

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 28, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

PETROL DISCOUNTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Recently all petrol companies simultaneously withdrew discounts that they were giving to customers with large monthly accounts. Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of prices, say whether these discounts were discontinued at the direction of the Prices Commissioner or of the Government? If they were, what was the reason for the direction?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not aware of any discounts given by petrol companies to customers. To the best of my knowledge petrol distributors still carry out a certain commercial practice concerning motor lorries and so on. The industry has agreed to cut out gimmicks that were used until recently. As Minister in charge of prices, I am concerned about a discussion to take place, probably late this afternoon. For a long time before I assumed office the Prices Commissioner always automatically increased the price of petrol to the consumer if facts indicated that that was justified. However, there is one proviso: if a person selling petrol can offer 3d. per gallon, sometimes 6d., as a discount, there must be a need to ascertain the reason, and it appears that there will be a discussion between the marketing organization and me as Minister in charge of prices. I am prepared to back the Commissioner in his attitude regarding proposed increases for higher octane petrol. As a matter of fact, before I left for overseas I agreed in principle that if the Commissioner could prove that there was a need for a higher octane content in petrol and that it needed a further increase, I would back him. The marketing organizations have now dispensed with the gimmicks that were being offered, I believe to draw custom. I am no authority on the question of other discounts of any description.

I make it perfectly clear that I am in harmony with the prices investigation. The method of fixing prices of fuel oils in this State has been recognized and accepted in other States as being an authority. In other words, if there is to be an increase in this case it will have to apply all round. If somebody can undersell by 3d. a gallon, I shall want to know what discount enables him to do so. Further,

I hold the view that I am unable to agree to any increase in the price of petrol whilst it can be sold at a price 3d. or 6d. a gallon less than the approved price.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: Last week I sought information concerning the calling of tenders and the commencing date of work on the new Jervois bridge. Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, any information on this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that tenders for the construction of Jervois bridge will be called early in July. With a contract of this size, a reasonably long period is required for tenders to remain open so that contractors have ample time to prepare an accurate estimate. In this case, it is intended to allow three months for this purpose. After tenders are closed, a further month is expected to be required before a contract is let, but this will depend on the number and complexity of tenders received. After acceptance of a tender, the contractor will be allowed up to three months to commence work on the site, even though he may use some of this time in off-site preparation, such as casting of piles, etc. Taking all factors into consideration, therefore, actual construction of the new bridge will probably commence in late January, 1967.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked him last week regarding a drainage proposal for the Prospect, Enfield and Hindmarsh councils?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Roads reports that while there is no doubt as to the urgency of the implementation of the drainage scheme proposed jointly by Prospect, Enfield and Hindmarsh councils, its priority in relation to other proposed schemes, such as the Eastern Suburbs, Salisbury's comprehensive proposal, or the Sturt Creek scheme, cannot be assessed without consideration by a properly constituted drainage authority. I understand that a draft Bill for the prevention and control of floodwaters in the metropolitan area is to be forwarded by the Parliamentary Draftsman to Cabinet for consideration.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked last week, regarding legislation likely to be introduced concerning the control of metropolitan floodwaters?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that a Bill for the setting up of a metropolitan drainage authority has been drafted and that, after consideration by Cabinet, it will be introduced this session, when honourable members may consider it in detail.

NORTH YELTA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HUGHES: Last week I was very distressed to learn that fire had completely gutted a house at North Yelta. On January 25 this year I prefaced a question to the Minister of Works by reading a petition handed to me by residents of North Yelta seeking a better water supply for that area. The petition drew attention to the extremely poor water pressure to their houses, and pointed out that the position was so serious that should a fire occur residents would be obliged to watch their houses burn. That is exactly what happened last week. A resident's report appearing in the local newspaper stated:

I am more than disgusted with the water supply at North Yelta. When a resident's home was destroyed by fire there were firemen trying their best to effect a save, and to cap it all they had to run a hose from a fire plug across the railway line about 1,000yds. away. When they got the water it was too late and the pressure a disgrace. Some months ago the people handed a petition to their member, Mr. Hughes, for presentation. A new main was promised. Now is the time to get busy before the summer arrives, during the peak period of which the water just dribbles out of taps. The present main has been down 96 years so it will have paid for itself. When the new main is installed, more fire plugs should also be provided in case of fires. The tragic part of last Saturday's fire was the fact that the police and firemen had to stop a train to prevent it from running over the hose.

In fairness to the Minister, when I previously drew his attention to the poor water supply in this area his immediate investigation confirmed that the supply was poor. The department considered that replacement of the main was warranted and an estimate was to be made and approval sought for the expenditure, with provision for the replacement in the 1966-67 Loan Estimates. In view of this recent fire and the danger that still exists to other properties in the area, will the Minister treat as urgent this request for a better water supply to North Yelta?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I express my sympathy to those who lost because of the fire. As it was explained to the honourable member, we acknowledged there was a need but also there was a necessity for an investigation to be made. Investigations have been made and

a report has been prepared, and it was expected that the work would be carried out during the 1966-67 financial year. I am pleased to inform the honourable member that I have received information that the laying of mains will be commenced in August of this year and will be continued for the remainder of this year.

SOUTH ROAD TRAFFIC.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A traffic hazard at present exists at the Morphett Vale Primary School. This school, which is due for replacement within a few years, is situated adjacent to the Main South Road and has about 500 children attending it. Several hundreds of these schoolchildren walk daily along the road from the Morphett Vale township and many have to cross the Main South Road to reach the school. The Road Traffic Board has refused to allow the installation of flashing light crossings in the vicinity but has approved the installation of a much more expensive safety measure, namely, a pedestrian over-pass which would clearly be a bad investment in view of the limited future of the present school. I point out that flashing lights, besides being not nearly as expensive as a pedestrian over-pass, would be suitable for the purpose. In view of the extreme danger that exists on this busy highway and the anxiety of parents of schoolchildren concerned, will the Minister of Education again discuss the matter with the Minister of Roads in order to ascertain whether flashing lights or some other safety measure can be installed at the site of the present school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am conversant with this problem and shall be pleased to confer with my colleague on the matter.

DARLINGTON INFANTS SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the progress of building on the new Darlington Infants School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Public Buildings Department has informed me that work on this building is well advanced and that it is expected to be ready for occupation at the commencement of the third term of this year.

FREE BOOKS.

