Reply debate. If the Leader desires to give notice that on a certain Wednesday he will move this motion, I think the Notice Paper can be arranged accordingly.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have listened to the Premier with amazement. What I am doing is completely in accordance with a resolution carried by this House, and with Standing Orders. The resolution carried is to the effect that on all days except Wednesday afternoons Government business takes precedence over other members' business. In accordance with that, I moved that the Notice of Motion under my name be taken into consideration after Government business. What the Premier is growling about I do not know. For his further information, I have already told the Clerk of the House that, if we come to it today, I propose to ask that it be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow because I realize, as every honourable member realizes, that this cannot be debated until the Address in Reply has been concluded. If the Premier thinks he will prevent matters from coming before this House by getting up in his place and objecting to them, he will find that we can be just as unco-operative as he is—and more so, because we understand Standing Orders just as much as he does. This Parliament has the right to debate matters of public importance and not only matters brought forward by the Government. So, if the Premier thinks he is going to stifle debate here, he has another think coming.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 17. Page 428.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I draw the attention of the Minister of Works to the supply of water for some towns in my district, which I have been concerned about for a number of years. The township of Terowie, situated about 140 miles north of Adelaide, is in the throes of the rail standardization programme between Broken Hill and Port Pirie. Whilst it is not on the direct road between Broken Hill and Port Pirie, it still links up with the

standardization programme, in that the broad gauge line, which now extends from Adelaide to Terowie, will be extended to Peterborough, which means that the change of gauge will be moved from Terowie to Peterborough.

The Leader of the Opposition will recall that a deputation waited on him as early as 1938, when the first move was made for a reticulated water supply for Terowie. Strangely enough, when a combined water programme was mooted later (and, I understand, was actually approved by the former State Government) to provide Peterborough with Murray water on the basis of a shandy, which now exists there, the programme also provided for a water supply from Belalie to Terowie; but, unfortunately, one landholder in the district opposed this scheme from Belalie to Terowie. I understand he had some pull in Government departments. If honourable members desire me to do so, I can mention names but I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. Clark: Was it pull or influence?

Mr. CASEY: It was pull and influence: he had the influence and he got the pull. Because one landowner did not wish to pay rates on the main, the scheme was thrown out by the former Government. Terowie has a good power supply but no water. I think that in fairness to these small country towns, not only in the north of the State, but also in other parts, they should be provided with a reticulated water supply. Their requirements are not large; I estimate that the daily water consumption at Terowie would be between 30,000 and 40,000 gallons. At present about 100 houses are occupied at Terowie and that does not include business premises and two hotels.

Terowie's future will be determined by what happens to the town when the broad gauge is extended to Peterborough. I look upon it as a challenge to members and to the rest of the community to see that small towns do not fall by the wayside. A typical example of this is what happened at Quorn and I do not want to see the same thing happen at Terowie. Many people work in the district and they look upon Terowie as their town. Many of those who work on the railways at Terowie will possibly be moved to Peterborough when the broad gauge goes through to that centre. As the majority of them own their own houses in Terowie they should not be asked to pick up their sticks and move to another town. They could still own their own houses in Terowie and travel the short distance of 14 miles to Peterborough to their work and return in

the evening. Therefore, I draw the Minister's attention to this matter and ask him to see whether a small water reticulation scheme can be implemented for Terowie.

Last week, in the House, I said that some small towns in America with populations ranging from 2,500 to 6,000 had their own desalination plants, which have been paid for by the ratepayers in four or five years. If that is the way people are treated in some other countries in the world, then there is no earthly reason why something could not be done for some of our people. The Peterborough water supply can be improved. The shandy system was probably suggested because of lack of public money. I was not a member of Parliament at the time, so I cannot be sure. However, I believe this system is most undesirable because people at a distance from the main get a higher salt content in their water than do those along the main. The main from Belalie to Peterborough is asbestos and could be removed easily. I suggest that the Government should consider the advisability of enlarging this to a 12in. main. This should have been the size in the first place instead of the Government's merely saying that it would do what it could at the time. This showed a failure to look ahead and face the future.

If a dry period is experienced in the North-East of the State (and it has happened many times in the past), the railways will have to carry up to 160,000 gallons of water a day on the line. This would cause a real problem as adequate water is not available. Peterborough would be the nearest centre and the easiest from which to carry the water. Over the past five years 2,500,000 gallons of water a year were carted to Terowie. Therefore, a water supply at Terowie is a necessity. I made certain recommendations to the former Minister of Works, and I have now made them to the present Minister. I outlined several schemes that could be implemented to ensure water being available for Terowie. I understand that the Minister has considered this problem, and I hope that his report will be favourable for the people of Terowie.

A power supply for railway residences at Olary is urgently required. I spoke to the former Premier about this, but when the request was made to the Commissioner of Railways it was refused. Why, I shall never know. I asked the previous Minister of Agriculture to ask the previous Minister of Railways whether electric power supplied by the Agriculture Department to the fruit fly block could be available for railway employees

at Olary. This is the only town in the North where people do not have an electricity supply. The Highways Department established a reasonably large camp in the town and immediately had electric power supplied by its power plant. A section of the railway standardization gang stationed at Olary was provided immediately with gas lighting. However, the permanent railway employees at Olary are still using kerosene lamps. The engines that are not being used at Cockburn, and which supplied that town with power, should be used at Olary to provide power not only for railway employees but for others. These engines are large enough to produce sufficient power to supply many consumers.

The honourable member for Alexandra referred to the drought in the Far North and North-East. I did not understand whether he meant along the Cockburn track or in the Far North-East on the Innamincka side. The North-East of this State takes in a vast area.

Mr. Clark: You represent the North, don't you?

Mr. CASEY: Yes, I do. I do not think the drought in South Australia is anywhere near as serious as in, say, the north-western, western and northern parts of New South Wales, where the people in those areas are in a different category altogether from us. I think the honourable member for Alexandra would agree with that because, while many store cattle are coming from the north, a big percentage are coming from the Cordillo Downs station in the Far North-East, which is part of Beltana Pastoral Company holding. Strangely enough, at this time last year they were sending down quality fat cattle. They were probably over-stocked, because they did move many stock from Murnpeowie and Cordillo Downs right up in that far northern corner.

On the other hand, cattlemen told me last week that fats were being brought down. Admittedly, they are in limited supply because the herds have been depleted over the years. I think that the drought in the Far North of the State three years ago was far more severe than the present drought. Nevertheless, conditions there are bad. A couple of weeks ago we had the statement that people concerned with Macumba station had only 500 head of cattle. That station, unfortunately, has been in the grip of a bad drought for the past 10 years. I have been on that property several times in the last three or four

years and have seen for myself just how serious are the conditions.

I think the honourable member for Alexandra was trying to hop on the band-waggon of the present general drought throughout Australia which drought extends from Queensland and which is particularly bad in New South Wales. In fact, it is absolutely shocking there, because certain parts of that State that have a normal annual rainfall of 30in. to 40in. have had no rain at all so far this year. One cannot possibly compare those conditions with conditions in some parts of this State that receive an annual rainfall of only about 5in. We must be fair on this score and must not compare the conditions in our Far North and North-East with those in the drought-stricken areas of New South Wales as they apply today. While dealing with land matters, I compliment the member for Victoria on his speech. He showed an excellent knowledge of his district. I think his district could become an important producer of beef cattle.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Now you are on the right track!

Mr. CASEY: I am glad the honourable member for Alexandra gives me credit for something. He tells me that I am on the right track but I assure him that I was on the right track before, too, and I can also tell the honourable member that I will be on that track in about two weeks' time, when I see the situation for myself at first hand. In fact, the Minister of Lands is going and he invited me to go along. That is more than the previous Minister of Lands did when he planned to tour my district.

I think the district of Victoria and adjacent South-Eastern districts will become a large beef-producing area in the future. I am sorry that I shall not be able to attend the beef sales that I understand will be held in that area later this year, because I think that if we are to produce a good type of beef in this State we must secure a particularly good strain of sire in the beef industry. I think beef has a great future in South Australia particularly. Our State, perhaps, lags behind the other States in the quantity of top grade beef produced and I think that force feeding in pens has possibilities, not for the immediate future but in later years. After seeing that system operating in parts of America, I think that such a programme could become a big industry in South Australia, which is situated more or less in the centre of the continent and is thus able to serve both the east and the west.

Cattle fattening is big business in America. For example, in the State of Nebraska, particularly around the capital, Lincoln, and another big city, Omaha, the whole income of the farmers on which they support their families comes from the turnover of force-feeding cattle. The number of cattle held ranges from 500 to 1,000 and the farmers produce fodder, store it in silos and feed it to the cattle by means of feed boxes in fairly small yards. They are not pens in the true sense of the word; we would refer to them as "cattle yards". These farmers grow corn on a big scale but their farms are not big. They range from, say, 250 acres, and 500 acres would be a large farm in parts of Nebraska. Of course, that State is referred to as the beef cattle State.

On the west coast of the United States, the Californian side, there are some huge cattle force-feeding places. I was privileged to visit one situated about 35 miles east of San Francisco and owned by a Mr. McDougall, who was in Australia only last year. He was the guest of Sir William Gunn and toured a considerable part of Queensland. He was greatly impressed by what he saw and told me that he hoped to come back next year to see whether he could interest himself in some beef cattle in this country. To give honourable members some idea of the size of this man's undertaking outside San Francisco, I point out that he force-feeds 45,000 head of cattle every year—and he is not the largest operator. Mr. McDougall's is a private undertaking, but companies farther down the coast fatten over 100,000 head of cattle a year. Honourable members might well ponder the possibility of developing the potential that exists in this country, although I do not think the time for this type of undertaking has yet arrived. However, I think that experiments of this nature would be useful at this stage, and, indeed, I think the district of the member for Chaffey might well be suitable for such experiments (from my observations, and from comparing our State with what I saw in America), because one of the basic ingredients necessary for cattle fattening is, of course, lucerne.

Mr. McKee: Do they give them grapefruit over there?

Mr. CASEY: No, but they use citrus fruit, the skin of which contains a high concentrate of carbohydrates (one of the major ingredients used in cattle fattening in United States), which is also obtained from corn and barley. In addition, concentrated feed is manufactured by certain companies there, similar to Meggitts'

nuts here. In America I saw cattle which had been in pens for about 60 days, and which had increased in weight by 200 lb. in that time. It is estimated that over 120 days the weight of these cattle would increase by 400 lb. live weight. Incidentally, all cattle in America are weighed on the hoof, in contrast to the Australian method of weighing on the hook (or dressed weight).

Mr. Ryan: Which do you think is the better proposition?

Mr. CASEY: I have always thought that for the producer to get the best value for his cattle the best method is to weigh it on the hook.

Mr. Ryan: How does that affect the retailer and the consumer?

Mr. CASEY: Americans do not buy beef under the same system as we buy it in Australia. For example, I saw a cattle sale in Omaha (which, incidentally, is proud to have the largest cattle selling yards in the world) where the yards hold about 35,000 head of cattle, and where sales are conducted five days a week. Of course, 35,000 head of cattle are not in the yards at the same time on any given day, but many thousands are. The seller brings in his cattle and places them in the hands of the agents, about 35 of whom have headquarters there, and who auction the cattle at so many cents a pound to the prospective buyer. A man may pay 26 cents a pound for a line of cattle in the pen (the beasts having been knocked down at that figure on a live-weight basis). Similarly, buyers will offer the owner of force-fed cattle (or the man in charge of a force-feeding farm) so many cents a pound; the cattle are then weighed (live weight) and the owner is paid accordingly. I also had the privilege of inspecting Swifts, a large meat-packing firm in San Francisco.

Mr. Ryan: One of the largest in the world.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, where pigs, sheep and cattle are killed. That organization also has many slaughtering houses at other places, particularly around San Francisco.

Mr. Ryan: Is this killing undertaken privately?

Mr. CASEY: Everything is done on the site.

Mr. Ryan: By the State or by private enterprise?

Mr. CASEY: Privately. I do not know whether this is the system in all cities, but it is the system also applying in Nebraska. Around the cattle yards in Omaha a person may obtain killed and dressed meat at as many as 12 meat-packing places. In San Francisco there are individual packing houses which

have contracts with some of the large supermarkets throughout the country, and which kill the cattle, sheep and hogs (we call them pigs), dress them, and hang them in the meat halls, where they are inspected and branded according to their quality. Woolworths may order 20 carcasses of beef, weighing between 450 and 550 lb. The man with the order then brands the carcasses in the meat hall with the Woolworth stamp and conforms to Woolworths' requirements.

Mr. Ryan: Wouldn't that prevent racketeering in retail prices, where quality is a factor?

Mr. CASEY: I think this is one of the best methods of letting the consuming public buy what it wants. Unfortunately, today in most parts of Australia we often see a sign on the butcher's shop window "First-grade Quality Meats", but when we go inside to purchase a piece of steak we could be getting anything. We have no guarantee of what we are buying, because we have no choice. With the grading of meat the consumer can say that he wants a choice cut, first-quality cut or second-quality cut, and this is what will eventuate in South Australia. A new firm has commenced at Gepps Cross in conjunction with South Australian pastoralists, and has been functioning for some years in Western Australia. I think it is the Neilson organization, and it is doing exceptionally well. When a producer wishes to sell his meat for slaughter he can say to this firm, "I have a beast which I want slaughtered." He would not do that unless the beast were in very good condition, and the firm pays him according to the quality of the meat and the weight of the beast as it hangs on the hook after dressing.

I pay my respects to the Acting Speaker, whom I omitted in the opening part of my remarks, and congratulate him on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. I know that he will do what he can to maintain the dignity of this Parliament. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I associate myself with the remarks made by previous speakers on both sides of the House about our loyalty to the Throne and about several other matters on which every member agrees. I join in conveying good wishes to those mentioned by previous speakers. I express my appreciation of the wonderful work His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan are doing. I also congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election. I have no doubt that you will carry out your duties capably

and impartially, and I am pleased that you have been appointed. I congratulate your colleague, the member for Adelaide, on his appointment as Chairman of Committees, and extend my good wishes to members of the Ministry. I am ready to criticize, and undoubtedly will criticize, their actions and policy, but I hope I will not criticize them personally. I have nothing but goodwill towards the Ministers, whom I believe are energetic and conscientious men. In some ways I envy them the hard work they have ahead of them, although, on the other hand, I must to a degree sympathize with them, as I know that being a Cabinet Minister is an exacting job that entails responsibilities in many directions. I hope they will accept my good wishes.

I also wish to say a few words of praise for the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Thomas Playford, who is one of the outstanding personalities in South Australia's history. Every member on this side of the House has the deepest admiration for him, and I believe this is shared by a large proportion of the people of this State. Many of the matters for which he is appreciated are still to some degree in the realms of Party politics, and it may therefore be too much to expect that the members of the present Government or their supporters will appreciate everything he has done. Nevertheless, he has a wide field of admirers for the work he has done and is still doing. My views will not necessarily be agreed with by every member, but I believe that one of his most courageous decisions was to carry on in Government after the 1962 election. He rightly decided then that what constituted a Government was the Party that controlled the greatest number of supporters in the House; if it could command a majority it was in business. He decided he was in business, and carried on with courage and wisdom. As a result, the State was given three years of government which, in the opinion of most people, was good government. I recognize that some will disagree with that view, so there is no point in going into it in detail. After all, history is one thing; what is happening now and what should be happening in the future are our concern.

I suppose there are many outstanding characteristics about Sir Thomas, but one of them is his ability to get people to work with him. That was obviously how he was able to carry on with such a great degree of success in Parliament. His handling of the Parliamentary situation would be a lesson to any

statesman in any Parliament based on our type of Constitution. The new Government, to the Ministers of which I have offered my personal congratulations, would do well to emulate him, particularly his handling of the House. He achieved most of his results by gaining agreement from both sides. Sometimes a disagreement occurred and a vote was taken, but often decisions were made with the full agreement of both sides. This was done often by prior discussion and because all members trusted Sir Thomas, when Premier, to carry out his agreements. He was sympathetic to the views of private members on both sides of the House, and time and time again in the last few years I have seen him put that attitude into practice in the running of Parliament.