Mrs. STEELE: Free books for both State and private primary schools are to be introduced at the beginning of 1967, and in this respect the Minister of Education has already made a public statement. Obviously, the

South Australian Institute of Teachers is interested in this scheme, as its members will play an important part in its implementation and administration. Indeed, I understand that members have thoroughly considered the matter and, judging from the statement emanating from the institute, they have some doubts as to its practicability, although they have assured the Minister that they will loyally try to honour the idea of the scheme. As a result of a survey and discussions that took place, institute members have submitted a number of points for consideration by the Minister and the officers of his department who are responsible for planning the scheme. Can the Minister say whether those points have been considered and, if they have, will he comment on them?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have considered the points raised by the Institute of Teachers but, as I do not have the list of points raised with me today, it is rather difficult for me to comment on them at such short notice. However, I shall be happy to comment on the list when it is available.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Burnside has now handed the Minister of Education a copy of the *S.A.I.T. News* of June 15 in which the points she has mentioned are set out. The first, and perhaps the most important, point is that the purchase and distribution of books by the schools should continue as at present, except that there should be a monetary grant to parents. The other points are in the publication now in the Minister's possession. The views expressed by the South Australian Institute of Teachers are shared by and large by the headmasters and headmistresses of independent schools with whom I have talked on this matter. Now that the Minister is in possession of these four points, will he comment on them? In particular will he say whether the Government has considered the obvious alternative scheme of simply making a grant of money for books in lieu of the scheme that the Government proposes, or perhaps proposed, to put into operation pursuant to the Australian Labor Party policy?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Government would deserve serious criticism if it had not considered all alternatives, and I assure the honourable member that every facet of this matter was considered carefully before the Government embarked on its present policy. The first point is that the purchase and distribution of books by the schools should continue as at present except that there should be a monetary grant to parents. I think this

would cause a considerable waste of public money compared with the method proposed to be used. It would probably cost about twice as much as the suggested arrangements. As considerable public funds are involved, naturally the Government has considered this, and it has adopted its present policy on this score. The next point is that the children should own the books. It has been the practice in many schools to have what can be called a book hiring system whereby books have been handed down from child to child if in good order. The education of these children has never suffered through their not owning the books, so there is no disadvantage on this point. Another point is that the choice of books must remain with the schools. The choice of books by schools will be no different from the previous position, so this point is of no consequence. In the past the list of books for selection by teachers of a school has been supplied by curriculum committees. The work of these committees will proceed in the same way as in the past, so the schools will have the same choice as they have had. The fourth point is that the list of recommended books should not be restricted or reduced, and should be amended as required. I think my answer to the third point is an answer to the fourth, because there will be no more restriction on the list of books than there has been in the past. In other words, there will be the same method of choice and selection of books by the curriculum committee, and the introduction of new books will proceed precisely as in the past.

Mr. HEASLIP: This year parents might purchase, at their own expense, books that would be of no value if free books were introduced next year. Last session I asked the Minister whether the department would buy back the books bought by these parents, thus compensating them for the expenditure incurred. If that is not done, the books will be of no value and will be thrown away and wasted. Will the Minister comment on this, as such a scheme would benefit both the parents and the department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The department would not be prepared to do that as it would amount to introducing, to some extent, free books retrospectively. I am sure the honourable member opposes the introduction of retrospective measures.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister said he had carefully considered all alternatives to the scheme which is to be put into operation next year and which appears in Labor Party policy.

He also said that monetary grants in lieu of an issue of free school books would cost about twice as much as the proposed scheme. As he says that all these alternatives have been considered, he must have the figures at his fingertips, so will he tomorrow bring down the costs of the two alternative schemes?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I could inform the honourable member of the tender prices we received for books, but I have not had worked out an accurate estimate of providing a monetary equivalent. However, it is not necessary to provide that because, if the honourable member thinks about it in detail, he will see what the answer is. If the monetary equivalent were provided, the books would be bought at full retail prices and there would be an annual charge at retail prices for the total number of books, whereas under the proposed scheme the Government will obtain books considerably more cheaply by calling tenders, and most of these books will be used again in the second year.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you comment on the cost of administration?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That will be very small.

Mr. Millhouse: School teachers will do it for nothing, I suppose.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If the honourable member requires this, I can tell him the extra cost to the department of distributing the books, which the department will be doing. However, that will not be a large sum. I said that the cost of the alternative would be about double, and if the honourable member cares to work it out in his head he will see that I am fairly close to the mark.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier received from the Minister of Transport a reply to the question I asked last week about the repainting of the Adelaide Railway Station?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague states that at present \$40,000 a year is spent on maintaining the Adelaide Railway Station and that cleaning with detergent and repainting only the concourse would cost a further \$20,000.

GAWLER SEWERAGE.

Mr. CLARK: The Minister of Works, like other members, will know that for the 14 years I have been a member I have persistently sought a sewerage scheme for Gawler. I was much heartened last year to hear His Excellency the Governor, in opening Parliament, say that sewerage schemes for the metropolitan

area and country towns, particularly Gawler, were contemplated. I was therefore disappointed that a scheme for Gawler was not mentioned this year. I hope that does not mean what I fear it means and what many of my constituents are sure it means. Can the Minister of Works indicate the position regarding Gawler sewerage and, if he cannot, will he obtain a report on the matter for me?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the programme for the allocation of funds has not yet been finally determined by the Government, I cannot make a definite statement now.

ADELAIDE-MANNUM ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of June 22 regarding the reconstruction and widening of the Adelaide-Mannum road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that it is proposed to continue the work of reconstruction and widening of the Adelaide-Mannum main road (No. 33) beyond its intersection with the Grand Junction main road (No. 59) and towards Tea Tree Gully during 1966-67. The work is expected to be substantially completed during the following financial year.

EDUCATION METHODS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In the *Bulletin* of June 25 appeared an article headed "The Teachers' Dilemma" in which the writer suggested that insufficient finance and the population explosion after the war were not the causes of the present crisis in education but that it was caused rather by lack of imagination, of long-term planning and of teacher independence. The article also suggested that many problems would disappear if relatively new, but thoroughly tried, European and American methods of education, such as programme learning and team teaching, were extensively used and directed by skilled senior teachers. In view of the campaign now being waged for greater financial allocations for education, will the Minister of Education comment on this article and say whether either of the methods suggested has been used in South Australia or whether experiments with such new methods have been considered?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I thank the honourable member for supplying me with a copy of this question thus allowing me time to consider it. The solution suggested by the *Bulletin* is, of course, an easy solution dealing

with, at best, only a small part of the problem. I believe it is not directed at the main problem in education today. The article from which the honourable member read refers to the need for a crash programme for educational research, experiment and dissemination of new methods. I point out that the Education Department sends teachers overseas every year to ascertain what methods employed in Europe, Great Britain and America could be followed with advantage in Australia. Reports are frequently made by these officers and, where such methods can be applied, they are applied.

I am not sure whether the honourable member has seen my report of this year, but in it I point out that the department is already doing a great deal along the lines referred to by the honourable member. For example, in 1965, 290 in service training courses were held, the duration of the courses ranging from half a day to six weeks or longer. Some courses extended over the whole year with sessions once each week for teachers. In addition, the practice of holding conferences jointly with other bodies has been continued. Conferences were organized in conjunction with the English Teachers' Association, the History Teachers' Association and the University Departments of Biology and Geology. There were two residential conferences held in 1965. One of these, entitled "Programmed Instruction", was attended by teachers' college lecturers and teachers representing all types of schools. The other was an "Orientation Course" for recently appointed members of teachers' college staffs. The development of Arbury Park buildings as a residential in service conference centre will give considerable impetus to the departmental residential conference programme in future years.

I do not agree with the suggestion implicit in the *Bulletin* article that these new methods of improving teaching are not constantly followed up by the Education Department in South Australia, at least; I am not competent to speak on happenings in other States. The *Bulletin* refers to the real crisis in education not being created by insufficient Government provided finance or too many post-war babies but rather by too little imagination, long term planning and teacher independence. I believe that is quite beside the point and certainly does not deal with the real problem of much-needed finance. In South Australia enrolments over the last 20 years have increased three times by comparison with the Australian average increase of two and a quarter times. In addition, the number of students 15 years and over

attending our secondary schools has more than doubled; of course, the cost of teaching a student in a high school is much higher than in a primary school.

To say that the problem in education is not mainly concerned with lack of finance, is to misunderstand the problem completely. This State spends about one-quarter of its Budget on education and, with regard to the building of schools for example, we are not in a position to replace many schools at present. In fact, all the State's Loan money is being spent on new schools in areas where there is a population explosion. I certainly do not agree with statements in the article to which the honourable member referred.

BERRI-BOOKPURNONG ROAD.

Mr. CURREN: At several meetings of the Upper Murray Local Government Association that I have attended in recent years, the desirability of raising the level of the road from Berri to Bookpurnong has been discussed. The road is important for inter-town traffic, but minor floods have often put it out of operation in recent years. Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether funds have been allocated by the Highways Department so that this work can be undertaken during the next financial year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has supplied me with a report which states that funds have been included in the 1966-67 schedule of works to enable the Berri-Bookpurnong Road to be raised. The work will be done by the District Council of Loxton, and the council is expected to be able to commence early next financial year, with completion some months later.

MINNIPA DENTIST.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: During the May holidays the Education Department assured me that a dentist would be centered at the Minnipa Area School at the beginning of the second term, but no dentist has yet appeared. Will the Minister of Education ascertain when the dentist is likely to be sent to this school?

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

SCALPS.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week regarding an investigation into the payment for dog scalps from the Far North?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have had this matter investigated, and I now have a report as follows:

The Wild Dogs Act, 1931-61, requires a certificate in duplicate to be made out by an authorized person for receiving dog scalps. One is to be forwarded with a declaration to the Director of Lands, and the other, acting as a receipt, is to be handed to the person applying for payment, who is obliged to send or surrender it to the Director of Lands to ensure payment to him. The issue of the duplicate certificate is actually for the protection of the person delivering the scalps. I am advised that there have been isolated instances where payments for scalps have been subject to delay. However, in these cases, non-delivery of the duplicate certificate or non-arrival of the actual scalps have been the major causes. Of course, this does not take into account the long periods which may elapse between the time the dogs are destroyed and the scalps produced to the authorized person. It is not desired that the destruction of dingoes should be hindered, and the Pastoral Board is looking into one or two aspects of the Act with a view to streamlining the provisions regarding the receipt and dispatch of scalps in various districts. However, it must be appreciated that the provisions of this Act are designed not only for the best possible protection of Government funds but also the doggers' claims for bonus payments and the minimizing of irregularities in claims.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT.

Mr. HALL: When does the Minister of Works intend to bring down to this House the report of the committee set up to investigate the use of effluent from the Bolivar sewage works?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following inquiries I made recently, I learned that the report is nearing completion, and as soon as it is available I will have it tabled so that the honourable member may peruse it.

PORT PIRIE OFFICES.

Mr. McKEE: Some time ago the Minister of Works told me that plans were being prepared for a new office block for the Engineering and Water Supply Department on Senate Road, Port Pirie. If the Minister cannot now say what progress is being made, will he obtain a report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member has rather anticipated that I do not have the answer, and that is true. I will call for the report and let him have the details as soon as they are available.

ELECTRICIANS.

Mr. LANGLEY: During last session a Bill providing for the licensing of electrical contractors and electrical workers was passed, and

a committee representing all sections of the electrical industry was to be formed. Can the Minister of Works say whether the committee has been formed and when licensing is likely to be introduced?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: All the bodies that have the right to nominate personnel for the committee have exercised that right, and I expect to be able to submit their names to Cabinet on Monday. If approved, the committee will meet the Electricity Trust authorities with a view to getting the necessary regulations submitted to the House in order that we may get on with licensing as early as possible.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last week I asked the Premier a question regarding the proposed increase in superphosphate prices. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Prices Commissioner states that superphosphate manufacturers will incur higher prices for phosphate rock as from July 1 and, as some other cost components will also rise, an application for an interim increase in the price of superphosphate has been made. The application is being investigated, but no decision can be made until the extent of cost increases is determined.

NOVAR GARDENS DRAIN.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week I asked the Minister of Education a question about a drain that runs through Novar Gardens. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The drain to which the honourable member refers runs north and south alongside the western boundary of land purchased by the Education Department as a site for a future technical high school at Novar Gardens. The drain is owned by the West Torrens Corporation. The Education Department has easement rights only over it, the maintenance and responsibility for it resting with the corporation. When a school is built on this site, the department will follow its normal policy and bear the full cost of erecting and maintaining the fencing on the eastern side of the drain. Fencing on the western side is the responsibility of the West Torrens Corporation.

EGGS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have been told that there is to be an increase in the tax paid on hens. Can the Minister

of Agriculture say whether this increase is to take place? If it is, what is the amount of the increase, and what is the reason for it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Leader refers to a hen tax, whereas it is a hen levy. Extensive information has been provided in the press of the proposal to increase the levy, as from July 1, from 70c to 91c a bird. The reason is that the overall programme of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities has been so successful that many people who earlier stopped keeping hens for egg production have now started again and this has increased the surplus to be exported. The export is at a loss and it is necessary to increase the levy to overcome this loss. I understand that there will be a slight loss to C.E.M.A. in the first year of operation, but the authority is not concerned with this as it is planning for next year's production, and that is the reason for the increase. Despite any increase producers will still be better off than in former years. Last year they were better off by over 2c compared with former years, and even with an increase they will be better off if that price prevails. The C.E.M.A. plan has been well accepted by producers, and people are happy with the levy because it has stabilized prices.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister say whether the 91c will be sufficient to cover all export losses?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I should like to get a considered reply for the honourable member, and will let him have it tomorrow.

ROLLING STOCK.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport to ascertain the policy of the Railways Department on the reconstruction of railway trucks handling bulk grain? Further, has the Minister of Transport communicated with the New South Wales Railways Department about the design and type of hopper trucks being used in that State for the adequate and quick disposal of bulk grain?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will get a report.

STUDENTS' HAIRCUTS.

Mr. CLARK: During the weekend a friend of mine, living in the Norwood district and interested in this matter, telephoned me about an incident that has been considerably reported in the press, the matter of two boys at a high school having long hair and not wanting it cut. Has the Minister of Education anything to report on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am pleased that this question has been asked because the House and public should know of the way this report was obtained and the way it was presented to the public. First, I point out that the names of the two boys in this report were not their correct surnames. Their surnames have never been given to the public, but it should be noticed that the name of the headmaster was given correctly.

The boys are members of a guitar group, the Mau Maus, which plays as an entertainment pop group and has appeared on morning programmes on Television Channel 10. On Thursday morning, June 23, the compere of their presentation over Channel 10 discussed with them the origin and success of the group as entertainers, and ostensibly only incidentally discussed their hair styles. On Thursday, June 23, their manager was invited to assemble the whole group for an interview with the *Advertiser*. The boys were under the impression that the interview was about their work as entertainers and most of the time it comprised questions about the group. Only towards the end of a long interview were questions asked about hair styles. To the boys' consternation the *Advertiser* published the interview under the headline "Will defy ban on long hair", which put them in a false position. It was not their wish to involve the school and they were so astounded that the words had been so wrongly used that they sought out the headmaster to give their version of the interview to show that their statements were twisted and falsely reported. Although they mentioned to the reporter they had been absent from school with their parents' permission to give a Mau Mau group telecast this was reported by the *Advertiser* as, "Because they refused to have their hair cut, Rino did not go to school yesterday and George had been absent for the past two days."