The new Government, I think, has started a little shakily in this respect. There is no point in over-emphasizing these things, but on the first day of Parliament members of the Opposition were startled at the attitude of the new Government towards them. Perhaps the Government expected some dire opposition from us; I do not know. On the first day of Parliament I think the Premier stated when the House would rise. He did not consult the Opposition, but said that if the Opposition wanted it that way it could have it. He said straight away that the House would rise at 6 o'clock, and that was that. I think he said that the Opposition had usurped the time of Parliament. This was not very thoughtful of our rights, and I hope that that attitude will not continue. Honourable members will recall that when the previous Premier wished the House to sit to dispose of a measure by a certain time he asked members if they were prepared to sit until a specified hour, or to sit later on other occasions. This was done with little fuss. It could be done again if the Government considered the wishes of the Opposition in these matters of sitting and speaking.

The new Government made a fearsome list of promises in order to attain the Treasury benches. That list I have not seen as one document, but it would be lengthy. I hope it can be carried out. Undoubtedly, the present Government started, in the Premier's policy speech, by accepting all the promises of the Playford Government and dismissing them as administrative matters that the Labor Government would honour. That will give it much work because, although considered administrative, the list of undertakings announced by Sir

Thomas Playford was considerable. Honourable members can be sure that, knowing the Treasury as he did, he knew what he was capable of providing, should he be returned to office. He expected to be returned and he could have carried out those undertakings.

The Premier undertook to implement those promises of Sir Thomas and, in addition, announced many new ones that he would fulfil. I noticed again and again his use of the word "immediately". Since the election the Premier has stated that he did not have to carry out his promises immediately but that he had three years in which to carry them out. Undoubtedly he may have three years in which to carry out many of them, but when one says "immediately" one normally means "immediately", and people interpret it in that way. I presume that many things that the Premier stated he would do immediately have not yet been done. I do not know what stage they have reached. The use of the word "immediately" in the Premier's policy speech was frequent. For instance, there was much to be done without delay with hospitals. There was to be an immediate increase in health matters. The Government infirmary accommodation was to be increased. Two major hospitals were announced, one at Tea Tree Gully (about which we have heard much since) and one near Bedford Park. In a number of matters the Government's policy speech makes strange reading in the light of what has happened since. Amongst other things I noticed that the Premier was rather tough on the Railways Commissioner. He accused him of inefficiency. I do not know what he has done about it since, whether he has straightened him up or what has happened, but I have not heard more about it since the election. However, in the Premier's view, when he made his policy speech, the Railways Commissioner was inefficient. I thought that a surprising statement.

Another point made by the Premier in his policy speech which interested me was that Labor had always been opposed to Executive control. He said that to make the point that it should be Parliament and not the Executive that gained the greater control. I propose, shortly, to mention some of the things which have been done without reference to Parliament and in which I think Executive control has played a major significant part. But, before doing so, I stress how important it is that we in this State remember the value of primary production. If we do not watch the fortunes of our primary industries, we shall surely lose

our living standards. That applies to the whole of Australia, not only to this State. The primary industries are all-important to maintain our present living standards. Having said that, I turn to the portfolios of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands. Again, I offer my best wishes to the Minister personally and, whilst I hope at times to criticize his policies and actions, I hope not to criticize him as a person. I will go further, and say that the Minister is a capable man who, I believe, is doing a conscientious and energetic job.

Having said that, I now point out that he is doing two jobs, as they were in the last Government and as they mostly have been throughout the history of this State. The Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands each has a separate and full-time job. He is the one with whom the primary producers have the closest contact and to whom they look for the answers to nearly all their questions. Whereas there were two Ministers, now there is only one. In reply to a question that I asked, the Premier stated it was to be a temporary situation. It may be so in his view, but it has persisted for some time. It depends on the outcome of many legislative actions within this Parliament, so we do not know how long it will last; but many urgent problems are awaiting attention by Ministers at the moment. The Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture have difficult problems to attend to now. First of all, in spite of what the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) has said, I maintain there is a very serious drought in the far North-East of South Australia. The custodian of the far North-East (in fact, of almost the whole of the pastoral country in South Australia) is regarded as being the Minister of Lands, who administers the leases of all those properties outside the farming belt. From the discussion this afternoon, it appears that the Minister of Lands proposes to visit soon some territory in the far North-East. I think I heard the interjection correctly. Earlier in the day I had asked the Premier if he would give members from both sides of the House an opportunity to visit this territory now. I shall return later to the drought in the North-East but I mention, in passing, that that is one of the responsibilities claiming the urgent attention of the Minister of Lands. Also, as Minister of Agriculture, he has other problems to deal with. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) has from time to time raised in this House the question whether a silo

is to be built at Apilla. That has been often discussed in the House, and I believe the honourable member for Rocky River is still not satisfied with the replies that he has received. It is a pressing problem that requires the attention of the Minister of Agriculture.

A problem that has concerned the Minister and me in recent months (and, perhaps, in recent years) is the egg marketing scheme, and this has the attention of the Minister at the moment. I shall not discuss it at great length but I will make a few points about it. A decision has been made to proceed with the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities scheme. I do not intend to continue with fruitless protests about the way this decision was brought into effect. I believe that there comes a time when the Executive must have its way and, clearly, the Executive is legally correct as far as it has gone. In his policy speech the Premier said that Labor had always been opposed to Executive control. However, in this case Executive control took effect strongly and Parliamentary control not at all.

The egg marketing scheme has been discussed at great length lately and far more than ever before. Many features of the way in which the decision has been carried out are unsatisfactory. "Stabilization", in the marketing of primary products, is a magic word and it was freely used in connection with this scheme. When he is pressed, the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry does not say that this is a stabilization scheme although he sometimes uses the word in his correspondence to describe the scheme. The fact is that everybody wants stable conditions in which to operate and I concur in that view and ambition. I believe that much can be said for providing stable conditions, particularly for a primary product for sale, and they should be conditions in which a primary product can be produced. However, many features of this scheme are anything but stable, and I do not think it would be fair to talk of it as a stabilization scheme in the normally accepted sense of the word. Stabilization of the wheat industry was brought about by legislation setting up the Australian Wheat Board and by complementary legislation that was taken through each of the Houses of Parliament in each of the States. That is a true stabilization scheme and I believe that most people (in South Australia at least) think of that when they talk of stabilization.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Wasn't the Marketing of Eggs Act passed in just that way?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: No, throughout the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, I should say not. If I am correct in my understanding of the Minister's interjection, the Marketing of Eggs Act differs considerably from the wheat stabilization legislation.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Legislation was passed in each State.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We are talking about something that does not matter now. However, the generally accepted idea of stabilization is wheat stabilization or something similar. The C.E.M.A. plan, which will come into effect shortly, could scarcely be more different and still have the description of a marketing scheme. My principal concern is with the right of producers to declare their own opinion of the C.E.M.A. scheme. To my mind, the details of the scheme are in some ways obscure and I have voiced my doubts about that often.

I remind members that over the time that I was Minister of Agriculture I had much to do with negotiating the present agreement between the States. A few years ago the old Egg Marketing Council (I think that that was what it was called) did not include South Australia and we did not have representatives attending its meetings. I believe that it was partly through my efforts that the board in South Australia had representatives attend those meetings, rejoined the council and took part in its discussions. The result of the renewed meetings of the Egg Marketing Council was C.E.M.A. I was one of the Ministers who attended informal meetings and I remember one in Sydney very well. At that meeting we discussed the possibility of the egg industry being organized correctly. One thing that I learned then (and have seen since) was the attitude of the Eastern States towards the smaller States west of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. The Eastern States do not trouble much about South Australia. At one of the meetings that I attended South Australia was attacked for selling egg pulp in the Sydney market. The attack was so blatant that even one of the Victorians present stood up to defend South Australia's right to do this. He pointed out that South Australia had actually pioneered the marketing of egg pulp in Australia and he said that he could

see no reason why it should not be able to continue this practice. It was made abundantly clear at this meeting that most Ministers considered that their State should be a closed market to any but those of their own choosing, and they made it quite clear that they did not want South Australia. At this time South Australia was selling to other States and the other States were selling in South Australia, and that situation has continued. Despite what has been said, other States have been selling shell eggs in South Australia in large quantities and this is through board action in other States.

An Agricultural Council meeting was held in Adelaide in this House of Assembly Chamber and egg marketing was the subject of discussion. I think that this was the last meeting held in Adelaide. Several Ministers attacked South Australia. They had been given part of the story by authorities in their own States and they inferred that South Australia was selling eggs in other States. That was quite correct, but what they did not allow for was that their own State authorities were selling eggs in South Australia. At that time I asked one of our officers to go down the street while the meeting was being held to buy several dozen eggs from various grocers in King William Street and in the city block. He brought them back, and the prices he paid for them indicated a severe under-selling of South Australian eggs. They were stamped with the board stamp of the two States concerned. I put the eggs on the table, and at the tea break the other Ministers saw them. It was something they had not expected and the prices completely surprised them, as they had not been warned that their State boards were taking this action. The Eastern States do not worry about South Australia in many marketing situations. One recent instance was the attempt by New South Wales to prevent South Australian citrus fruit from being sold on the Sydney market. That was a particularly clumsy attempt, and was eventually satisfactorily settled by the action of the present Leader of the Opposition, who took a temperate view. The matter was finally settled to the satisfaction of South Australian producers, but it was not a happy situation, as it was a blatant attempt to shut South Australians out of the Sydney market.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: There has been a change in Government since then.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I refer to this instance to show that we do not receive much consideration from the Eastern

States. Recently, a meeting on egg marketing that I attended was addressed by Mr. K. O. Triggs, the Chairman of the marketing board in New South Wales. He made some solid threats against South Australia, and stated that New South Wales was prepared to undersell South Australian eggs and to continue to do so until the industry was finished in this State. That was an interesting statement to me, as when I was in Canberra in February this year, an egg war was in progress. Mr. Triggs used much the same language in discussing the row he was having about selling eggs in the Australian Capital Territory. From memory, he said that the New South Wales board considered the A.C.T. as part of its market. He is inconsistent, as I am sure he would not like others considering Sydney as part of their market. I asked on one occasion whether we were not all Australians in this matter, and was it their wish to shut the borders completely. I was told that that was what was wanted by the New South Wales Egg Board, and the previous chairman of the board had said that at a meeting.

These incidents illustrate the value of section 92 of the Constitution, and I can imagine the chaos resulting if this section had not operated through most of the history of marketing primary products. On many occasions that section does not operate, and this could happen when a deliberate and well-considered marketing scheme is put into operation. It is not necessary for section 92 to operate always, but it has much value. Personally, I value it considerably, as do most producers in this State. At times, it can operate to our disadvantage when we are trying to introduce organized marketing, but we must ensure that it does not become an obstacle to organized marketing. However, we should never allow section 92 to be taken out of the Constitution. Having experienced other States' attitudes towards their own marketing, I say that the history of marketing would be completely altered in Australia if this happened, and all States would tend to adopt an attitude of restricting their market when it suited them. That situation does not suit the people of Australia. The theory of the C.E.M.A. plan is sound in many respects. It is formed on the basis of a relatively good home market but a relatively poor export market. More eggs are produced than the home market can absorb, and the surplus has to be sold unprofitably for export.

Some private sellers sold their produce in other States on the profitable home market and did not contribute to the loss sustained from

exporting. This loss was borne by the organized marketing authorities which now want to ensure that this loss is shared by all. Instead of taxing eggs that come to the board, provision is made for a tax on birds so that, wherever the eggs are sold, the owner will pay a tax to support those selling on the oversea market. The plan has much merit, but I was not prepared to commit South Australian producers to many details of the scheme until I knew more about it. I asked for (and it took several years to get the answer) an official statement about the amount of the poultry levy for the first 12 months of operation. That answer was received during 1964. As a result of this information and of the answers to other questions, the Government at that time agreed that a poll was a satisfactory means of ascertaining the wishes of producers. A Bill was introduced stating that all those who would be levied under the scheme (at that time the owners of 50 birds) would have the right to vote in a poll of producers. The Bill was passed unanimously by this House.

Apart from the smaller producers, every one of those who followed it was satisfied. They were to be asked their opinion on the scheme. It was a two-Party scheme, so to speak, because it was a unanimous decision of both Houses. Everybody was satisfied about it. At the meeting the other night a speaker from another State was asked why he had only just started to take an interest in the C.E.M.A. plan and why he withheld his protest until recently. He replied, in effect, "We have been rather lax about this. We depended on South Australia to decide this scheme for us." In other words, they knew that the vote was to be taken in South Australia, that there would be a discussion on the merits of the scheme before the vote was taken, and that the producers would decide; without South Australia, the scheme would not proceed.

Although the proposal was supported unanimously by both Houses in South Australia, it was not popular with members of C.E.M.A. or with the Commonwealth Government. Time and time again I heard people, some of whom I can name, say, "If you have a poll, you will lose the scheme." I am not sure why they assumed that and I do not know that it was an accurate assumption at all. However, people thought that and, therefore, went on to attack the proposal to hold a poll. That is the absolute opposite of any policy declared by any Party in this State. No-one has ever before openly adopted the attitude that if you let people have a vote, they may vote the wrong

way. There was some inference (and I am not sure that it was more than that) that the poll might have been held before the last State election and I think there was a slightly stronger inference that it could have been held if I, as Minister at the time, had wanted it to be held.

I tell honourable members that I spoke in good faith and, when I brought in the Bill providing for a poll, I would not have been likely to go to all that trouble just to do a little bit of grand-standing. I was completely sincere and a poll was to have been held but, as things turned out, a poll could have been fairly conducted by only the State Returning Officer. It was made clear to me that he was extremely busy at the time a poll could otherwise have been held. It could have been held in February this year had there not been a State election. It could have been quite easily held since the election and, in fact, whilst I knew that there would be a State election some time in the early part of 1965, I did not at that time know exactly when that State election would be held. However, I knew that whatever happened, a poll on the egg marketing scheme, as well as a State poll, could be held and a decision made in time to have the C.E.M.A. scheme brought into operation by July 1. If the former Government had been returned to office, a poll would have been held and decided by now.

There was unanimous support for this scheme in both Houses of Parliament and I can find no reference by any member of the present Government during the State election campaign to the possibility of dispensing with the poll for this egg scheme. Although I have looked through the remarks of some of the present Ministers, I have seen nothing to that effect. If they knew at that time that it was to be dispensed with should Labor become the Government, they kept it a very close secret. It might be that they decided after the election to dispense with the poll. I ask the Government whether it thinks that is doing the right thing by the people in the industry. Parliament gave a unanimous verdict in favour of holding a poll, a State election campaign was held, when there was no suggestion of dispensing with the poll, the election was won by the present Government and within a few days of Labor's assuming office, it was declared that there was to be no poll. Does that tally with the statement by the present Minister in his Policy Speech that "Labor has always been opposed to Executive control"?