The boys have not been defiant about their hair styles. They hoped to avoid detection of their long hair until the last telecast. When they arrived at the school to give their version the headmaster was engaged in a telephone conversation and consequently he asked them to see the deputy headmaster. They asked permission to be away from school to go to the hairdresser to have their hair cut because, as one said, they "realized the reason". They were not "summoned to the headmaster's office" a few minutes after they entered the classroom: they went of their own volition to the interview with the deputy headmaster.

The photographs in the *Advertiser* were taken in such a way as to give people a false impression of what their hair looked like when it was not pressed down and prepared for the occasion. Every opportunity seems to be taken to distort incidents of this kind, particularly when they refer to the Education Department. Then the practice is to ring officers of the department and the Minister of Education for comment. As a consequence, much valuable time of highly paid officers is wasted in obtaining reports and correcting misstatements and half truths. I could say more on similar incidents but I shall not waste the time of the House. Members can rest assured that this is not the only occasion on which this sort of thing has occurred. This form of sensationalism is not only misleading but wastes public money; it may affect discipline in our schools; and it causes considerable embarrassment and trouble to our headmasters whose time is fully occupied.

PARA HILLS SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the Para Hills West Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Because of the rapid increase in enrolment at Para Hills it was necessary to establish the Para Hills West School in timber rooms pending the erection of a solid construction building. It is planned to build a primary school of 15 classrooms and an 8-classroom infants school. Approach roads are the responsibility of the Salisbury City Council, and the headmaster and the school committee have approached the officers of the council on a number of occasions. They are sympathetic, but the school has been built on the perimeter of the existing development, and the council's resources are strained to meet commitments in the areas of existing housing. The council is aware of the situation and will do what it can.

Quarry rubble has been spread around the timber buildings, and a rubbled assembly area provided. Currently, the Public Buildings Department is preparing plans to improve the grounds further, especially as regards the provision of rubbled pathways from the school boundary. The Public Buildings Department has not been asked to provide bitumen paving, as the new buildings, when erected will, of course, have considerable areas of associated bitumen paving. Assembly halls are not provided in primary schools, although in the larger schools an activity room is. A shelter shed has been provided at the school

and there is a folding partition between two of the timber classrooms, thus enabling a room 48ft. x 24ft. to be available for meetings, etc., when required. The school enrolment, at present 304, is increasing relatively rapidly, but even when the mid-year intake is housed on June 27 there will be a spare classroom.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Irrigation say what action is contemplated as a result of a deputation which he received (and which I accompanied) last Wednesday morning, comprising representatives of several organizations established in the township and district of Barmera, concerning the salinity of Lake Bonney and attendant problems?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. My reply may also interest the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) who last week asked me a question concerning salinity of the Murray River and its backwaters. I have discussed that matter with the officers concerned, who have informed me that they believe every possible solution concerning salinity in the river itself has been investigated and that the higher salinity in the backwaters would involve the supply of water to those areas. I received a deputation last Wednesday morning which made submissions to me on the effects of salinity in Lake Bonney over the years and the need from certain points of view not only to minimize the build-up of that salinity but also to bring about a freshening of the lake waters. Agreement was reached on the fact that the construction of a short length of pipeline in place of an earth channel at the outfall end of No. 2 Main Drain, Nookamka, would not increase the amount of seepage water entering the lake from that drain.

Furthermore, it was some encouragement to the deputation to learn that the department's attitude was to avoid discharging seepage water into Lake Bonney as far as it was practicable to do so, and that this attitude was reflected in steps already taken over a period of years to divert an appreciable proportion of the seepage water from the Nookamka Division and K Country to evaporation basins instead of to Lake Bonney. I reiterated an assurance given to the Barmera District Council on March 28 last that the practicability of diverting more seepage water away from Lake Bonney would be investigated, and in view of their submissions I also undertook to look into the question of deepening the inlet of Chambers Creek to Lake Bonney.

These two matters will receive attention as soon as staff can be spared from other urgent work. So far as freshening Lake Bonney by more direct means is concerned, I indicated to the deputation that having regard to the tremendous cost involved, as ascertained in a number of investigations in past years, and to the need to consider a step of this nature in conjunction with the husbanding of water resources for all irrigation areas and, in fact, the State as a whole, direct freshening of the lake to the extent proposed by the deputation was unlikely to be achieved.

HIGHWAY No. 12.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked on June 22, concerning the reconstruction of Highway No. 12?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that funds are being included in the 1966-67 schedule of works to enable the commencement of the reconstruction of the Tailern Bend to Pinnaroo main road, No. 5, east of Moorlands. It is planned to reconstruct the section of road between Moorlands and Peake (a length of about 19 miles), and other sections will be improved. The precise date of commencement of reconstruction is not yet known, as it depends on the completion of other works by a departmental gang at Blanchetown. However, it is expected that a start will not be possible until late in the 1966-67 financial year, probably in March or April, 1967.

MIGRANTS.

Mrs. BYRNE: As the Premier is aware, an agreement exists between the Commonwealth Government and United Kingdom authorities in relation to bringing migrants to Australia, under which South Australia has no fixed quota. Can the Premier say whether the South Australian Government has a separate agreement with the United Kingdom authorities to bring migrants to South Australia? If it has, what is the annual quota under, and the duration of, that agreement?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The South Australian Government has no agreement with any oversea Government, particularly that of the United Kingdom, concerning migrant quotas. However, I point out that migrants can be and are nominated by ordinary citizens, including former migrants, and invited to migrate here. In addition, of course, people in the United Kingdom are still entirely at liberty to elect to migrate to this country.

ALFORD SCHOOL.

Mr. HUGHES: During the weekend the Chairman of the Alford Primary School Committee informed me by telephone that about four years ago the Alford school residence was condemned. The department has since approved the erection of a new residence, for which tenders have been called. In fact, I believe that has taken place during the term of this Government. However, only one tender was received, and that was not acceptable. Since then, a property that was for sale at Alford was offered to the department, and I understand from the chairman of the school committee that this residence is acceptable to the Public Buildings Department and that the matter has been handed back to the Education Department for Cabinet approval. In view of the time that has elapsed since the school-house was condemned (this goes back some years into the previous Government's term of office), will the Minister of Education have this matter examined and inform me of the present position so that, should a new head teacher be appointed to Alford, the chairman of the school committee will be saved embarrassment?

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

WATERVALE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked last week about a reticulated water supply for Watervale?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that, following the failure to locate satisfactory underground water, a scheme was prepared to supply Watervale from the Warren trunk main. However, in May of this year further petitions were received from residents at Sevenhills and Penwortham, and it was decided that a supply to this area should be considered as an extension from the proposed Watervale scheme. Plans are therefore being prepared showing the land owned by the petitioners, but a considerable amount of searching has been necessary and a plan of the Penwortham area has to be prepared. Further design work and estimates will be necessary to incorporate the new areas, and the investigation will be completed as soon as possible.

NARACOORTE ELECTRICITY.