To my mind, it is one of the worst misuses of Executive control and should not have occurred. It has been done now and will not be undone, and I want Government members to accept the responsibility for having disfranchised the producers in the poultry industry. I am not greatly concerned with the provisions of the scheme but am more concerned about whether the producers have a voice in accepting the scheme. The former Government has stated frequently that the policy of the Party on this side of the House is that producers should control their own marketing schemes and that those marketing schemes should be brought in only at the wish of the producer, not without it. This scheme will produce some unusual effects and we do not yet know the full implications of it. In the first place, it has broken completely new ground in my experience by putting a head tax on livestock. I do not know of any other industry that has ever had a similar system. There are slaughter levies on cattle, sheep and swine, sales levies on swine, levies on eggs delivered and so on, but I have no knowledge of a scheme involving a specific tax upon every head of livestock in a prescribed class, that is to say, the six-months-old hen. Nobody knows what the full effect of this will be. We do not know how many "producers" there are, in the literal definition of the word. We are not sure who is a producer and who is not and the confusion has been added to by contradictory answers given in this House by the Minister during last week. All we know is that the owners of more than 20 fowls will be subject to a tax if those fowls are domesticated, if they are six months old, and if they are kept for commercial purposes. We have heard much talk and argument about this poultry scheme, and many people are now conversant with it, but many small producers, owning perhaps only a few birds, are still unaware of its implications and of how it will affect them. The Minister has announced that the Egg Board is appointing two public relations officers to put this scheme into effect, but if it is rigorously policed it will eventually put an end to the small producer, and if it is not rigorously policed I do not know what the effect will be. However, if only two public relations officers are to travel around the country, then I should say that it does not look as though the scheme will be very vigorously policed for the time being.

If that is so, I wonder what the point of it is. People now owning a few dozen birds

will be forced out of production, and that is exactly what a large section of the professional side of the industry wants. The blame for all of the trouble concerning surplus eggs is laid at the door of the small producer. Indeed, I have not seen a marketing scheme before which is entirely wrapped around the small producer. Unfortunately, nobody knows how many small producers exist at the present time. On many occasions I asked the Minister for Primary Industry at the agricultural council and outside it whether he would consider setting up a committee of inquiry into the poultry industry. An inquiry into the dairying industry was undertaken a few years ago, and much of the information obtained was put to good use. My request was not agreed to and it was looked on with suspicion as an endeavour to stall the authorities in implementing the scheme, although I pointed out that that was not intended.

An inquiry into the poultry industry is highly desirable, and I believe it is inevitable, but in the meantime there will be certain effects on the small producers—suburban people, farmers, and the like—about which we know nothing at present. Indeed, many ludicrous aspects in trying to severely police this plan may be evident. If a producer does not sell eggs to the Egg Board, he has no money out of which his levy can be deducted. He has the onus of paying the levy to the board, but first of all he must know whether he should or should not pay it; he should know exactly what a “commercial producer” is and is not. The Commonwealth Act gives the wording “kept for commercial purposes”, but does that cover people in remote areas, who perhaps sell only a few eggs now and again to passers-by, trappers, or such people? Do those producers automatically become commercial producers? The Minister’s reply indicates they would.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Minister said it was anybody who had more than 20 birds.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: He gave two replies. He said at one stage that anybody with more than 20 birds was considered to be a commercial producer. Later, however, the statement of the Minister for Primary Industry, which was put into *Hansard*, held to the contrary, and I think it gave the correct picture, as far as it went, in that it would apply to people who kept birds for commercial purposes. However, we still do not know just what constitutes “commercial purposes”. In any case, these questions will have to be answered in the future. The inspectors have

wide powers to search books and buildings, etc., a provision contained in the drafting of many of these Acts, but one interesting feature arises in regard to the situation where birds are not easily identified: the Act provides that the inspector may deem fowls to be owned by a person he designates. That is a rather peculiar provision; an inspector can go along to a property, and if the owner of that property says that the birds are not his but that they belong to a relative or someone else, the inspector can declare them as belonging to the property owner—and he can become liable to pay the tax. Whatever happens, these two public relations officers will be busy, and I shall be interested to see the results.

In summing up on this point, I can say only that my complaint is not with the details of the scheme but with the attitude to the rights of producers in declaring whether they want it or not. We seem to be wrapped up in this unprofitable export market, but the fact remains that more than one authority is currently exporting eggs from Australia. I refer to the Australian and New South Wales Egg Boards, both of which export eggs, and both of which at times compete with each other on the same market. That is a ridiculous situation in a country where eggs have to be sold far below cost on an oversea market.

Mr. Corcoran: Would that continue under the C.E.M.A. plan?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It has been stated that, under the plan, this will not occur, and that those boards’ activities will be brought together. I hope that is correct, but it is ridiculous that while we are engrossed in this problem of local production we have never been able to rectify the export problem. I suspect that the architects of the plan would be happy for the small producer to be put out of business and for the production of eggs to be checked so that it would meet only the needs of the local market. Perhaps they should read an article, appearing in the *News* a few weeks ago, by Mr. McArdle, a former member of the Agriculture Department now in India, who wrote that when he dropped an egg on the ground starving children rushed to pick up the scraps to eat them.

In regard to the drought in the North-East, the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) said that he was not clear as to what I meant. I asked a question of the Premier this afternoon about the drought in the North-East of the State, and the honourable member said, “What he means by the North-East normally is the town of Peterborough,” and so on. I point out that

I mean the Far North-East and nothing else. The whole of the North has been affected by a severe drought, and I am convinced by what the member for Frome has said that even he underestimates it. He said that some good rains occurred last year, and that fat cattle were coming into the market at the present time. That is correct. A year ago there was a good rain in the North-East, and some properties came out of it well, but the effects of a good rain do not always carry one over a period of almost complete drought, which we have had ever since.

For over a year there has been a tremendously severe drought in the far North-East of our State, and whereas cattle were turned off fat last winter they are not being turned off fat now. Anyone who looks at the cattle market will see that many store cattle are coming into the market now. Most are poor, although some are in a strong condition. However, that does not account for the large numbers of cattle not brought to market. If cattle are below a certain condition they cannot be brought to market, and store sales are to be held for the next few weeks because of this. Stores are lined up from the North of this State and Central Australia for sale; apart from the ordinary Monday markets, special store sales will be held each Friday for several weeks.

The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) mentioned fat cattle, and I have seen a few of these lately, although their quality has been fairly poor. The few I have seen have come from one or two places. Some have come from small corners of properties where conditions have been slightly better than on the remainder of the properties. Within a big station, where watering points are scattered, some cattle are in better condition than others, and I have seen some cattle in good condition recently although I have known that the main herd on the property has been poor and low in condition. Breeding cattle are being sold in huge quantities. The other fat cattle I have seen have come from the Tennant Creek area where there was a wonderful rain last March. The Banka Banka station and the Brunchilly station, both near Tennant Creek, got over 10in. of rain in a few days, and from the former station the fat cattle came to market yesterday. I know definitely that there are not many fat cattle in the market now, however.

The drought in the far North-East is not to be shrugged off lightly. In a question I asked the Premier I suggested that he arrange for members of both sides of the House to

visit the area. This opens up the important point of whether members always want to see conditions at good times or whether they like to be faced with the starker conditions that sometimes occur. Members are soon to visit Woomera for the day, and I shall be happy to take this opportunity to go there. Some years ago members saw the Flinders Ranges at the best time of the year. It is important for us to look at conditions prevailing now. I believe a trip could be organized for some members, if not for all, and that it would be welcomed by people in the area.

Over the last few years the Agriculture Department has concentrated more and more upon the feeding of livestock to see how far stock carrying could be increased, although it has not gone as far as advising farmers to do something that they may regret later. They have been sharing in a type of research that has been going on all over Australia, as every part of Australia is doing research work on the stock that can be carried. The South Australian department has some distinguished results to show. It has produced over a continuous period about 88 lb. of wool to the acre on Kangaroo Island, and in the South-East it has produced many ewes and lambs to the acre, although I do not know the exact figures. The department has several properties, and I suggest that with the present influx of store cattle the department should see whether it has room for more cattle on its properties. These store cattle are thin, but they would normally be "fats"; they are breeding cattle—young heifers and cows as well as steers. Even store steers, if slaughtered now, will be a loss to the community in the long run because one day, if kept on farms and fattened, they would provide beef. The shortage of steers we would have as a result would cause a demand for breeding cattle to go to slaughter in the future.

The need for feed for cattle has been exercising the minds of the officers of the Agriculture Department ever since I have been associated with them. Although they have never found the answer, they have learnt that more stock can be carried in the southern districts. The member for Frome mentioned the South-East of the State, and I agree entirely with what he said. The South-East has a vast potential for carrying stock, and it will carry more. The increase in the last few years has been staggering, but I think in the next few years it will be even more dramatic. The Agriculture Department has a beef research station at Struan, and I wonder whether the

department can take any more cattle for its own work as well as for ordinary farming operations.

Although I intended to mention several things of a district nature, I shall not do so because I have already spoken at length; I shall inquire from the Government about these matters later. I thank members for their patient hearing, and I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): This is an occasion that I have long awaited. Although I have been a member of this House for about only six years, I and my colleagues have waited patiently during that time for the ambition of any politician, whoever he may be—and I think it can truthfully be said that the ambition of any politician is to be a member of the Government Party. I waited for three years for my Party to become the Government of the State, but unfortunately in 1962 it was prevented, against the wishes of the people, from becoming the Government. What counts is the figures at the poll. Nobody can deny that the Labor Party was elected with a majority of members on that occasion.

Before I proceed to my complimentary remarks, I refer to the statement made this afternoon by the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) that the greatest feat of political confidence that he had seen was that of Sir Thomas Playford when he carried on as Premier of this State in 1962. I distinctly remember, when speaking in the debate on the Address in Reply in 1962, that I said (and these words are in *Hansard* for the benefit of honourable members if they wish to see them) the Government at that time had more members than were on the floor of the House, because representations had been made for a certain individual to join the Liberal Party. At that time I was accused of not sticking to the truth. It is amazing that, when an election was held in 1965, the truth did sometimes prevail. It was reported in the *News* of March 2, 1965, that one of the greatest secrets that had been withheld from members was that negotiations had taken place before the 1962 election for a certain individual to join the Liberal Party. I mention that because we make statements in this House and then are accused of not telling the truth.

Mr. Lawn: I was accused of being a liar.

Mr. RYAN: The passage is contained in *Hansard*. What the member for Adelaide has said is true, and no-one can deny it. We can go back to the words of Sir Thomas Playford at Peterborough on March 2, 1965; they too are

true. We know that the representation of the Liberal Party in 1962 was greater than the 18 members who were sitting on the Government side at that time.

Mr. Lawn: And the Speaker, too.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The Speaker gave an assurance that he would support the Government on all occasions. How can people say that the Speaker is absolutely unbiased when he gives an assurance that he will support a certain Party? I come to the Governor's Speech. I think the purpose of the Governor's Speech is clearly set out in a booklet entitled *The Parliament of South Australia*. The part dealing with the Governor's Speech states:

The Governor opens each session of Parliament by reading in the Legislative Council Chamber a speech prepared by the Government, and which sets out, *inter alia*, the policy the Government intends to pursue and the legislation proposed to be introduced during the session. Of course, in this duty the Governor acts as the mouthpiece of his Ministers, and they alone are responsible for the contents of the Speech.

I read that because comments made by members of the Liberal Party in the course of this debate are amazing. Each of them has criticized the Governor's Speech and has said many times that it is possibly the worst speech that a Governor has ever made to Parliament; it was not constructive and was more domestic than developmental. We can understand the attitude of the Liberals on this occasion because on March 6, 1965, a political miracle occurred, because any Party that can become the Government of this State under the conditions under which the Labor Party was forced to act creates a political miracle. With the dice loaded against the Labor Party, as it has been in this State for many years, it had to achieve a political miracle to become the Government. Members opposite were firm in their conviction that it was impossible for the Labor Party ever to become the Government in this State under the set-up that had operated for many years. But let us recall the Governor's Speeches delivered since the Liberal Party was defeated and returned with fewer members than the Labor Party had in 1962.

Mr. Hudson: Liberal and Country League Party, not Liberal Party.

Mr. RYAN: I mean when the Liberal and Country League Party was returned with fewer members than the Labor Party had. I correct that mistake. In 1962 one would have thought that the Government, which knew it was on its last legs as a Government

and could not survive another election, whenever it was held, would come out with far greater promises than we had ever heard in the 29 years it was a Government, but that was not so. I say that the Governor's Speeches in 1962, 1963 and 1964 were possibly the most negative speeches ever delivered by any Governor in the Commonwealth. All we heard was a eulogy of what had happened in the previous three years.

Mr. Nankivell: Speak up; we can't hear you!

Mr. Clark: You can make them hear, but can you make them understand?

Mr. RYAN: Politically, it would be impossible to make the members of the Liberal and Country League understand. The only thing they were good at was working the gerrymander in this State.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Gawler meant that the mental faculties of the members opposite were insufficient to enable them to be capable of understanding.

Mr. RYAN: There is an element of truth in that. In 1962 the Governor's Speech contained 29 paragraphs and it referred mainly to what the Government had done during the previous three years. In 1963 the Speech contained 31 paragraphs, and it was practically identical with that of 1962. One could have read that speech, crossed out the year printed on it, and it could have been the Speech delivered in the previous year. But 1964 was the year when one would have expected the Governor's Speech to include an alarming programme of what the Government intended to do, the great number of alterations to be made, and the introduction of many new Bills, to save it from impending defeat at the election, but again it was a recapitulation of what had happened in the previous two years. The Governor's Speech, to my mind, should be a deliverance by the Governor to Parliament of the policy of the Government during the current three years of that Parliament. It was never intended that the Governor's Speech should be a eulogy of what a Government had done in the past, and yet Opposition members on May 13, 68 days after the election, expected the Government, which had been in Opposition for 32 years, to bring down a Governor's Speech that contained the whole of the legislation to be implemented by it. Members opposite know in their own minds that that was impossible. It would have taken the Ministers at least half that period to become acquainted with their particular administrations.

Mr. McAnancy: Mr. Wilson wanted 100 days and now he wants 200.

Mr. RYAN: How would the honourable member know what happened in the United Kingdom? I will not express my opinion on something about which I know nothing. I am not conversant with the situation in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Lawn: The Liberal Party in the United Kingdom is supporting the policy of the Labor Government there and not the Conservative Party.

Mr. RYAN: Although that Government had been in office for only 100 days I believe that some of the reforms that it introduced were acceptable to the majority of the people in the United Kingdom. Let me remind members opposite that although the Government had been in office here for only 68 days on May 13, the legislative programme outlined by the Governor was readily acceptable to the majority of the people of the State. I was one who realized that miracles would not be achieved in the 1965 Governor's Speech. Any Party that had been in Opposition for 32 years could not be expected to be in a position to bring down a definite programme of legislation. However, in the next two years the Opposition will receive ample warning of legislation long overdue in South Australia that will be introduced by the Government.

I wish to congratulate my colleagues who have been selected for the Ministry. They were elected by the Parliamentary representatives of the Party, by a majority of the members present. Let us imagine what would have happened if the L.C.L. had been elected and what happened during its 32 years of Government. Opposition members had no say whatsoever about their Ministry. What I said about the selection of the previous Minister of Lands can be read in *Hansard*. He was selected two days before the Opposition was called together for a meeting.

Mr. Lawn: That was why they were always patting the Leader's back.

Mr. RYAN: Some members opposite must be sorely disappointed that the possibility of their getting into the Cabinet has disappeared for the next decade at least.

Mr. Nankivell: The honourable member says that he knew who would fill the Cabinet vacancy in the previous Government, but there was no vacancy. Did he know that any Minister was going to die?

Mr. RYAN: Did the honourable member know who would succeed Sir Cecil Hincks? I knew as soon as he did who would succeed him. He read it in the press at the same

time as I did, and that is how much say he had in the appointment of that Minister.

Mr. McKee: The honourable member for Albert was a runner himself.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. Members opposite hoped that the Bill for a ninth Minister would be passed and there was some jostling for the position with the Premier at that time.

Mr. Lawn: There was betting in the House on it.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member for Albert was six to four on. However, at least the selection of the Cabinet of the Labor Party was done democratically; the members of the Parliamentary Labor Party selected the Party's Cabinet. This is vastly different from the set-up in the Liberal Party. I know that some Opposition back-benchers during the previous 32 years of office would very much have liked the same principles and rules that apply in the Labor Party for the election of their Cabinet.