Mr. RODDA: Much concern has been expressed in my district about the rate of progress on electricity extensions in the Naracoorte district, because many lighting plants

and batteries will be wearing out this year and people are wondering whether they should replace them. Can the Minister of Works say when power will be transmitted to the town of Naracoorte and what progress is being made on the survey for its ultimate reticulation to surrounding districts?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I can appreciate the anxiety of people who have local supplies, but I regret that I cannot give a detailed reply. Nevertheless, I shall ask the Electricity Trust to supply a report, which I shall make available to the honourable member as soon as it is available.

LAND TAX.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Premier will realize that the quinquennial land tax assessment has been made and that the time in which objections can be lodged is running out. In country districts there is much interest in and anxiety about this matter. The previous rate was three-farthings. Can the Premier announce the new rate in decimal currency and say whether there is to be any differential rating?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not in the habit of giving any member of this House preferential treatment, and I do not intend to start now. As soon as I can announce the rate, I shall do so. Legislation on this matter will be introduced as soon as possible, and I hope it will be satisfactory to the House. If this matter is to be treated with contempt, other ways of financing the government of this State will have to be found.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of June 23 about the acquisition of land at Tea Tree Gully for school purposes?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The land mentioned by the honourable member is part section 51, hundred of Yatala, comprising about 10 acres urgently required for the establishment of the Banksia Park Primary School. It was transferred to the Education Department in July, 1963, subject to the compensation being assessed by the Supreme Court. The school was occupied at the beginning of 1964.

OMBUDSMAN.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Several times over the last couple of years I have raised, by question and in other ways, the appointment of an ombudsman or Parliamentary commissioner in this State. Last year, in reply to my question on notice, the suggestion was turned down flat.

I was therefore interested to read in the *Advertiser* at about the time of the Australian Labor Party conference that the learned Attorney-General was making certain inquiries in New Zealand before, as he said, we rushed into appointing one. I would have asked the Attorney-General this question, but I presume he has been given leave today by the Premier. I therefore ask the Premier whether there has been a change of policy by the Government on this matter and what inquiries are being made in New Zealand about it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I apologize for the absence of the Attorney-General, who has been working longer hours than he should be called on to work. I would have to be Mandrake to catch up with everything that occurred whilst I was away, and I was not here for the A.L.P. conference.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought you would have been brought up to date on that.

Mr. Jennings: At least we let reporters into our conference, which is more than you do.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have been informed about legislation to be introduced pursuant to Labor policy. I have not been informed of any change in the position since I commented on it 12 months ago. My colleague is not here today but if he has inquired I should think that the results of his inquiry could be taken as evidence of whether the policy I announced previously should be altered. That is as far as I am prepared to go on the matter.

MOUNT TORRENS SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: On October 20, last year, I was informed that the plans and specifications in connection with the fencing of the Mount Torrens Primary School property and the grading of the oval area would be completed shortly by the Public Buildings Department, and that tenders were expected to be called within two weeks of that date. The work was held in abeyance on the request of school committee members who wished to submit suggestions and proposals to the civil design section, which they did. Can the Minister of Works supply me with a report of the progress made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, the work was proposed and held in abeyance pending a conference between the school committee and the Public Buildings Department. An agreement was reached at the conference and I am pleased to inform the honourable member that a contract has been accepted for Mr. J. V.

Green to do the grading and levelling of the ground, and the fencing will be given early attention.

KAROONDA SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: As the Public Works Committee has approved the Karoonda Area School project, can the Minister of Works say when work is likely to commence?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I have seen reports on this matter, unfortunately I cannot remember the details and I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of Wednesday last regarding the payment of railway employees when absent on Citizen Military Forces duty?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Since the Minister of Transport wrote to the honourable member on April 21, 1966, investigations have been proceeding as to the practices adopted by the other State Governments in granting military leave to railway employees. These inquiries are almost complete and Cabinet will be able to consider this matter soon.

BARLEY.

Mr. FERGUSON: I understand that the Western Australian Agriculture Department this season released to selected growers a new malting type barley, Dampier. Dampier was bred by the department from the cross, Olli Selection by Research. It is a two-row barley and flowers one day earlier than Prior. In field trials it has yielded 20 per cent to 30 per cent more than Prior over a six-year period, and its straw is shorter and stronger. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this variety of Dampier is being or is likely to be tested by the South Australian Agriculture Department?

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

CLOVERCREST WATER.

Mrs. BYRNE: Last week I received two complaints from residents of Clovercrest, Modbury, stating that the water supply in the area had an unpleasant odour and taste. Will the Minister of Works inquire into the reason for this and take action to have it remedied?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The question is rather vague with regard to the locality where the unpleasant odour occurred. Complaints are often made by people and, on investigation, the department finds that many com-

plaints result from water softeners being left unattended for some time causing the water to become stagnant. I strongly recommend to the honourable member, and to other honourable members who receive complaints about discolouration or offensive odours from water, to contact the Engineering and Water Supply Department at Kent Town whereupon inspectors will be sent out immediately to investigate. It would be better for members to give the name of the people and the locality concerned so that attention can be given to remedy the trouble promptly.

HACKNEY BRIDGE.

Mr. COUNBE (on notice):

1. Is the reason for cessation of work on the reconstruction of the Hackney bridge shortage of funds or design problems?

2. Have the faults found in the steel for the bridge girders been overcome?

3. Why has the anticipated completion date for the girders, given in *Hansard* on February 9, 1966, as late February, 1966, not yet been achieved?

4. When is it expected that work will recommence on this bridge?

5. What is now the anticipated completion date of the whole project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are:

1. The reason for the cessation of work is faulty steel used in the fabrication of the girders.

2. Remedial measures are in hand.

3. Additional investigations and laboratory tests were necessary.

4. Work is currently proceeding on the bridge and on the girders.

5. It is expected that the girders will be erected by September 1, 1966, and the bridge completed in early December, 1966.

RAILWAY OFFICERS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware that railway officers are seriously dissatisfied that they have been excluded from "over award" payments?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to agree to make "over award" payments to railway officers?

3. If so, when will such payments be approved; and if not, will the Government give the reasons for its decision?

4. Will payment, if approved, be made retrospective to the same date as payment to other railway employees?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Representations for the granting of service pay to Railways Department salaried officers are at present receiving the Government's consideration.

GOVERNMENT COSTS.

Mrs. STEELE (on notice): What is the estimated cost of:

- (a) The Royal Commission on the Licensing Act?
- (b) The Royal Commission on State Transport Services?
- (c) The Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal?
- (d) The Local Government Act Revision Committee?
- (e) The overseas trip of the Premier and the Minister of Mines, together with the Director and Assistant Director of Mines?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

- (a) \$52,318.
- (b) \$50,000.
- (c) \$1,100.
- (d) \$16,000.
- (e) \$18,430.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice): What is:

- (a) The average daily cost per child; and
 - (b) The highest daily cost per child,
- of transporting children by departmental school buses?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The replies are:

- (a) 33c.
- (b) \$1.37. This is a very special case.

LAND VALUES.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (on notice): What percentage increase has taken place in assessed unimproved values of land in South Australia, excluding the Adelaide metropolitan area, between the last two quinquennial assessments?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The percentage increase in the assessed unimproved land in South Australia, excluding the Adelaide metropolitan area, is 45 per cent as between the quinquennial assessment of 1960 and that of 1965.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. G. G. PEARSON.