I congratulate the members of Cabinet on their appointment and I was one who had the experience of participating in their selection. Some members had waited a long time to achieve this distinction. You, Mr. Speaker, have been elected to the highest office that this Parliament can confer, and I sincerely congratulate you because no member of this Parliament waited longer and more patiently than you did before your elevation to the office. You waited the full period during which the Labor Party was in opposition and you naturally received the highest office that this Parliament can bestow on any member. I know that we shall have unbiased rulings from you. Previously we had a Speaker who gave the assurance that, irrespective of the merit of the legislation, he would support the Government because otherwise he would cause its downfall. In that position he could not be unbiased and I believe that all members of Parliament (whether Government or Opposition) are pleased that this same set of circumstances does not apply now.

I congratulate my very valued colleague, the member for Adelaide, on his appointment to the second highest office that this Parliament can offer, that of Chairman of Committees. It is pleasing to know that the Chairman of Committees will be impartial in his deliberations and decisions in this Chamber. I believe all members have seen him studying the Standing Orders of the House. I think that the member for Adelaide would consider it an insult if any member of the House challenged his rulings, because he intends to be completely impartial

and he has made a study of the matters that will concern him so that he may give fair decisions.

Mr. Coumbe: You'll get on!

Mr. RYAN: If I get on it will be by the selection of all members of my own Party, not by the selection of one. During the next decade the Opposition will learn politics the hard way, as we did for some time. Honourable members opposite will learn what it is like to be in Opposition without the numbers to carry what they want carried. What counts in Parliament is the number of members that represent the Government compared with the number that represents the Opposition.

Mr. Nankivell: There goes the argument with which you started your speech, as to who should govern in this way.

Mr. RYAN: The numbers are 19 to 18!

Mr. Nankivell: No, 19 all!

Mr. RYAN: Here it is in this document if the honourable member wants to see it. The secrets are out.

Mr. Lawn: It was 19 to 18, but they had two in the bag.

Mr. RYAN: They still have them.

Mr. Lawn: They are welcome to them, too.

Mr. RYAN: People that count most in the Government are the Ministry—

Mr. McAnaney: I thought it was the back-benchers.

Mr. RYAN: No, they keep the front-benchers in their places. Members of the Opposition do not realize that any political Party has to operate as a team.

Mr. Lawn: They don't know what a team is.

Mr. RYAN: The Opposition has been the most disunited political team that has existed in any free country in the world.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Gawler said that they would not understand you if you spoke about teams. Perhaps they would if you spoke about horse teams.

Mr. RYAN: I sincerely sympathize with the Leader of the Opposition, as the control he exercised over his Party in Government has now disappeared when it is in Opposition. He has no need for strict control; members of his Party cannot get out of line, as they do not have the numbers. The honourable member for Mitcham is now able to jump the traces as much as he wants, as he realizes the futile position of the Opposition. Several of my constituents have told me they are pleased that the former Premier does not now speak on television on Wednesday evenings. I am

sure the Leader will admit that he is not putting it over the public any more. If broken promises are going to be the theme song of the Opposition, let us remember what happened during the Leader's speeches on Wednesday nights on ADS-7. I am sure that is why the previous Government purchased the computer to be installed in the Public Service, because no-one could add up the millions of pounds that he spent on ADS-7 on Wednesday nights.

Mr. Coumbe: You mean a comp"tom"meter!

Mr. RYAN: Yes. It was impossible to add up the millions of pounds that were spent, or promised. It is a pleasure for people to watch television knowing they do not have to tolerate that programme any longer. The only good thing about the programme was that it was introduced by a picture of a magpie.

Mr. Hudson: It would have been more fitting if it were a crow.

Mr. RYAN: Yes.

Mr. Hall: We are waiting to hear the difference in the Government policy that is coming from the back-benchers.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member will hear it.

Mr. Lawn: It will take Opposition members six months to get through it.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The honourable member for Mitcham can get a new rule book, as they are available now. The honourable member for Flinders said that the Labor Party Government is controlled by the trade unions. I do not know where he got the figures that he quoted, but this is one of the most inaccurate statements that I have heard since I have been a member. The honourable member said that seven out of 10 of the Labor members in this House were selected by the Labor Party as its representatives because they were trade union officials, but that is far from true. The Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, was criticized by the press because he referred to the previous Premier in his correct capacity. In the 32 years of Liberal rule of this State there was never a Premier. The member for Edwardstown can legally claim to be the first Premier of South Australia, irrespective of what the Opposition may say, and members opposite cannot refute that statement. The Premier was never a representative of the trade unions: he was a rank-and-file sub-branch member of the Australian Labor Party and has always been that. The Minister of Works was never a trade union official; he was never pre-selected by the Labor Party as a trade

union candidate for political honours, but was a rank-and-file sub-branch member.

The Attorney-General, who has been severely criticized by the Opposition, was never a representative of the trade union movement; he was not pre-selected as a trade unionist, but was a rank-and-file sub-branch member when selected, and has been ever since. The Minister of Education worked in industry and was a rank-and-file representative of the Labor Party; he was pre-selected to represent the Labor Party at the election for the seat of Whyalla when it was incorporated as a new seat, and was never a trade union official. The Minister of Agriculture was also a representative of the rank and file in the Labor Party, and was an ordinary sub-branch representative when pre-selected to become the member for Murray. You, Mr. Speaker, know well that you were never pre-selected by the Labor Party as a trade union official. You were a rank-and-file sub-branch member when pre-selected as a representative of the Labor Party. The Government Whip was not a trade union official, but was a rank-and-file member, as were the members for Gawler, Wallaroo, Frome, Unley, Chaffey, Barossa, Glenelg, Mount Gambier, and Millicent.

Mr. Hall: You may have your Parties mixed with the member for Frome!

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

Mr. RYAN: Prior to the dinner adjournment, I quoted 16 honourable members from the Government side who were rank-and-file sub-branch members of the A.L.P. organization.

Mr. Hall: You were explaining the membership of the Labor Party of the member for Frome.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member was explaining it. I mentioned that the member for Frome was not a trade union official and I will follow up what the honourable member for Adelaide said. If ever a Party set out to defeat a pre-selected Labor candidate, the L.C.L. did it at the election of the honourable member for Frome but even the machinery that the L.C.L. had available to it as a political Party was not successful in overcoming the organizing of the members of the Parliamentary Labor Party. I say to the Opposition Whip, the honourable member for Gouger, that the members of the Opposition, who were members of the Government Party at that time, severely resented being called upon by their Party to organize on behalf of the L.C.L. Nobody knows that better than does the honourable member for Gouger. In fact, they thought it

was beneath their dignity as members of Parliament to organize on behalf of one of their candidates.

Mr. Jennings: The honourable member for Gouger said, "Call me Steele", didn't he?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, "Call me Steele." The first of the other five honourable members of the Government Party whom I have not mentioned is the Chairman of Committees, the honourable member for Adelaide, who, I will admit, was a trade union official at the time of his pre-selection.

Mr. Lawn: And he makes no apology for it, either.

Mr. RYAN: No. The next is the honourable member for Port Pirie and, although he was a trade union official at the time of his pre-selection, he was not a Trades Hall representative, as was stated by some Opposition members. However, for the purpose of definition, I am regarding him as having been a trade union official at the time of his pre-selection. The member for West Torrens was, without doubt, a trade union official, as was his predecessor in that seat, and I have heard from the Opposition high praise of his ability and reputation. The honourable member for Semaphore is in the category of being a trade union official and I can be placed in that category although, like the honourable member for Port Pirie, I was not a Trades Hall representative. Out of a representation of 21 members—and I should say that that would be fairly high representation in this House for the Government Party, irrespective of who was in Government—

Mr. Jennings: And that will increase.

Mr. RYAN: That will increase election after election and we will not have to gerrymander in order to increase our representation. As a member of the Government Party, I tell the Opposition that we will increase our representation, even with the present gerrymander.

Mr. Hall: What seats do you think you will win?

Mr. RYAN: I named the seats during the last Parliament and if the honourable member for Gouger wants to look them up, he may do so.

Mr. Jennings: He will find that he himself is mentioned.

Mr. RYAN: I said on two occasions that the former member for Glenelg would not be a member of this Parliament and I now make the prediction that the Opposition Whip will be on the outside looking in after the next election.

Mr. Jennings: How about the last speaker in this debate?

Mr. RYAN: He will be out, too. The honourable members I have mentioned from the Government side comprise 16 who were rank-and-file sub-branch members and five who were trade union representatives when they entered this House. That gives a proportional representation of over three to one. Yet we have the honourable member for Flinders, who has had Ministerial experience (and a member from whom one would expect at least some reliable statements), coming out with one of the most ridiculous statements I have heard in this House. On the figures that I have quoted, I can say only that he is thicker in the skull that I thought he was. The honourable member said that members of the Labor Party have to face up to, and be pre-selected by, the executive of their Party. The honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) must cherish the Australian Labor Party's rule book, for he apparently does not want any other member of the Opposition to read what is in it. Nothing is further from the truth than that the executive pre-selects its representatives for political honours. Our representation, we believe, is effected by a democratic system, whereby representatives of the rank and file and of the whole membership in this State declare who shall be the representative. We say that it shall be the same principle so far as the public is concerned in selecting its representatives.

Mr. Lawn: Our representation in this House proves that.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and, further, if the Opposition wants dirty linen aired, and if it wants to speak along the lines that it has, it has to expect the dirty linen to be thrown back at it.

The SPEAKER: There will be no dirty linen aired here, and I should like to hear fewer interjections. I think the member for Port Adelaide is doing excellently without them.

Mr. Jennings: He can't hear them, anyway.

Mr. RYAN: I distinctly remember a by-election for representation in this House, which bears some investigation. Opposition members will remember the pay-off given to a certain member of their Party, when he was appointed to the board of the Electricity Trust. Much has been said to the effect that the Labor Party has not the appropriate personnel to govern this State.

Mr. Jennings: They can't say it now.

Mr. RYAN: No; as far as members of Parliament who were formerly professional men are concerned, let me remind the Opposition that probably the greatest Prime Minister and Treasurer this country has ever seen was an engine driver by profession.

Mr. Lawn: And a trade unionist representative!

Mr. RYAN: Yes; if honourable members opposite wish to draw comparisons and to classify members of the Government Party and their ability to be administrators, let them do so.

Mr. Lawn: Wouldn't you say there was more all-round ability on this side of the House?

Mr. RYAN: I do not think we should have to improve much on the position that existed in this State for many years for that to be the case. Much has been said about the propositions put forward by the Government about the finances of this State, and about the Government's not being in a position to carry out what it outlined at the time of the elections. Let me remind honourable members that if this State ever attempted to finance a project submitted to this Parliament by the previous Treasurer, we should have been bankrupt 27 years ago, because the propositions submitted by the then Government were ridiculous in many ways. For some unknown reason this debate has proceeded along the lines of criticizing the Government, but we have heard little from the Opposition on the result of the elections. I do not know whether honourable members opposite are ostriches and whether they wish to bury their heads in the sand and forget the past—

Mr. McKee: They are trying to blame us for their past.

Mr. RYAN: They can blame their defeat on the good Opposition that existed in this Parliament for many years, and I think it was the Opposition pressure placed on the Government at that time that resulted in the Labor Party's ultimate win and in its becoming the Government of this State. It is apparent that Opposition members forget March 6, and by their attitude I think that the sooner they do so the better. March 6 will be written into the political history of this State as the day of success of the Party that was placed in Opposition for a 32-year period, a position that I do not think has existed in any other Parliament in the British Commonwealth of Nations. I think it was a red-letter day for the political world of this State when the Labor Party was elected the Government. In the administration of this State we can do no harm but we can do much good. I think we all realize that when my Party was in Opposition, although the Government was not prepared on any occasion to accept legislation we introduced, it brought in similar legislation later and claimed the credit for it. Much of the legislation now on

the Statute Book can be claimed to have resulted from the foresight of the Labor Opposition, and I think that is the very reason why the voting public said, "They were an extremely good Opposition and they are entitled to be put in office." I have no doubt that this Government's term of office will continue for many years.

Much has been said about what is contained in the Governor's Speech and what is not contained in it. I have no doubt that, although certain matters are not specifically mentioned, the Government will during its term of office (and I believe it has a long term of office in front of it) implement practically everything mentioned in the policy speech. The honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) is now conspicuous by his absence, and I do not think there is a bigger Tory or anyone more totally opposed to the policy of my Party than he is.

Mr. Corcoran: He is a Victorian Tory, isn't he?

Mr. RYAN: I do not think a feudal viscount would be as great a Tory as he is. In fact, I think he is so great a Tory that he would not even have made that great honours list we have heard so much about. He mentioned our Party, and I have no doubt that the policy of that Party will be implemented while it is in office. The amalgamation of the two banks was mentioned often. Nobody opposite mentioned that part of our policy when they went to the electors, although it was freely mentioned by every member of my Party during the campaign and by the press on numerous occasions. I shall now mention the socialistic programme implemented to a certain degree by the Liberal and Country Party. The Savings Bank of South Australia Act Amendment Bill was introduced on October 9, 1945, by the Honourable Sir Thomas Playford, who then said:

The Bill provides in the first place that the Savings Bank will hold all its real and personal property for and on account of the Crown as representing the State of South Australia. This provision is similar in effect to a section in the State Bank Act and a section in the Act relating to the Savings Bank of Victoria; and the Government is advised that such a provision, read in conjunction with the rest of the Act, will constitute the Bank an organ of the State. . . . The Government is of opinion that in view of the proposal to make the Bank a State instrumentality it is reasonable that the Government should definitely guarantee the depositors.

This was mentioned at a time when the Treasurer of this State had received a request from the Labor Treasurer of the Commonwealth Parliament to introduce this Bill. On October 10, 1945, the then Treasurer said:

The Government is taking over all the assets of the Savings Bank on behalf of the Crown. Therefore, it is proper that it should guarantee the depositors against any loss.

I repeat the statement made by the Treasurer at that time—"The Government is taking over all the assets of the Savings Bank on behalf of the Crown." If he needs any more Socialist policy, I do not know how far we can go. I will go even further. Many times I have criticized the Electricity Trust of South Australia; I asked many questions when I was in the Opposition and was told that this was not a State instrumentality but that, if information was requested, the Premier would try to obtain it, although there was no compulsion for that information to be obtained if asked for by members of Parliament. I do not want to be accused of making something up, so I turn to *Hansard* of November 12, 1946, page 885, where the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) gave the second reading explanation of the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment Bill. There was a mix-up and the same Bill had to be introduced twice. The then Premier said:

When the Bill to take over the assets of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company Limited was before this House I believed that the legislation was quite effective on the information which the Government then had before it, but I stated that if any matter arose which required further attention the Government would not hesitate to bring it before the House.

Then follows the part I really want to bring home to the Opposition:

I made that statement because we were taking over one of the largest undertakings in the State and we could not have definite knowledge as to its assets, where located, their type . . .

I had a fairly good education and can interpret English as well as the next person but I cannot place any interpretation on that other than what is set out in *Hansard*: that the Government was taking over one of the largest undertakings in the State. That means it was taking it over from private enterprise for it to become a Government instrumentality.

Mr. Corcoran: The assets of that private company were to be held for and on behalf of the Crown.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. If that is not a Socialist programme, I do not know what is. I am pleased that it happened because, if it had not happened then, it would not have saved the present Government the financial embarrassment of taking over this private

institution. *Hansard* is the official record of what is said in Parliament and that is what is recorded. There was a bitter opponent of the Government's taking over this private enterprise as a Government instrumentality. The present member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) was the bitterest opponent of that take-over at that time, yet he himself will admit that in the circumstances it was absolutely necessary and, if it had not been done at that time, it would have had to be done in the future.

Mr. Hurst: Implementing Karl Marx's theory.

Mr. RYAN: Whether or not it implemented that theory, it would have been necessary at some future time. It is no good praising a Government instrumentality at this stage when most members opposite bitterly opposed the measure when it was before the Parliament. If it had not been done then it would have to be done now. I believe that this was a cunning move by the Government at that time. Rather than make it an absolute Government department, the Government realized that there was less possibility of criticism, if things did not turn out according to plan, if it placed the trust on the basis that it did.

The Housing Trust is another State instrumentality that was created by the Liberal and Country League. It has developed so that it undertakes previously undreamed of activities. One of the provisions of the Act under which it was established is that the trust has to build houses for letting and sale in accordance with two requirements. The trust has definitely departed from the original basis. Someone came up with the brilliant idea that rather than let it become one of the greatest landlords in Australia it should divorce itself from letting houses and develop the sale of them. It is interesting, in the light of that, to study the speech made on the second reading of the Bill by the Hon. R. R. Butler, who was Premier at that time. He said:

Not only representatives of employees, but representatives of employers, the Chamber of Manufactures, the Chamber of Commerce and other associations are strongly in favour of the introduction of a Bill of this nature. Perhaps it is only a start, but most great things have small beginnings. What we particularly desire to do is to place a Bill on the Statute Book and provide for the expenditure of a small amount this year with the idea of establishing the principle, hoping—

and this is important when considering the trust's activities today—
that we will find manufacturers willing to lend money to the trust and that some of our wealthy citizens will either make grants or

gifts to the trust in order to help those who are on considerably less than the basic wage. It was intended that the Government would appropriate a small sum for the purpose of establishing the trust and that wealthy citizens would contribute towards the funds so that the trust could assist people who had housing problems and whose weekly income was not sufficient to meet the rental payments.

Let us examine how the trust has been divorced from the original intention. The trust's administration has deviated from what was laid down in the Act. We do not know what was the intention of the previous Government prior to its defeat. Had it been returned in 1965 I believe that ultimately no rental houses would have been built by the trust and that all its houses would have been on a purchase basis. The trust now builds what is normally a rental house. It gets a £50 deposit under the purchase scheme on what is normally a rental house. It pays no maintenance whatsoever, because that is the responsibility of the owner under the £50 deposit purchase scheme. It pays no rates and taxes. I calculate that ultimately this must mean a saving to the trust of £1,500,000 a year on what would normally be rental houses. Some activities of the trust have merit. It was never thought that the trust would divorce itself from building rental houses. Every member realizes that the supply of trust rental houses will never equal the demand. No-one knows that better than the Leader of the Opposition. He knows that the present waiting period for people in urgent housing circumstances is about four years, but people in dire circumstances are not able to wait four years for a house.

Some Opposition members think it is a good scheme, as it shifts the responsibility of ownership from the trust to the people who buy the houses, but let us not forget the people who cannot meet the requirements demanded by the trust for a £50-deposit house. People over a certain age cannot get this type of house because they will be unable to make the necessary repayments. I bring this matter to the Government's notice in the hope that the original provisions of the Act will be reverted to. The trust's activities have been good, and that is proved by the number of people waiting to be trust tenants. The trust cannot supply enough houses. On the present financial allocation of funds the return on investment is healthy, but more rental houses than purchase houses should be provided. This is in addition to the £50-deposit houses.

I am sure the honourable member for Semaphore is aware of the circumstances of the introduction of the dreamed-up 50-year plan for Port Adelaide. I understand that the plan is now in its 20th year of operation. I think it was about 1946 or 1947 when the scheme was first suggested. It has been recommended that the Housing Trust (which cannot meet the housing demand in this State now) should erect a glorified suburb in the district of the member for Semaphore where it links with that of the member for West Torrens. Blocks of land will be offered at prices from about £2,000 to more than £4,000 each. I believe that it is not the responsibility and jurisdiction of the Government to increase deliberately the cost of living. We can assume that these blocks of land at more than £4,000 each will be available to only that section of the public that can well afford a property elsewhere. If this scheme comes to fruition, it may be the intention of councils to limit the cost of the houses to be built on these blocks. If a price of £4,000 for a block of land is not an inflated value, I do not know what is, and it will mean that we shall have inflated values in the whole district. The Government should be charged with at least stabilizing the cost of building blocks. I do not think it is good government to embark on a scheme whereby 3,500 blocks will be made available at about £4,000 each. I bring this matter to the Government's notice, because I do not think for one moment that we should inherit every scheme dreamed by the previous Government. If it did dream schemes, we should not be charged with carrying them out, because this Party was elected on a Policy submitted to the people. It contained a definite promise that the Labor Party^c would institute its policy of providing work for people urgently in need of it. Our policy is certainly not one of inflated prices for building blocks.

Mr. Lawn: Do you support price control on land?

Mr. RYAN: My word I do. I have always said I am opposed to inflated prices. I want to refer to a statement made by the Minister of Works in relation water. He said that people will be charged on the basis of the valuation, whether it be the unimproved value or the rental value, but I believe that the volume of water allowed to those people will be astronomical. The Government realizes that it is essential to put the brake on the consumption of water. Nobody knows better than the former Premier and the former Minister of Works that the consumption of water is

getting out of hand in this State. We are charged with spending millions of pounds on supplying water in some places, yet we spend millions of pounds disposing of surplus water in other areas. The cost of water should not be astronomically high because an inflated value is placed on the land. It is not compulsory for people to buy these high priced blocks, but the Government should give a lead to private enterprise to do away with inflated land values.

I refer now to the Australian Labor Party, which brought about a drastic change in the political field in this State. Various statements have been made about the administration of the Party, but I have heard about what happens on North Terrace in the administration of the L.C.L. Its members say from time to time that they are not governed by any organization outside this building in the State sphere, and in the Commonwealth sphere they claim that they take no notice of people outside the Commonwealth Parliament. A statement by Sir Philip McBride appeared in the press of June 7. Sir Philip usually comes for a sleep in this Chamber, but I think the purpose of his visits here is to keep an eye on the activities of and statements by the people whom he represents in the Commonwealth sphere. As Federal President of the Liberal Party he said, after a meeting of that Party's policy committee (which met over a long period):

The policy committee has concerned itself with restrictive trade practices legislation. Twelve months ago our committee decided at a series of meetings the whole question of defence and internal security . . .

Although that emanated from the Federal President of the Party, we have often heard that whatever North Terrace says it is not binding on Liberal Party members in their State political representation, or on that Party's representation in the Commonwealth Parliament; yet the Opposition always refers to the "36 faceless men" of the Australian Labor Party. Nobody knows better than you, Mr. Speaker, that the Commonwealth representation and administration of the Australian Labor Party is not carried out by "faceless" men. They are democratically elected by the rank and file to speak, as a Commonwealth organization, on behalf of the whole of the Australian Labor Party. However, let us refer to the Liberal Party, whether it be in relation to North Terrace or Canberra. Recently, the Federal Executive of that Party was called to Canberra to discuss various matters. The statement issued after that meeting was, I

believe, the only statement ever published by that organization. I stand to be corrected, but I believe that the executive comprised Sir Philip McBride, Mr. Cooper, and the present Leader of the Opposition. Sir Philip McBride was a Parliamentarian at one time, but he is not now. He has not been one for some time. Mr. Cooper is not a political representative, but a member of his family is a Parliamentarian.

Mr. Corcoran: Doesn't he crack the whip over there?

Mr. RYAN: Of course he does, because he is one of the South Australian representatives of the Liberal Party's Commonwealth body.

Mr. Hurst: He tells them what to do.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and the amazing part of it is that the organization's meetings are closed to the press.

Mr. Hurst: They are headless men.

Mr. RYAN: They are the hooded men, who might just as well be members of the Ku Klux Klan. Compare that with the Australian Labor Party's Federal Executive! At least our representatives' names are published. Their deliberations and decisions are available to the press, which is invited to report on the activities of the Commonwealth organization. These L.C.L. men criticize what their political opponents do. Does it not prove that the political Party they fear is the Australian Labor Party? Only one Party in any State, or in the Commonwealth itself, has not changed its name, and it is a Party that stands as an individual Party.

Mr. Hall: Do you support Mr. Calwell or Mr. Whitlam, in the present schism?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Is the member for Gouger supporting Mr. McEwin or Sir Robert Menzies?

Mr. RYAN: It is amazing that members of the opposite Party cannot reach unanimity as a political Party in its Commonwealth organization. One says one thing, and another says something else; they are more divided than the Labor Party ever was.

Mr. Hall: The Labor Party is sensitive about this matter!

Mr. Coumbe: Now you have stopped him!

Mr. RYAN: I have not stopped.

Mr. Shannon: The reason why I and another Liberal member originally got into Parliament was that there were three-member districts and there were representatives of three Labor Parties opposing us.

Mr. RYAN: Did we ever change our name from the Australian Labor Party? This Party has always been known as the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Hall: You are only a part of it.

Mr. Shannon: I can name the Parties.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You have broken away from the Democratic Labor Party.

Mr. RYAN: The mentality of the Opposition was mentioned earlier; obviously it is getting lower and lower. Who created the D.L.P.? Whom does the D.L.P. support?

Mr. Hall: Doctor Evatt created the D.L.P.

Mr. RYAN: After hearing the statements from the honourable member, I can understand why the representation of the Gouger District will be changed after the next election. Let us look at the Liberal-Country Government in the Commonwealth sphere.

Mr. Lawn: That is the Liberal and Country Party only at the time of an election; it is now the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. RYAN: Because of disunity, a Country Party has been started in this State. Would the Liberal Party govern the Commonwealth today if it had the representation of only one Party? Definitely not. That Party is in the minority, and it has always had to rely on the co-operation of some splinter group to keep it in power.

Mr. Hall: Your Party relies on that, too.

Mr. RYAN: It relies only on its own representation.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you think the Liberal Party would tolerate the Country Party if it could get rid of it?

Mr. RYAN: Definitely not. The present Prime Minister would dearly love to resign but owing to the dissention that exists inside the coalition he cannot do so. Is there not friction between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Country Party about who will be the next Prime Minister? You know that we have one Leader.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Adelaide will address the Chair.

Mr. RYAN: If members opposite want any evidence about the unbiased opinions you will express as Speaker, Sir, you have just provided it. Let us face this matter seriously. How many members opposite are aspiring for the position of Leader of the Opposition? There must be more than there are starters in the Melbourne Cup. The greatest problem the Leader has now is deciding who will follow him.

Mr. Lawn: Is he appointing a successor?

Mr. RYAN: We do not know that, as the rule book does not show how the Leader of that Party is selected. Naturally, if Party meetings are not held one cannot do what is necessary.

Mr. Shannon: Our rule book does not lay down an age limit.

Mr. RYAN: Some members of the Opposition wish that that same rule were incorporated in their rule book. Is it on the agenda for discussion at the next September conference?

Mr. Hurst: Do they have a conference?

Mr. Lawn: They have a little get-together talk.

Mr. RYAN: Looking at the history of Parliament, we can learn how the Speaker originally got his name. It was realized that a Parliament had no governmental power, and the Speaker was created as the person elected to speak on behalf of Parliament. Wouldn't the Liberal and Country League love to have the same policy as the Labor Party has, that Parliamentary representation is required to bring forward a policy as demanded, submitted and discussed by the rank-and-file representation in Parliament! I want to refer now to the number of occasions on which, both here and in another place, it has been said that the moment the new Government was elected, on its policy, it immediately set out to break its promises and show that it did not intend to implement its policy. Apparently, members of the Liberal and Country League place their own interpretation on statements. If they do that with the statements made about the implementation of Labor's policy as regards the ton-mile tax, they will discover that the Minister stated "It is not the intention at this stage to carry out that policy" (and I emphasize the words "at this stage"). After 32 years in Opposition, the Labor Government has much leeway to make up and a lot to learn about the administration of this State. It is neither possible nor practicable for a new Government that has been in Opposition for so long to implement every plank of its platform in the first few weeks of the sittings of this Parliament. If my arithmetic is correct—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you going to remit the road tax on Eyre Peninsula later on?

Mr. RYAN: That is up to the Government to decide. The ex-Minister will be an ex-politician after the next election, because he will be on the outside looking in, and nobody knows better than he that the writing is on the wall.

Mr. Jennings: And he interjected from a place other than his own, too!

Mr. RYAN: I should imagine that possibly the most worried member of the Opposition as

regards his political future would be the member for Alexandra. Going on what happened three months ago I should say that the honourable member has reason to worry because he may not be returned at the 1968 election.

Mr. Hall: With the help you are giving he would not be in trouble.

Mr. RYAN: I do not need to help in that district. I have given my efforts in other places where we were successful in returning a Government.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about the road tax on Eyre Peninsula? Are you going to remit it?

Mr. RYAN: It is difficult to drive a nail into a piece of jarrah, but trying to drive home a point to Opposition members is impossible. If he wishes, the honourable member can read in *Hansard* the statement made by the Minister in another place and know the exact position. I recommend to him that he reads this statement rather than talk about something he believes was said in another place.

Mr. Hall: Does the honourable member subscribe to that statement?

Mr. RYAN: I subscribe to the policy of this Government made by this Government and which will be implemented by this Government on behalf of the majority of the people of South Australia. This is not a minority Government and it was not a minority Opposition. If a Party can increase its percentage of votes at successive elections it deserves to be the Government. The Labor Party's percentage of the vote increased in 1959, 1962 and 1965. Nowhere else in the free world does a system operate where a Party needs 58 per cent of the votes before it can form a Government.

Mr. Nankivell: What percentage of the seats in the House does the Government hold now?

Mr. RYAN: It holds 21 seats.

Mr. Nankivell: That is 58 per cent of the seats.

Mr. RYAN: The Labor Party had 58.4 per cent of the votes in 1965 and this was an improvement on the percentage it received in 1962. If the honourable member wishes to delve into percentages let him examine the percentage of the vote received by the Liberal and Country League. This decreased in 1962 and went down further in 1965. If it decreases much more, then the Democratic Labor Party may become the second Party in South Australia.

Before I was interrupted, I was dealing with the reference made by Opposition members to broken promises by the Australian Labor Party. Opposition members made great play

that the Labor Party would not live up to the promises that it made prior to the State election. If my arithmetic is correct I believe that the Government has been in office for about 104 days. Surely the Opposition does not expect wonders from a Government that has been in office, for the first time in 32 years, for only 104 days. The amazing fact is that the Government is being asked to implement all the legislation enunciated by the Premier prior to the election.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you think Opposition members are being genuine or are they merely trying to embarrass us?

Mr. RYAN: They are trying to embarrass us. Consider the Notice Paper and the private members' Bills that have been submitted by members of the Opposition.

Mr. Hughes: It is more significant to read the names of those submitting them.

Mr. RYAN: They are the greatest Tories in the Liberal Party. Doesn't this link up with what I have said, that there are certain people aspiring to the leadership of that Party and doing everything to bring themselves into the public eye, so that they will get support in their bid to become future Leaders of the Opposition in the L.C.L. Each notice of motion is part of the platform and policy of the Australian Labor Party. The Labor Party won the Government because of its action policy, and the Liberal Party was defeated on its no-action policy, and now the Liberals are asking the Government to implement its policy. I have never seen anything so ridiculous in the political world where the Opposition, by private members' Bills, asks the Government to introduce legislation to implement Government policy.

Mr. Jennings: To do something they opposed a few months ago!

Mr. RYAN: One of the Tories has submitted a private member's Bill for the creation of a public accounts committee.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not proceed with that line of talk.

Mr. RYAN: I abide by your ruling, Sir. It is amusing when we consider parts of the Governor's Speech where he said that certain legislation was to be introduced, that now some of the Opposition Party are requesting that these portions of the Labor Party's policy be implemented. Anything I want to say to the member for Flinders I will say to his face and not behind his back.

Mr. Jennings: He can probably hear you now.