Mr. HALL moved:

That two week's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) on account of absence overseas.

Motion carried.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE COUNCIL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That one member of the House be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the University of Adelaide, as provided by the University of Adelaide Act, 1935-1964, *vice* Mr. H. R. Hudson, resigned.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, Mr. D. H. McKee was declared elected.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 23. Page 74.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I congratulate the person who prepared His Excellency's Speech. Whoever prepared that document should have a permanent job preparing statements for the Government, because I have never before seen a statement which did not touch on so many things that it should have touched on, but which touched on so many things that were not important. The author of that document can be justly proud. However, I agree with much of the contents of the document. I was pleased to see the references made to leading citizens of this State who had been associated with this Parliament and who had passed on. These gentlemen had the highest character, but too frequently we have been prone to take the services of men of this calibre for granted and have forgotten what they have done for us.

First, I refer to the services of Sir Richard Butler. I was privileged to serve with him in this House, and you, Mr. Speaker, and the members for Onkaparinga and Ridley are the only other members who were members when he was Premier. It is to Sir Richard Butler that we owe much of what has taken place in this State because he realized that, if industries were to be attracted to South Australia, they had to be on a basis that enabled them to compete successfully with industries in other States. The most significant action, although it was controversial at the time, was to reduce company taxation to a flat rate of 2s. in the

pound. When that was done we saw an entirely different approach by companies that had previously disregarded South Australia as a venue of activity. The reduction of tax, which attracted industry, points to the policy that this House should pursue if we wish to expand industrial development in this State. Up to that time we had protested against the protectionist fiscal policy of the Commonwealth Government: we objected to it and did not try to use it. It was Sir Richard Butler who first encouraged the establishment of industry in this State, which has meant so much to its development.

Sir Frank Perry was a member of this House but he was also one of those great industrialists who first showed confidence in establishing secondary industry here. These people not only successfully established their own industry but pointed the way for many other industries to come to the State. The first secondary industry established in this State was the wine industry. The firm of Fauldings goes back a long way. First established in 1847, it has carried on successfully, employing many people and exporting a high-grade product. Other industries that were established mainly as a result of the initiative of one person were Richards (now Chrysler-Dodge); Kelvinator (established by Mr. William Queale); and Holdens (associated in the first instance with the Holden family).

Sir Essington Lewis was a major contributor to the establishment of industry in this State, and the fact that Whyalla is such an important adjunct to our economy is because Sir Essington Lewis particularly sponsored its development. Mr. Alfred Simpson was one of the earliest persons to establish an industry, and this firm has since expanded. I was pleased that His Excellency saw fit to remember those connected with the expansion of industry in this State. There are many others, of course, but it is to these pioneers that we owe much of our prosperity today.

You, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Onkaparinga will remember Mr. A. V. Thompson, who was a member of this House. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) will remember him, too. No man ever served in this House with greater sincerity of purpose than did Mr. Thompson. His word was absolutely reliable, and he never deviated from a course that he knew to be worth while. However, I venture to suggest that if he were in the House today he would not support certain matters contained in His Excellency's Speech. Indeed, he could never be made to support one

or two particular items contained in the Speech, merely because he would not have believed in them. Mr. Craigie was also devoted to a cause, and he was a man of ability and integrity. Everyone who served with him will remember him as one of the most brilliant debaters we have had in the House. Not only is paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech a worthy one but it was designed last year and proved to be good. The matter with which it deals appeared in paragraph 10 of the Governor's Speech last year, but it is up-graded to paragraph 6 this year. Last year His Excellency the Governor said in paragraph 10:

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

This year we have a slight deviation from that, for we hear:

My Government will continue to pursue policies designed to make full use of the potential of the State in agriculture, mining, land settlement, irrigation—

and that is the big advance—
forestry and other fields.

Was there ever a time when His Excellency's Speech gave the primary industries of this State such little notice? Was there ever a time when the Minister of Agriculture was so complacent? Nothing in the agricultural world requires any more reference than that made last year. In fact, last year we heard a little more, because paragraph 10 also stated:

Private industry will be encouraged to the greatest possible extent.

However, that policy is now ruled out. Today, in reply to a question concerning the egg marketing scheme, the Minister of Agriculture said that it was brilliantly successful, so we have to increase the tax which, incidentally, he said was not a tax but a levy (although I am not sure what the difference is). However, the tax is to be increased 30 per cent, because the production is increasing 30 per cent. Of course, the increased production had to be sold overseas at the magnificent price, I am informed, of 7c a dozen! We shall find that this scheme is bound to explode itself soon into what will be a great catastrophe to everyone associated with the industry. How long can we prop up the sale of eggs that cost at least 32c a dozen to produce in order to export them for 7c a dozen? The plan is so "brilliantly successful" that it is not concerning the Minister at all, but I venture to suggest that another 30 per cent increase will take place next year; the industry will really boom, and will increase not by 30 per cent but by 100 per cent each year.

The Minister knows that it is an unsound proposition to sell, at 7c a dozen, eggs that cost 32c to produce. He cannot deny that it is costing 32c to produce eggs. The higher the export surplus, the more the local consumer will have to pay, and the higher the tax the egg producer will have to pay. It will be an endless circuit, because everyone knows that in such an industry—

Mrs. Steele: Eggs are far too expensive now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister does not worry about this particular matter in the Speech. Taking the flour industry, for example, the Minister knows that already one country mill has closed, and I am informed that three other country mills are experiencing grave problems. I am informed, too, that the oversea market for flour today is practically non-existent and that a Victorian firm is at present bringing flour into South Australia and selling it at \$6 a ton below the price fixed by the Prices Commissioner, and yet apparently this creates no problem for anybody. The butter industry in South Australia also has problems. Previously, this industry faced competition from the sale of margarine but, as margarine largely depended on imported fats, the Commonwealth and State Governments intervened and controlled the sales of margarine. However, today all of the base products of margarine are produced in Australia, and the Minister of Agriculture knows that freedom of trade between the States is guaranteed by the Commonwealth Constitution and that already much margarine is coming into South Australia.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: This Government lays prosecutions, whereas the previous one didn't.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister knows those prosecutions cannot and will not be effective.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You'll learn something about this, then. It shows your complete ignorance on this subject.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot agree with the dismissal of our primary industries in the Speech with only 28 words devoted to them. Only one word, "irrigation", has been added to what was said about primary industries in the Governor's Speech last year.

Mr. Millhouse: There is a new Minister now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. Without being Party political, if the State is going to progress it will do so only if the difficulties of primary industries are appreciated. The apple industry has suffered heavy losses

because of a divergence in the grading of apples. Apples which were acceptable to the buyer and on which he would have been prepared to pay a margin were not able to be sent overseas because of this divergence. Dumped crops mean additional costs to primary industry, and primary industries throughout the world are being made to dump their traditional crops. This will add to the cost of primary industry, an increase it cannot afford. Let us consider the Bruce box, which is confidently advocated by the Minister.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That's not true: the department answered it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The department of which the Minister is the head. The Bruce box will be made of timber and imported from, I think, the Philippines. An enormous royalty will have to be paid on each box made. Therefore, the Bruce box will be foisted on to our rural industries. It will be costly and its manufacture will rely on imported materials. As we do not have an industry for this box, we will have to pay, in perpetuity, a royalty to use it. Is that good economics, when the State has forests producing timber that would be suitable in every way? I hope primary industry will not be dealt with again in the way it was dealt with in this year's Speech. Such treatment shows a great lack of appreciation of what primary industry means to the State. This year the Speech did not include even the traditional report on the cereal crop; at least we used to get that in the past.