Mr. RYAN: I will soon comment on the remarks he made. They were deliberate, and what I say to him will be deliberate, too. No doubt the affairs of this State will progress in accordance with the progressive policy put forward by the Australian Labor Party. According to the Opposition, the Governor's Speech may have been brief, but the number of paragraphs contained in it is greater than that on any occasion during the previous three years, and the legislation that will be introduced by the Government during the life of this Parliament is far greater than anything that appeared in the Governor's Speech during the preceding three years.

Mrs. Steele: The Attorney-General is going to be busy.

Mr. RYAN: Why shouldn't he be? Electoral reform in this State has gone backward, and it is this Government's policy to bring electoral reform in line with modern requirements. In fact, the previous Government went so far backwards that not only the Attorney-General but all Cabinet Ministers in this Government will be extremely busy introducing legislation to meet the needs of the public of this State. Of course, some of these measures should have been implemented previously but the L.C.L. Government would not face up to its responsibilities. More legislation was quoted in the Governor's Speech in the opening of this session of Parliament than on any other occasion during the past three years.

Mr. Lawn: Members opposite will be busy considering our legislation.

Mr. RYAN: I do not think that there will be much opposition, because honourable members opposite now support the very things they opposed when in Government.

Mr. Lawn: But they will spend more time in the Parliament than they did in previous years.

Mr. RYAN: It will not make much difference whether they are in the Parliament or not, because the Government members will be here carrying out their duties in the same way as they did when in Opposition, and the legislation introduced by the Government will be passed. Before concluding, I congratulate the new honourable members in the Chamber. There is no higher profession in the world than Parliamentary representation of the people of a State or country, as I think all honourable members will agree. We try to deliberate and to make decisions in accordance with our responsibilities as members of Parliament. The mover of the motion (the honourable member for Barossa) made a

fine speech indeed and I would say with certainty that she will go down in history as the first female Australian Labor Party Government member who moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply on the occasion of her election to Parliament. Her contribution indicates that she will be a force in future deliberations of this Chamber.

I also congratulate the seconder of the motion (the honourable member for Glenelg). I do not crow after certain things have happened but I prophesied that the former Minister of Education would not be returned to this Parliament. I said this two or three times and honourable members can check that in *Hansard* if they so desire. The new member for Glenelg has made a splendid contribution and he will doubtless be heard frequently in this Chamber as a Government member. The mover and seconder have the great distinction that, after the election in which they were successful, they come to this Chamber as the members of the Government.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are your backbenchers going to be "yes" men?

Mr. Lawn: Just because members opposite are used to that, we do not have to be "yes" men.

Mr. RYAN: All I can say in answer to the interjection by the honourable member for Alexandra is that actions speak louder than words and the actions will be the implementation of the policy of the Labor Party. At the end of three years the honourable member will get his answer. The other new member on the Government side is the honourable member for West Torrens, who has also made an excellent contribution to the debate in his first speech. He has to live up to the reputation of his predecessor and I say without fear of contradiction that the former member for West Torrens was probably held in greater esteem than was any other member of Parliament, whether on the Opposition side or the Government side. The present member for West Torrens has to follow the high standard set by his predecessor, but I have no doubt that time will record the fact that he has lived up to his predecessor's reputation in representing the district of West Torrens. We have three new members, sufficient to give this Government a terrific majority. I have not looked up the records to see whether it is the largest majority a Government has enjoyed in this Chamber, but as time goes by that majority will become greater, and representation on the opposite side will become less and less.

The member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) has made a great contribution to this debate, and we can expect much more from him. Honourable members will agree that, as each of us has come into this Chamber as a new member, each has, irrespective of Party, received the greatest help from other members. I believe that this assistance has also been given to the new members, and that as a result of that assistance they will continue to progress as Parliamentarians in this State. The officers of Parliament have done a magnificent job and have assisted each member of Parliament, new or old, and irrespective of Party. I do not think any Parliament can claim to have better officers. It gives me the greatest pleasure to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply because I, together with other honourable members on this side, believe that we have achieved our political ambition of speaking in this debate as members of the Government Party, and I hope (and have no doubt) that, as a result of the Government's actions and of the implementation of its policy, this Party will be in office for many years, and that the Opposition Party will remain that way—

Mr. Jennings: For 32 years!

Mr. RYAN: I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): One feels somewhat humble in rising to speak after so eloquent a contribution by the member for Port Adelaide. One also feels a little naked in not being surrounded by the portable library that surrounded the honourable member, but I will try to make some contribution to this debate. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to that high office, and I am sure that you will carry out your duties with the dignity required in that office. Over the two years that I have been in this House you have indicated to me a sense of fair play, as well as a sense of humour (which you displayed one night during a tour of the Snowy River scheme). Those qualities are essential in a man who presides over Parliament for such lengthy periods.

I pledge my loyalty to The Queen, and I, too, join with other honourable members who have indicated their desire to see the Governor's term of office extended. I am sure we all agree that Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan have carried out their official duties most ably and courteously and have done a splendid job. The Governor has made a personal contribution by the quality and wisdom of the speeches he has made, and people in the Stirling District have

often been pleased to welcome him to Victor Harbour when he has stayed in his residence there.

I congratulate the Premier on leading his Party to victory. I think this shows certain qualities of leadership that we must admire in any man. I also congratulate the Ministers on their election and the Labor Party on gaining office. The Government said that it would introduce certain reforms. I do not intend to oppose these just because the Labor Party will be introducing them; if the Government brings in something good, I think my Party will be reasonable enough to support it. I congratulate the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) on his election as Chairman of Committees. I am sure he will carry out this job most ably and conscientiously. I remember that on the first day I was a member of this House he made an eloquent speech in which he told how he had greeted me when I came up the stairs and that he had said that he did not know whether I was to support the master or be a rebel. I do not know whether he was a gremlin, a Dr. Jekyll or a Mr. Hyde, because the Clerk of Parliaments showed me through the House and I did not see the member for Adelaide. I assure him that I have not yet found out who is the master or who are the rebels. The only thing about my colleagues I complain of is that they are too pleasant and agreeable. I would like to have a donnybrook occasionally, but the members of my Party are too pleasant. I should like at times to attend some of the Federal Labor Caucus meetings, where there are groups going in all directions. I should have a pleasant time there! I have been happy to be a member of the Liberal Party, in which I have spent a pleasant time, but I shall always remain invincibly myself and not have to kow-tow to the federal President, as the member for Port Adelaide has suggested. I can do as I like subject to the whims and wishes of the electors of Stirling.

The member for Adelaide soon after my election quoted certain figures. He was elated over the by-election figures, and he said that in the by-election the Liberal Party received 64.2 per cent of the votes and the Labor Party 35.8 per cent. He said that that was poor compared with the 1961 Commonwealth election figures, which were 69.6 and 30.4 per cent. On March 6, I point out, the Liberal Party gained 70.9 per cent and the Labor Party 29.1 per cent, so the honourable member must look sad occasionally. When honourable members examine the last election figures they will notice the general trend. In many districts the Liberal Party

gained on its previous figures. I congratulate the Party opposite, which made gains from high-pressure tactics in two or three seats. I congratulate members opposite on those tactics, but I remind them that they made certain promises. There is an old axiom that it pays to advertise but you must also deliver the goods. That is what the Party opposite must do. Now the pressure is on, they must fulfil their promises. I shall not chide them on broken promises. If they break them, the electors will catch up with them, and I do not have to worry about that. The problem they must face is that they have made certain rash promises that will increase costs in the State.

Mr. Corcoran: Which promises do you consider rash?

Mr. McANANEY: I think they have made many rash statements. I have not enough time to compile a complete list, but they made certain promises (I will withdraw the word "rash"), which will increase costs in this State. That will make it more difficult for us to export our goods to other States. The test they will have to face in the future is how unemployment figures rise or fall. Under the able leadership of Sir Thomas Playford we kept our unemployment figures the second lowest among the States for years. That is what the barometer will show. Every time these unemployment figures rise, they will feel the cold wind of change blowing down their necks.

The then Leader of the Opposition, when he gave his policy speech, made the point that the number of beds in public hospitals in South Australia was the second lowest in Australia, but he did not say that the number of private beds here was much higher than that in other States, that our overall bed capacity was about equal to the average of the other States, and that our unoccupied bed rate was higher than that of the other States—so why the need for a 500-bed hospital at Tea Tree Gully when a smaller one would do for the present? That is what the Government has now discovered and is prepared to admit.

I notice that one honourable member referred slightly to the ex-Premier as "promising Tom", but I call him "the great humanitarian Tom" because during his period of office he made the cake bigger for everybody to share. By certain actions he kept our employment figures well up. A great humanitarian is a man who increases the production of a State, not he who tries to cut up a small cake into shares and hand it around. He is "humanitarian Tom", not "promising Tom".

When the present Government was in Opposition, it always used to complain about the Wednesday evening telecast when we announced our plans as a Government, so that the next morning one could readily find out what the Government intended to do. But it is most awkward now. I cannot find out what the Government intends to do. I have to try to discover when the Attorney-General is addressing a meeting; I have to look through the *Advertiser* to see where and when he is speaking, which takes much time, to ascertain the Government's policy.

Mr. Corcoran: You have your opportunity at question time.

Mr. McANANEY: I notice that one or two Ministers answer their questions fully but it is difficult to elicit information from some. My poor unfortunate colleague, the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), has been asking the same question week after week and, although he wants only a simple answer, he has not got it yet. He is still trying and is hopeful. All he wants to know is whether it is within the legal power of the Government to do what it has done, but it will not come up and say anything.

Public relations officers give service to the community, and the community pays for them. It is a good idea. In 1934 I was travelling in a country that had a Minister of Propaganda who had to sell that country's ideas to the people. Many members opposite may not agree but it is possible for something to happen in that direction, so this situation must be watched in order that these public relations officers do not become sellers of the policy of the Government, which is not necessarily in the interests of the community.

Two Ministers have visited my district since the election. They honoured promises made by previous Ministers, and I thank them for coming. I thank the Minister of Health for going to Victor Harbour with me and for what he did there. The Minister of Works visited Strathalbyn in my district and opened a scheme that had been brought to fruition by the previous Government. I thank the Minister for coming to Strathalbyn and acting so graciously. The Strathalbyn district water scheme has proved a great success. Already one farmer in the area has told me that last summer his property carried 700 sheep, whereas in the previous year it had been able to carry only 400. This scheme will make a great difference to the area. Many people are applying for connections now but have been told that it will take two years

before they can be connected. This year the reservoir was allowed to become almost empty before pumping from the lake was commenced. One short line was not connected at that stage, but the reservoir was allowed to become almost empty before pumping was commenced. From then on the pumping more than supplied the needs of the district. Therefore, without dealing with the functions of the technicians in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I believe that if the reservoir were kept full from the beginning of summer to the time when there was sufficient water to carry through the winter, it would be possible for many more connections to be made. Then it would be the will of the Government which would be the determining factor rather than the lack of water. The Hartley, Woodchester, Callington and Brinkley area is badly in need of water. An investigation was made in recent years into this matter, but at that stage the area was mostly mallee and the Public Works Committee did not think much of the scheme. However, much clearing has been done since then and I am sure that the area would be improved if a water scheme were provided. It is rather surprising that water is taken hundreds of miles while areas close to the river still require water.

One thing greatly appreciated in my area is the fact that there is a much better transport service since the regulations have been lifted. There is greater efficiency. I have heard it said that in Naracoorte items can be obtained quickly. In my district if it were necessary to have repairs done to machinery because of a breakdown a person had to get spare parts put on the train in Adelaide and sometimes it took three or four days for them to arrive. If this happened at harvest time it would be inconvenient. With the daily transport service a person can telephone for spare parts at any time before two o'clock and at six o'clock he can pick up the parts. Co-ordination of transport was referred to in the Address in Reply speeches. I did not properly understand this word, as I am a simple country boy, so I looked it up in the dictionary. The definition is, "of the same order; equal in rank, degree or importance; or a number of actions". This makes me think that the co-ordination that the Government will introduce, if it provides for all things being equal, will allow private transport equal opportunities with public transport. The word "co-ordination" also means "provide for the production of one result". This may mean that the Railways Department will provide a better service than it does now. The

word means also "combine activities". In the past the practice with superphosphate has been to pick it up in Adelaide and take it to Strathalbyn.

Mr. Corcoran: Does not the word "co-ordination" also mean "to integrate or combine harmoniously"?

Mr. McANANEY: I did not see those meanings, but perhaps I shall arrive at the point the honourable member is trying to make. If the Railways Department were to provide a service perhaps it may be something like the honourable member suggests, provided it does not cut out the order and fairness that now exists. I suggest that if the railways want freight there should be more co-operation. The department takes the superphosphate to Strathalbyn where it should have a crane to lift a ton at a time, and put it on the private truck if that is integrated into the service, or on to its own truck. A load should be put on in five minutes instead of the time taken now when one uses a hand truck. The railways should put it in my shed as does the private transporter. Co-ordination is not elimination or the creation of a monopoly. If Labor's policy is to eliminate private transport, why not say that it is going to nationalize transport and be done with it?

Mr. Corcoran: Are you sure we are going to nationalize transport?

Mr. Casey: This is pure supposition!

Mr. McANANEY: A Labor spokesman said that the railways is in an impossible position to compete with road transport operators who do not transport enough to pay for the wear and tear on the roads used by their vehicles. I ask for fair competition. Road users should pay for the use of the roads. A landowner pays high rates for the use of the roads, which perhaps he does not use. The member for Semaphore said something about reduced rates for pensioners at Port Adelaide. Under the present system pensioners are rated on property to provide roads, but many do not have a motor car. Pensioners could be helped by making people who use the roads pay for them by means of a petrol tax or other imposition, which is easy to collect and without high administration costs. I asked a question about the Langhorne Creek road, and was told that work on it would be carried out, if funds were available, by the end of 1966. This is the only piece of road not bituminized between Mount Gambier and Adelaide on that route. People travelling on the bitumen reach this unsealed road without realizing that they are travelling at a dangerous speed. Last Sunday two cars

turned over within half an hour at one corner because they were travelling too quickly. I hope the road will be sealed as soon as possible.

One problem in my district, which is mainly a farming community with many small dairy-men, is the lack of capital held by small farmers. I know many instances where farmers lack available finance, and have asked me if something can be done about it. I have assisted in one or two instances, but many small farmers are in difficulties. In one case a farmer has £2,000 or £3,000 on a private mortgage, and two mortgages with the Development Bank that have to be repaid. He also owes money to a stock firm. His commitments are too heavy. If he were able to obtain a long-term loan of about 40 per cent of his capital investment he would be much happier and his production would increase two-fold. He has old machinery that could be replaced, and he would not have to sell his stock. I assisted two or three people prior to the election of the present Government, but have not had much luck since.

Mr. Corcoran: Are these loans on second mortgage? Does he want the loan for machinery?

Mr. McANANEY: This man has 200 acres and land adjoining was sold for £100 an acre. Yet he cannot get finance. He does not want much more than what he could get advanced for a house on a low deposit in Adelaide. This shortage of capital is becoming more prevalent, necessitating more and more reliance on stock firms. The rate of interest charged is 7½ per cent and a person borrowing money is controlled to some extent. Long term loans at reasonable rates of interest would increase production and improve the position of smaller farmers in my area. It is said that we are Tories, but I criticize if I think criticism is necessary, and I do not think insurance companies carry out their full obligations to the farming community. They sell a lot of insurance in the country, yet are not prepared to lend money in proportion to the amount they get. Some insurance companies will not lend in the country at all, and some will not lend in areas with an annual rainfall of under 17in. In spite of that, I read the other day where one company lost £4,000,000 as a result of lending money on hire-purchase without requiring the payment of deposits. Attention should be given to that matter of lending by these companies.

Regarding afforestation, which was mentioned by other honourable members, the slopes on the southern side of the hills around Bull Creek

would be more profitable for afforestation purposes than for grazing. I also want to deal with tourism as it applies to my district. We have reached the stage where more money should be voted for tourism in South Australia. I know it could be said, "Why didn't you do it before?" but money had to be spent in other directions. More money should now be spent on tourism. I understand that the return in Queensland was £375,000,000, which amount is slightly below the value of primary production in that State. Tourism is a big industry and the more we can do to encourage people to come to this State the better. We stated in our policy that we would provide increased amounts for the payment of subsidies in relation to tourism and that we would widen the scope of the subsidies. Our South Coast possesses greater natural advantages than the Gold Coast of Queensland, but the difficulty is that we have a short season, whereas the Gold Coast has 12 months' season. The rents charged for holiday accommodation are too high. I paid £25 a week for a small cottage last January. However, if the facilities were extended it would be possible to reduce rents and many people would be able to pay their way.

Potatoes are grown on a large scale in my area. The legislation under which the Potato Board operates was amended 18 months ago, but so far the board has not put those amendments into operation, and is not carrying out the wishes of the growers. I have attended many meetings and I know that the potato growers are united, but they want effect given to those amendments. It is said, "You have five members on the board. Why don't you control it?" However, there are two members from the South-East, whose interests are different from the interests of growers in my district. South-East growers send quantities of their potatoes to other States. However, they have agreed to do away with one of their members.

Mr. Hughes: How do they propose to do away with him?

Mr. McANANEY: I thank the honourable member for that interjection. If it suits him better, let me say that the position on that board will be eliminated. I think the Government is now altering boundaries so that elections in respect of this board can take place, but the potato growers are unanimous in their desire for new elections and for a completely new board. Indeed, I would support any amendment to that effect. If growers became apathetic and did not make full use of the amendment, the blame would rest with them.

The chairmen of marketing boards are often trained horticulturists and agriculturists who have a full-time job to do in their own departments, where shortages of staff often exist. The chairman of a marketing board needs to have an inside knowledge of marketing, as well as specialized training. The existing set-up is anomalous because, if potato growers are dissatisfied with the chairman of the board, often they are not willing to accept his advice when he offers it. Sometimes, too, the chairmen of boards such as this one become old and, although still quite capable, reach the stage where they accept things as they are. They see no room for improvement. Someone said the other day that a man is old when he stops looking, but I think he is old when he sees no room for improvement. The Wheat Board and its orderly marketing scheme have been a great success; we must remember that the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) has been largely responsible for the stabilization of the wheat industry.

Mr. McKee: You should get him on to the Egg Board.

Mr. McANANEY: The Wheat Board has been successful, largely because of large-scale production and use of machinery, thereby reducing labour costs on farms. We have nearly always been able to export wheat without incurring losses, and for the first decade or more the Wheat Board financed the Australian consumer. I stand to be corrected but I think it was to the extent of over £150,000,000.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It was £190,000,000!

Mr. McANANEY: For a short period our costs of production were higher than the export price, and the Australian Government had to put about £10,000,000 into this industry. The marketing board reached the stage where it had almost broken down, and nearly every economics writer in the various Australian papers was saying, "Why hand this money out to the farmers?" I think that if the price had fallen and been kept below the export price, so much pressure would have been put on the Government that it would not have been prepared to continue with stabilizing the scheme. These orderly marketing schemes function well, provided that exports can be made without too big a loss. The Barley Board is another example of the success of such schemes. Although it allowed cheap barley to the beer drinker for many years (up to 6s. or 7s. a bushel), the drinker now pays more for the barley in his beer. That is a scheme which has worked out to advantage, because barley

can be grown and exported without losses being incurred. The orderly marketing and regulating on to the oversea markets has proved of great value to the grower. These other boards have control over things produced on a small scale—primary industries where labour costs and heavy expenditure on such things as transport are involved—and these things cannot be exported without loss. Then we are in trouble. In the egg industry, some of the production is sold at a reasonable margin of profit, but what is sold overseas brings practically nothing. The same applies to dairy produce and to many other primary industries. While that state of affairs exists, only a few efficient producers can carry on and enjoy a reasonable standard of living; the rest produce at cost of production or below, not at cost of production plus a reasonable margin so that they can live like anyone working under a reasonable award in another industry can live. It is hard to provide a solution, but I think someone should at least make some suggestions.

I suggest that, as applies with the Milk Board in Victoria, there will have to be a quota of, for instance, so many dozen eggs for each producer. This should be worked out so as to give cost of production plus a reasonable margin of profit, and any surplus production will have to be produced at the growers' own risk. I do not suggest that there should be any restriction on production. The grower should have a quota to supply a certain amount on the Australian market, any surplus being produced at his own risk. At times he will make a big profit and at others he will not. The Government would have to take into account that if the surplus production were not there it would not be able to meet overseas commitments. We import goods worth about £1,000,000,000 annually, of which £800,000,000 are for secondary industry, so the Government must have enough exports to pay for imports. If the production were not there, the Government would have to step in and give a guaranteed price for a greater production to ensure that it was there. This may sound a crazy jigsaw puzzle, but is not the Australian economy a jigsaw into which only a jigsaw puzzle would fit?

I prepared my speech before yesterday's rain, and I made a heading "Drought Conditions". However, I can still talk about the general principles of drought. The drought was mentioned in today's issue of the *News*, and someone said this morning that we had had a run of good seasons in this State. We

had droughts in 1940 and 1944, and then there was a period of ten good seasons. It was dry in 1957 and 1959; one year was as dry as 1914. There was another dry year in 1963, so it can be seen that we have had several dry years. Why does everyone think we have had good seasons? I think the reason is that we have improved farming conditions, and we are farming by different methods and conserving more fodder. Along the Murray through Jervois great stacks of hay can be seen. These stacks are there entirely because of improved methods. I was in Queensland a few days ago and went for a 375-mile trip to Theodore, where the position is completely different. I think they have more good seasons there, but they still run into bad seasons for which they have made no preparations. They have no machinery sheds, and the minute they run into dry periods they are in trouble.

Many South Australian farmers are going to farm in Theodore now and demonstrating how to farm the country, conserve fodder, and make the best of it. One wonders why the Queenslanders are so far behind in their farming methods. I think it can be attributed to the Government of the day—I was going to say the Labor Government—which would not give the people freehold tenure of the land. They had short-term leaseholds and these farmers did not learn to love their land and put the energy into it that we do in South Australia. With a different Government there, which is giving them freehold tenure, there will be great improvement in their farming.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They are taking freehold tenure away down here.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes. The Mills brothers in Tasmania have cleared much country over there. I was talking to them 10 or 12 years ago and said, "I have just been to Queensland. It is lovely country there, but I am not going there because of the land tenure." The other day I was told that Mills had moved to Queensland, where he will clear a great area of country.

Returning to the lack of finance, there is much talk about having a national scheme to deal with drought and the Government's making suitable provision; but it is not the Government's responsibility only. If a man is half a farmer he will do it himself, but in many cases through lack of capital he cannot afford to sink £1,000 in a shed in case of drought. If the Government is to do anything to assist in this conservation against drought, it should take the form of making money available for people to store hay and build haysheds.

Mr. Hughes: It all depends how you use the word "drought". There are people in my area who, when they get down to about eight bags, say they have had a drought.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes; it is always a matter of comparison, but this would not be a matter of determining whether it was a drought. It would be up to the farmer to provide a certain storage of hay in a shed so that, when a drought occurred, he would not have to pay for it. My idea is to give him an advance so that he can afford to store the hay. Always at this time of the year we start talking about how high meat prices are, saying that they have never been higher. Beef on an average monthly price at the abattoirs for the four years 1961 to 1964 was just under 2s. a lb; last week it was under 2s. 6d. a lb. and it has been much higher at other peak times in those years. That is an increase of 6d. a lb. on the average, yet people say that steak has risen to 10s. a lb. in some places. Mutton in the same period averaged just under 1s. a lb. Last week it was approximately 13d., or only a penny a pound dearer, and 3d. to 5d. a lb. cheaper than at other peak periods. Lamb over the same period averaged 22d. a lb.; last week it was 31d. a lb. but it is still not above the highest peak period in other years. Just where is this big price increase? It is hard to say. Many retail butchers are on the breadline and are not making excess profits.

Irrigation has been of tremendous value to my area. When the Chowilla dam comes into being, we hope we shall be able to make more use of that water. It will have to be taken back from the lake a few miles into better areas because near the lake the ground is not particularly suitable. My area is one of the few areas, from the point of view of farm production, where the population is rising. In the northern areas, we see empty houses and a declining population.

I turn now to decentralization. When it is mentioned many people immediately think that secondary industry is required and it is not realized that nearly half as many people are engaged in primary production as are engaged in secondary production. The actual figures are 29 per cent engaged in manufactures, 11 per cent in primary production, and 60 per cent in auxiliary industries.

Mr. McKee: Would it be the previous Government that caused that?

Mr. McANANEY: Those are the figures for the whole of Australia.

Mr. McKee: What caused the people to leave their farms?

Mr. McANANEY: These figures are for the whole of Australia and when they were made there had been many Labor Governments within Australia, so the honourable member cannot pin-point one particular Party and blame it.

Mr. McKee: There are a lot of farms.

Mr. McANANEY: A Labor Government has been in power in Tasmania for 32 years and the population is declining. The natural increases there cannot keep up with the departures. Therefore, why try to pin this on one Party? I am trying to talk about the problems.

Mr. Ryan: You said 60 per cent were engaged in auxiliary industries. Are they auxiliary to primary or secondary industries?

Mr. McANANEY: These are the people as a whole and this percentage includes politicians, school teachers, insurance men, bank clerks and so on. Apparently the honourable member is surprised at the point I am making that it is not realized that only 29 per cent of people are actually engaged in the production of goods. Nearly half as many are engaged in primary production. We talk about increasing population and for that we say we must have secondary industry. We impose high tariffs on imported secondary products irrespective of what they will do to rural industry. People who come to this country can go into primary industry provided costs are not too high and primary products can be exported without loss. In any country area many people live in the town who are engaged in primary production around it. If one man is put on to the land another is put in a country town.

Mr. Ryan: That does not apply to Port Pirie or Whyalla.

Mr. McANANEY: People there are actively engaged in industrial cities the same as those in parts of Adelaide. If one man is put into primary production another man will be working in a country town, and this is one way of getting decentralization. For instance, one farmer producing on the land means that there will be another man in a factory providing him with machinery and doing his repairs. I keep books for my farm and I have a wages bill of £3,000, but the repair bill is higher than that. Therefore, that is keeping someone in an industry. If men are put into primary production this will solve the population problem. It may be said that secondary industry produces the same result, but a man engaged in secondary production does not keep a man engaged in primary production. On the contrary, a man in primary production can produce enough to keep 10

families. I think this problem of decentralization can be solved by putting men on to the land.

Mr. McKee: Where will you get all the land to settle them? Will you break up the big monopoly farms?

Mr. McANANEY: I have seen a large part of the world and can say that in Australia we are only playing with production on the land. As the need arises, production will eventuate and there will be people on the land. We can produce foodstuffs more cheaply and with less effort than anywhere else in the world, but we cannot export them without loss, as we have artificially inflated our nominal costs in this country and this has nearly put us out of business and deprived us of the right to send food at a reasonable price to the starving millions of the world. Trade is always greater than aid. We make the mistake of giving a country aid, but we should trade with it and accept its goods in exchange for our primary production. When this happens the world's problems will be solved.

I do not see many new members in the House now. I was going to give one or two of them some fatherly advice. The honourable member for Glenelg referred to the "vicious gerrymander". The Labor Party at the election won 21 seats to 18. I spent some time working out how many seats it would have won in a 39-member House on the one vote one value principle, with some regard to the common interest of the electorate. I think all fair-minded people will agree that in any district there should be a common interest. I find that on that set-up the Labor Party would have just the faintest possibility of winning 22 to 17, or slightly better than it did. There is also a slight possibility that the Liberals would have won 20 to 19. I emphasize "slight". The best result would have been 21 to 18 with a distinct possibility of a 20 to 19 victory. I suggest honourable members try to work it out on that principle, because with that result, there would have been eight or nine different faces on the other side of the House.

I do not think it is wise that the young member for Glenelg should think that anything different from what he thinks is vicious, or is wrong. One can have a difference of opinion without using words like "vicious". I have argued with Communists and respect some of their views: I would not call them vicious. I took a young girl out once in New York, and she told me she was a Communist. Instead of going to the theatre, we sat and argued

Communism until 5.30 in the morning. I am sure I have a wider view than have members on the other side who can see only one side of an argument, because I can see both sides. That is advice that should be welcomed by the younger members of the House.

The member for Norwood stated on television that it took as many voters to elect the member for Enfield as it did to elect six Liberal members, and he named the districts represented by those Liberal members. That may be true, but in fairness he could have used also the six Labor districts of Murray, Port Pirie, Frome, Wallaroo, Millicent and Chaffey, which would have the same number of voters as Enfield.

Mr. Jennings: That still does not make the system right.

Mr. McANANEY: No, but I am disproving this charge of viciousness. The Labor Party voted for the present electoral system and it was not vicious then. Labor stood an equal chance under the set-up. Why pick on one of my constituents wandering up Bull Creek Road, who has a 70.9 chance of being a Liberal voter and ask whether his vote is more valuable than that of the man in Enfield? I suggest that they should have gone into the honourable member for Frome's district and had him walking up the Hawker Road in preference to quoting the case of my unfortunate fellow whose vote was not as good as that of the person in Frome, Millicent, Wallaroo or Port Pirie. I am amazed that a member of the legal profession should appear on television and put something up like that, having regard to his training in logic, reason and, we hope, commonsense. The word "democracy" has been used a great deal. I never did very well at English at school, so I always have to go to the dictionary. Here is the meaning of "democracy":

Government by the people. That form of Government in which the sovereign power resides in the people as a whole and is exercised either directly by them or by officers elected by them:

When one talks about "democracy", one always talks about people, not individuals, and people are defined as bodies of persons comprising a community, tribe, race or nation, so I trust that when the Government introduces its electoral reform Bill shortly it will recognize the various common interests and the rights of all sections of the community to have reasonable representation in Parliament.

Mr. Clark: That is exactly what we are going to do.

Mr. McANANEY: If the Government puts up something reasonable, I think you will find that there are some reasonable people in this world.

Mr. Jennings: Particularly if they are invincible themselves!

Mr. McANANEY: I ask the honourable member for Port Adelaide to recall an earlier statement of mine when I said I would support the setting up of an accounts committee, and if the Labor Party wanted it then—

Mr. Ryan: You opposed it when it came to the vote. Look at *Hansard*!

Mr. McANANEY: I said that I thought such a committee was needed. I praise the honourable member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) and welcome her to the House. We have had the honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) with us since I have been here and I am sure she has adequately fulfilled her role as a member of Parliament, and as well as the rest of us. I am sure that the honourable member for Barossa will contribute to the debates in the House and be a valuable honourable member. I will give her some advice. I think she made a somewhat sweeping statement when she said that the building industry was in an absolute state of chaos and that everything was wrong. I am not saying that there are not weaknesses in the building industry, but it is wrong to condemn everybody. She said that the workers, the architects and everybody said things were wrong. I was in Queensland 10 days ago and spoke to a bank manager who had been in Adelaide recently. He said to me, "Bill, you are lucky down there with the lovely houses being built. They are being built here at a much higher price. A person comes in for a loan that would buy a house in Adelaide, but he wants it for a shanty." Prices are higher there than here, of which the previous Government can be proud. Judgment is made on the standard and quantity of goods produced, and not on theoretical nonsense. There has been talk in this House about subcontracting, but most of the houses in the Strathalbyn area have been built by subcontractors, whose work has always been of a high standard. Indeed, I have not received one complaint about their work. A man in my district (himself connected with the building trade) had a house built at Strathalbyn, and he is proud of it. The only complaints I have actually received relate to some Housing Trust houses in my district. They were rented to people in semi-Government positions, in charge of perhaps 20 workmen.

Their houses are substandard and inferior to what is being provided by the subcontractors and local builders.