Mr. Heaslip: A drought was mentioned.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We were told that, but, in fact, the cereal crop was good. However, no reference was made to it. If more attention is not given to primary industries than was given in the Speech the State will go backwards.

Part of the Speech referred to natural gas development, and this subject has been often dealt with; it was dealt with in the Governor's Speech last year, too. However, references this year did not go as far as I had hoped. Much examination has been done into this matter and, as the Premier had gone overseas to look into it, I thought more reference might be made in the Speech to natural gas. Nevertheless, I will not criticize the Government because I know of the many problems associated with natural gas, and I know that the State will have to undertake heavy responsibilities. I believe the time has now arrived when authoritative action should be taken in regard to natural gas; the time has probably

come when the elements of law necessary to put proposals in motion should be considered by Parliament.

I read with much interest statements made by Ministers in connection with natural gas, and I shall refer particularly to two statements. I congratulate the Minister of Works on his down-to-earth approach on the matter. He went right to the kernel of the problem and pointed out that in South Australia we would have to compete with cheaper fuel supplies available in other States. As he gave valuable comparisons, I believe it would be useful if his statement were incorporated in *Hansard*. The Minister is reported as saying:

What must not be lost sight of is that the trust (the Electricity Trust) has to meet interstate competition. In this the trust has been very successful and much credit is due to its administrators, for the cost of fuels in this State is much greater than in others. Leigh Creek coal was the cheapest major fuel available to the Electricity Trust and 21c for each million BTUs was a good price considering the isolation of the coalfield and the rather poor quality of the fuel, Mr. Hutchens said. Nevertheless, other States could easily beat this figure. New South Wales could deliver coal into its new power station in the Newcastle area for less than 11c for each million BTUs. The Victorian figures at Yallourn and Morwell had been quoted at about 12c. In Queensland, figures of 10c had been quoted for the power station which fed the Gladstone industrial area, and for Swanbank Station, about 30 miles from Brisbane, 17c.

I thank the Minister for bringing those authentic figures to the notice of the people of South Australia. I believe that is the basis upon which this matter must be considered, and if it is considered upon that basis a number of things immediately become obvious. First, the money for the pipeline must be available at the lowest possible rate of interest. I know that money is readily available from overseas interests for pipeline construction, but the method on which the charges would be computed would make the interest charges so high that, if they were accepted, industry in this State would have no relief through the fact that we had natural gas in this State. Secondly (and this is equally important), the people who had put the money into finding the natural gas would get a very small reward indeed for their part in the undertaking, for we would find that the pipeline people would be extremely well off at the expense of the discoverers of the gas and at the expense of the industry that would be able to pay at this end.

I agree with the observation of the Premier that this is a national undertaking and that it is of national importance. I consider that the

Commonwealth Government should and must make a signal contribution to enable this pipeline to be established. The undertaking also has significance to the Commonwealth because in Central Australia and in the Northern Territory there are already proved immense supplies of natural gas which could and should be used to the economic good of the country. I agree that the pipeline should be financed by the Commonwealth Government. I agree, too, that the Commonwealth would probably insist that a high rate of amortization should be provided for it. This requirement should be accepted because such a pipeline should stand a high amortization rate, particularly where the field may not be proved beyond, say, 20 or 30 years of life. Secondly, the Commonwealth and the other States would probably require that the cost should be excluded from the quota for Loan works, and again I believe that that is something to which this State should be prepared to agree.

I believe that in the amortization the State itself could contribute towards the speedy amortization of the pipeline. I visualize (and I believe this would be a sound proposition) that an authority of five members would be appointed by the Government, and undoubtedly that authority should have a very close connection with the Electricity Trust. The Premier has not seen fit to table the report the Government obtained from the Bechtel organization, but I hope Cabinet will look at this matter and that the Premier will make the report available to all members, even if only on a restricted basis. I believe there should be a united approach by Parliament to ensure the best possible result.

I do not favour a small pipeline. We have had experience in this State over and over again of establishing a pipeline for water only to find that when it comes to real development the pipeline is inadequate. I believe that the pipeline should be a 20in. one and that its length must be about 500 miles. Such a pipeline, with a couple of booster stations, would cost about \$40,000,000. It would have a capacity, with very little boosting, of 100,000,000 cubic feet a day, and I believe that is the minimum that we should contemplate, although with additional boosting stations it could undoubtedly bring in probably twice as much. Members may ask whether there is a demand for 100,000,000 cubic feet a day in this State at present. Frankly, I do not believe there is. I think the South Australian Gas Company would be an immediate user for about 10,000,000 cubic feet

a day and no more. The Electricity Trust, as soon as Torrens Island was harnessed, could probably use 60,000,000 cubic feet a day, and private industry would probably use another 20,000,000 cubic feet, so 100,000,000 cubic feet would not be consumed immediately. However, it would soon be consumed if we went into industrial production using gas as the main fuel.

I noticed with great regret that a Japanese and an Australian complex had agreed to make nitrogenous manure in Australia using natural gas as the base for the manure. I believe that is one of the industries which we could break into successfully. Not only could we avoid the very high cost of importation of nitrogenous manures which we incur at present but we could help to remedy what is a world shortage. Actually, before my Government went out of office we were actively engaged in the development of an ammonium nitrate industry in this State, and there is no doubt that that industry could be effectively established here if we could hope for the use of the South Australian market which should be expanding, and the use of the Victorian market which might at that time be available to us. We could have had a limited industry, while paying a fairly high price for gas. If we could get the price of gas down to a competitive level comparable with gas prices in America, there would be unlimited opportunity for expansion in this industry.

I notice that since his return from overseas the Premier has talked about plastic and chemical industries to be associated with this field. Unfortunately, it will be extremely difficult to break into that group. First, there is already surplus capacity in Australia owned by very powerful groups, and there is surplus capacity in the world. Gas supplies are now becoming very readily available in Europe, and I have not the slightest doubt that in these circumstances there will be a tremendous influx of capital into the petro-chemical industry if there is an opportunity for that to happen. Therefore, I doubt very much whether there is an opportunity now of getting into that industry. However, in the nitrogenous fertilizer industry, where we are still importing large quantities of manures from Germany and other countries, I believe there is available to us an opportunity for the successful use of this product. I believe we could establish a natural gas pipeline which would have a capital cost of \$40,000,000 and a budget of about \$7,000,000 a year, providing for amortization over 20 years. This would be possible charging 21 or

22 cents per 1,000,000 British thermal units, while still paying a reasonable sum to the discoverers of the gas field and providing reasonable amortization. For such a project it is necessary that money shall be available at the lowest possible interest rates as this project would not stand high interest charges. Although the Premier made a statement on this matter, I am not sure of its implications. He said:

The South Australian Government wants a controlling interest in the proposed natural gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide.