My son had a house built on the subcontracting system, and the builders worked hard to put it up quickly. We might well say that there will be a different story in six months' time, but if we employ a builder surely we should first examine the type of house he is building. My son spent six months doing this, and finally chose a builder with whom everybody had been satisfied.

Mr. Corcoran: I don't think the member for Barossa blamed every subcontractor.

Mr. McANANEY: She made the sweeping statement that the building industry was in a state of chaos. I admit that some things in the building trade must be corrected, but surely this can be achieved by using the appropriate building regulations, without destroying the subcontracting system. Subcontractors are working people who want to get ahead, and by working in this way they can pull themselves out of a rut. I should say 90 per cent of them take an interest and pride in their work. They candidly admit the presence of a few unscrupulous men in the trade, but they maintain that their system is a way in which they can lift themselves out of a rut and perform a useful service to the community at the same time. I should certainly be opposed to dragging everybody down to the same standard of working for wages.

Mr. Corcoran: By pulling themselves out of the rut they probably put someone else in it.

Mr. McANANEY: The regulations are there to be used, but although I do not make a sweeping statement against all inspectors, often when a person is not succeeding as a builder he appears on the scene as an inspector in the same trade.

I welcome the new member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), who adequately performed his task in speaking in this debate. I do not intend to criticize him; actually, I praise him, for he said that the Engineering and Water Supply Department was not functioning very well in his district and that private enterprise should be brought in to facilitate matters.

I am sorry that the member for Glenelg is not present for I wish to point out that, although he mentioned happenings in 1855, I do not care to see people go back even five or 10 years for quotations. A person constantly changes his views and learns new things, and what one thinks is correct at 30 years of age may be vastly different when he reaches 40. If it is not so, he might well be a "no-hoper". The

honourable member quoted what Charles Kingston said in 1855, namely, that equal votes were the right thing. Naturally, as it was then purely a rural community and everyone had the same profession, equal voting rights was an equal and just system. Now we have community interests, and surely we must have progressed. When I was the same age as the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) I had certain theories, and I wrote a pamphlet on them. The member for Enfield chided me on that because I paid for the pamphlets myself, and the Attorney-General tried to use this in evidence against me in a by-election 15 years later, but he did not get on very well. I sent out that pamphlet to people in every walk of life throughout Australia, and I got back comments from members of this House who praised me for it.

Mr. McKee: They were members of your Party.

Mr. McANANEY: No, the late Mr. A. W. Lacey was one who praised me, and several other Labor members did so also. The member for Glenelg still wants to be thirsting after knowledge to improve his ideas and so educate himself. I was rather disappointed about one aspect of his speech. I was home for only one or two nights during the election campaign, but I saw him on television one night when he was taking £6,000,000 out of the air on one occasion and £5,000,000 from somewhere else, and finished by having taken £51,000,000. I thought that in his first speech in this House he would have given more definite information on how this would be achieved. Seeing him on television reminded me of an occasion when I was a member of a Workers' Association and someone had a perpetual motion machine working in Birks's store. This idea really caught on. I think the shares in this company fetched £243 and then all of a sudden the machine stopped working and everyone who had bought shares lost everything they had invested. I was hoping that the member for Glenelg would give some more practical explanation of what seemed to me like a system of perpetual motion. I was in the Sydney Art Gallery 10 days ago and saw something that looked like perpetual motion. On display there I saw a modern brass thing on a string which twisted first one way and then the other. It may not have been perpetual motion, but it was not getting anywhere, whereas in life one must always move forward.

The member for Glenelg asked in his speech whether his opponents believed in enterprise.

I say emphatically that I believe in any enterprise that is competitive. If the Government can, with its railways, compete against private transport, I am all for the railways. If the railways can give a service, let us have them. That is the whole thing—any enterprise must be competitive. His followers—and I had a rude remark to make but I will not make it—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn): Rude remarks are out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: This was comparatively polite. The honourable member's followers are frightened of the efficiency of private enterprise and seek at every opportunity to restrict or destroy it. I apologize to the member for Glenelg, who has just returned, for tackling him in his absence.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Previous speakers have drawn attention to the fact that it is not usual for a member to refer to another member who is absent from the Chamber. This is the second occasion the honourable member has done it, and it is not the usual practice.

Mr. McANANEY: As regards banking restrictions, I do not oppose the State Bank's operations but it is not under the control of the Commonwealth Banking Act. It receives cheap money from the Government to carry on its business. It was in the first place received from people with certain income tax concessions but a trading bank (and this is not fair) which is in competition, in order to get an equivalent amount of share capital, must make nearly 10 per cent to give an equivalent rate of interest to its investors, because 4 per cent would be taken in income tax. Its activities are also restricted by the Banking Act, and any enterprise must be competitive. The whole argument on banking is that, if the Government harnesses and develops the financial resources available to the State and gains control of the Savings Bank and by pursuing a development policy takes savings away from private persons, one finishes up with more money for development than before. I have always found that if I have two pennies in one pocket and two pennies in another and I take one penny out of one pocket and put it into the other pocket, making three pennies there, I still have only four pennies; but the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) tells us that we have four and a half or five pennies.

If more money is to be available for housing and other national development works, it must come from the savings of the people. We are a young country needing development. Everywhere the need is for more capital investments

or savings. We are borrowing £200,000,000 overseas and we would be in serious difficulty if we did not, but there is no reason why we cannot save enough in our own country to carry out development in our own interests. If our primary industries could produce more cheaply than anywhere else in the world, they should have costs to compete with the world, and it should not be hard to get in another £200,000,000.

Look at the amount invested in hire purchase! That is taken from the people's savings and could be used for development work. It is reaching a stage of crisis, for £73,000,000 has been lost in the past five years in bad debts, mainly on hire purchase. If we examined the balance sheets of all other companies still operating, I believe that up to £200,000,000 would have gone in bad debts. It is said, "Blame management for that." Perhaps it is true but, as long as we allow people to operate on hire purchase without deposit, they will enter into commitments that they cannot fulfil. I had an unfortunate instance in my own area the other day. A sister of a young man working in the Engineering and Water Supply Department came to him one morning when he was having breakfast and said, "Sign this guarantee; I want to buy a television set." She got a television set and a motor car. The company concerned grabbed the television set and the young man, out of the goodness of his heart, had given as security a block of land on which he wanted to build a house. He lost his block on this guarantee.

Mr. Hudson: You advocate Government control in that respect?

Mr. McANANEY: People should be prepared to save a little before entering into hire purchase commitments; then they would not over-commit themselves on hire purchase and get into the trouble they do today.

Mr. Hudson: We can prevent it happening only by control and minimum deposits.

Mr. McANANEY: I advocate that, in the interests of the community, if we are to have more savings and the necessary development works done, we must curtail the activities of people who are not prepared to save anything before they enjoy the benefits of a scheme.

Mr. Hudson: Does the honourable member advocate ceding the necessary power to the Commonwealth Government for this purpose?

Mr. McANANEY: I cannot answer that interjection exactly, but I understand that the State Government would have the power to enforce minimum deposits. I believe that that matter has been discussed in the House.

Mr. Hudson: One State cannot do this, as hire-purchase funds would go to the other States.

Mr. McANANEY: I think that it is necessary for the development of Australia that the people must be willing to save something before they use up some of the nation's wealth. I believe that the Commonwealth Government is on the right track in finance: if a person is prepared to save for a house then he is entitled to assistance, and the Commonwealth Government is making a gift of £250 to people prepared to save. In a speech that I made before the by-election at which I was elected I said that the Housing Trust should put more heart into its activities. I believe that it should be building houses for the aged, sick, and others in unfortunate circumstances rather than providing houses as a priority for people who should be able to provide houses for themselves.

The honourable member for Glenelg referred to "the little people". In this country's present position, I cannot understand who the little people are. I looked at a chart of the incomes of various grades of people in Australia and, if one draws a line through the average income earned, the bulk of the people are not far away from that average. If one allows for those above that line and the fact that they must pay greater income tax and possibly earn some interest on savings, then one can see that the bulk of the people are in almost the same position. Therefore, I am unable to work out who these little people are. I think that they are probably people that one would meet in Rundle Street on a Saturday night. They are spending every penny they have and really enjoying their lives. I say, "Good luck to them"; I am in favour of freedom and I believe that they should be allowed to do as they like. However, if they wish to spend every penny they have and not save for a house, then is it the obligation of a person who wants to save and does save to provide the capital and savings for these people? I favour a scheme to assist those who are prepared to save, even if it is in the way of a grant. I do not favour making interest rates higher to attract more money for this purpose because this places an unfair burden on those who must borrow to pay for the balance owing on their houses.

On the other side, whom would I call the big people? I refer again to what I saw a fortnight ago. I was staying at a motel in Brisbane and the Institute of Technology was not far up the street. Every night I walked

up the street and saw these lovely young Australian people with their satchels under their arms, happily engaged in trying to improve themselves. Many people sell young Australians short, but they are better than my generation as a whole because they have had the opportunity to improve themselves. I believe that these will be the big people of the future. They have confidence in their own ability and I have confidence in their ability, too. When I was elected to this Parliament my son was 19 years old and he told me that he knew twice as much as I did. I said to him, "Well, here is a farm—you run it." He is now 21 and he is doing better than I did because I was thinking of economics when I should have been thinking of the farm.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The two things go very much together.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not think these young people want restrictions. If they are prepared to help themselves our policy should be to help them. I was at the university 30 years ago, and those who attended were often the sons of rich people and did not care whether they passed or not. Today, many students are on scholarships and know that if they work and pass they will get out of the rut. I take my hat off to the young people today. I listened with considerable interest to the speech of the honourable member for Semaphore, who may take over the part that was played by the former member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh), who knew so much about trade union affairs and who was a fair-minded person. The Commonwealth Government has created conditions for full employment: people can move from job to job and can take an extra job if they wish. I do not know whether the trade unions are going to achieve what they have sought to achieve in the past. I ask the honourable member for Semaphore who would be the highest paid semi-skilled labourer in South Australia or Australia today. I should say they would be the farm labourer, who does not have a union. Farm labourers are not protected—

Mrs. Byrne: They have not got an award.

Mr. McANANEY: They are not covered by an award, although there is a stationhands' award.

Mr. Corcoran: They have not been allowed to have one.

Mr. McANANEY: Their conditions are the best in South Australia today. I sponsored a British migrant about six months ago and found out the wages being paid. He received £18 a week, a three-room house rent-free, and

meat and milk for four children. I pay £25 10s. for a unskilled man working a 40-hour week, without an award. If we create conditions in which there is full employment with the opportunity to work and with competition to secure the labour, the working man will get the maximum results.

Mr. Hurst: Workers have the right to sell their labour on the same basis as the employer sells his commodity.

Mr. McANANEY: They can get what they are able to.

Mr. Hurst: No, they cannot.

Mr. McANANEY: They may not by trade union rules.

Mr. Hurst: By the Arbitration Act!

Mr. McANANEY: They are not supposed to take two jobs but many people do that. If we can maintain this state of full employment and good conditions, working people will get the maximum that it is possible for industry to pay. I do not say they will get more.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you think we could do away with trade unions?

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member for Semaphore said that the application of manpower and materials creates the wealth of any State and that, if it were not for the workers in any industry, there would be no wealth.

Mr. Hurst: That is so.

Mr. McANANEY: We should forget the word "workers" because it is out of date. About 95 per cent to 98 per cent of the people are workers—employees or employers.

Mr. Hughes: Many are, but they do not like to be recognized as such.

Mr. McANANEY: When someone once said I was the President of the Workers Educational Association, the member for Adelaide wondered what I was doing as the President, because, he said, I was not a worker. I do not agree on this matter of the application of manpower and materials. I worked on a dairy farm for £1 a week, starting work at 6.30 a.m. and finishing at 6.30 p.m. We had a milking machine and three of us used to milk the cows. One night one employee was away and the milking machine broke down. The result was that two of us had to milk 80 cows, which called for much endurance. That was an example of a saving. Someone had saved money in order to purchase the facility to milk the cows. Those who are willing to save and build up for the future are the people who succeed. Another instance is that of a person whom I employed after the last war. I gave him a

percentage of wheat that was grown and assisted him in various ways. He was the saving type and created capital. I subsequently sold him some land, advanced him money and lent him a tractor so that he could work the land. He later bought another piece of land and later still bought an additional piece for £3,000. Subsequently an advance of £15,000 under the Rural Advances Act was made on this property. He had 60 acres of lucerne and erected a house and dairy on it. He still was not satisfied; he went to Queensland, where he has a 5,000-acre farm, and has bought 2,000 acres for his son, to be paid for over 20 years. All that was achieved by his own efforts.

Mr. Corcoran: What about the generosity of the person who gave him the start? That is important, because those opportunities do not often present themselves.

Mr. McANANEY: I am trying to disprove a statement on so-called economics by trying to get down to the hard, cold facts of life. I am not trying to get any kudos for myself, because many employers are just as generous. I do not hold myself out as any example. This man did not waste money but accumulated wealth, and he is now in that position. I think it was the honourable member for Murray who recently called me a bloated capitalist. However, I would not like to tell members about the conditions under which I started. On another occasion I started a dairy and put an employee on shares. He received half the milk cheque. His earnings got up to £45 a week in one year, yet I had to guarantee his account at the bank because he had to meet his income tax. He was a good worker but was not a saver who accumulated wealth. It is necessary to save. I think he is working for the Government now. It will get good value from him because he was a good worker, but he did not save or accumulate wealth. The return that I received, one half, was not sufficient to service the capital involved, and I could not make ends meet on it, but he did well on his half. Wealth can be dissipated in no time.

One honourable member mentioned the lack of tradesmen and skilled men, and seemed to think that it was the employers' obligation to train them. Possibly it is, but if they do that the consumers will have to pay for the training. I think that most of us should undertake our own training.

Mr. Corcoran: Who would do the training if the employer did not do so?

Mr. McANANEY: I am an accountant, and had to train myself. When I left a bank to become a farmer, despite the absence of any

training in this field, the knowledge of accountancy pulled me through. We hear it said that employers should train the tradesmen, but the consumer would have to pay for it. The obligation should be more on the individual to make himself a fit person. We award scholarships to people who work hard enough for them, and I believe that more and more scholarships should be awarded in this way. It takes four or five years for a man to become a plumber, but I think he should be educated to it in six months, with a further six months' practical experience. He should then qualify as a plumber.

Mr. Ryan: Why don't you be realistic?

Mr. McANANEY: I am, and, what is more, I am being practical. I know of one industry in South Australia where the trade union has some say in the number of men employed, but, when the employers request that more men be trained, if it does not suit the union it simply says that no labour is available to be trained. I think that is a pretty widespread state of affairs, and I do not think the member for Semaphore will deny that. I do not agree with the member for Port Adelaide that we shall be in Opposition for a decade or more. I shall say more on these matters at another time.

I welcome the new members to this House; perhaps I have been a little critical of them. It has in no way been vicious criticism, but fatherly advice. I welcome, too, the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), who is an intellectual person from whom we shall hear more in the future.

Mr. Clark: Give him some advice. You have helped the other people; you should help him, too.

Mr. McANANEY: They are in more need of help than he is, for he has had a good background and training. I sincerely welcome all the new members, who I am sure will greatly contribute to proceedings in this House.

Mr. Clark: Especially after the advice given them.

Mr. McANANEY: Although the member for Burra said that we should not read our speeches, I do not exactly agree with him, because it is not always the man who frequently rises to talk who talks the most sense.

Mr. Clark: I think you have proved that.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not wish to keep honourable members any longer. As I said before, the Governor's Speech mentioned certain items of reform. I will not be destructive in my criticism, and if a measure is introduced for something that I think should be done I will support it. I will not criticize members opposite for their broken promises, as these will catch up with them. Every month, when I see the unemployment figures increase, I will feel the cold wind of change that will float around the ears of members opposite. I support the motion.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.13 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 23, at 2 p.m.