If the Premier wants that, I cannot understand why he emphasizes the word "wants". Why should the Government not control this undertaking completely? If overseas interests make it a prerequisite for making capital available that they control the pipeline, this proposition will be of doubtful use to the economy of this State. Gas is a valuable asset but the amount paid is directly related with the proximity of the gas to the market. The suppliers of natural gas base their returns on the distance the gas has to be piped to the point of consumption. Where there is a small consumer (and Adelaide must be considered as such at present), with a field many miles from the point of consumption, it would be impossible to use expensive overseas finance to encourage people to look for gas and pay a fair price for it. The provision of money for a gas pipeline, not only in this State but in any other, is a national obligation: the money should be provided by the Commonwealth Government. It would probably be necessary to exclude this assistance from the Loan Council formula and to provide for a high rate of amortization. A 53-year amortization period would be of no value for a gas field that might have a life of 20 years. Any authority set up could be closely allied with the Electricity Trust, with the South Australian Gas Company, and with industry, so that we would have a united purpose. In order to have companies undertaking the heavy expenditure necessary for exploration and using the costly processes that have been devised, it will be necessary to give large exploration areas to the investigating companies. South Australia initiated the legislation that enabled that to be done, and this legislation has been copied successfully by other Australian States. With an enormous unproved area, which we have in South Australia, it is necessary to attract overseas capital by giving a large area and a long exploration

lease. The exploration lease covering Delhi-Taylor in the artesian basin is, I think, for 15 years, and probably within five years a large area will be available for subsequent cutting up and allocation to smaller prospecting companies. Obviously, no other company could come into the area unless it had at least partial use of the gas pipeline serving that area. One prerequisite of this type of project is cheap money from the Commonwealth Government, although I believe the undertaking should be initiated by legislation introduced in this House. The authority should be closely associated with industry—with the gas company and the Electricity Trust but, nevertheless, responsible to the general public. The gas pipeline will ultimately be amortized, at which time, of a budget that I estimate to be \$7,000,000, probably \$3,000,000 will have been excluded. A strong case will then exist for the benefit of the amortization to be shared equally between the owners of the oil wells and the consumer. I believe that whatever the basic world price may be at the beginning of the contract, when amortization has been effected, the owner of the well will have a logical and proper claim for a better price, because, after all, he will have helped amortize the total cost of the operation.

Be that as it may, I hope the Government will again examine, before this session is over, this reference in His Excellency's Speech with a view to ascertaining if it cannot introduce legislation to establish an authority provided with the necessary backing. I believe that a united case should be put before the Commonwealth Government to provide the necessary funds to enable this project to advance. Whether we like it or not, the lack of natural fuel in this State is one of the great inherent weaknesses of our economy. I believe it is the Commonwealth Government's obligation to assist in this regard. I hope that in the course of discussions that take place steps will be taken to bring into South Australia the enormous wealth that will arise from the large finds of gas in the centre of Australia adjacent to our northern border. It is rather significant that on this occasion His Excellency's Speech is altered substantially from the form it took last year. I realize that we have to take into account the fact that circumstances alter cases, but paragraph 19 of the Governor's Speech last year stated:

The employment position in this State continues to improve.

The word "employment" is singularly absent from the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech in that particular context. In fact, it occurs only once this year, strangely enough, again in paragraph 19, and is used in the following context:

My Government continues to be concerned at the number of persons who suffer accidents during employment . . .

Having witnessed that curious anomaly, I decided to examine the actual position, and it is not good. When the Government came into office in March last year, South Australia had the lowest unemployment figure in the Commonwealth, except for Victoria. In South Australia and New South Wales .8 per cent of the population was unemployed, but the Australian average at that time was 1.2 per cent, Victoria being the only State with a lower figure (.6 per cent). In May, 1965, the position was not what was stated in His Excellency's Speech; it was not improving, for the Commonwealth Statistician's figures showed that in May 3,422 were unemployed in South Australia and in June, 3,553. That retrogression was steadily increasing, and His Excellency had apparently been misinformed on the matter. In March, 1966, after the Government had been in office for a year, the figure had grown from 3,420 to 6,471. Unfortunately, the figure is still growing, because the last figures available (May) revealed that 6,714 were unemployed. In other words, 1.5 per cent of South Australia's work force is unemployed, whereas the Commonwealth figure is 1.2 per cent. Only one State in the Commonwealth has a figure higher than ours. I have a graph which clearly shows where the South Australian figure is going, and which must cause concern to everyone in this House.

I am disappointed at the way in which primary industries have received little notice in His Excellency's Speech. I am disappointed, too, that the Government does not seem to realize the unemployment problem, for no mention is made of it in the Speech, although I agree entirely with the reference in it to safety.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Reference is made to increased relief.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Such an increase might be caused by unemployment, by a change of policy by the Minister, or by some other factor, but I do not know exactly what is involved. The matter has now reached the stage where attention should be given to it. Unemployment in other States is decreasing, whereas in this State it is increasing. In New South Wales, where a serious drought was

experienced, unemployment is decreasing. Although this State did not feel the effects of such a serious drought, unemployment here is increasing.

Mr. Coumbe: New South Wales has a Liberal Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will not deal with that question now. The rise in unemployment figures should be considered by a Minister—I do not know which Minister, but any Minister who would do something about the position would be appropriate. Housing received far more attention in last year's Speech than in this year's Speech. Here again, the position has deteriorated in South Australia. For the year ended April, 1964, 12,222 new houses and flats were approved in South Australia. Throughout the Commonwealth in the same year about 111,000 new houses and flats were approved, so that this State approved 11 per cent of the Commonwealth total. In the year ended April, 1965, South Australia approved 14,113 new houses and flats out of a Commonwealth total of about 124,000, or 11.4 per cent. In the year ended April, 1966, however, South Australia approved 11,317 new houses and flats out of a Commonwealth total of 111,271, a drop to 10.2 per cent.

The same position applies in respect of the value of other new buildings: in 1964, South Australia approved other new buildings to the value of \$61,000,000; in 1965 the figure was \$80,000,000; and in 1966 it was down to \$60,000,000. In 1965, South Australia approved 12.1 per cent of the Commonwealth total value of other new buildings whereas in 1966 it approved only 8.8 per cent of the total. This is a serious matter and I should have thought that some reference would be made to it in His Excellency's Speech. The following official statement appeared in the *Advertiser* of June 23:

There is an encouraging rise in the number of building approvals given last month. All States except South Australia and Tasmania recorded the upward trend.

A necessity exists for something positive to be done in connection with this matter, and I am not alone in this opinion. The following statement appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of June 25 (and its origin is beyond political suspicion):

A strong plea for more concerted Government action to restore prosperity in the building industry in South Australia was made today by union leaders in Adelaide. One union is asking for the migration of building

workers from overseas to be curtailed immediately to avoid adding to unemployment problems. The South Australian secretary and Federal president of the Builders Laborers' Union, Mr. E. H. Thorp, said his committee viewed with alarm Government announcements of the further curtailing of public works.

The building industry is part of the backbone of the State's economy, which is already weakened by serious droughts, he said. Instead of grappling with the problem on a sound basis, the Government is chasing shadows trying to stimulate the economy with lotteries, TAB, and 10 o'clock closing. These things are useless to men walking the streets without a dollar in their pockets because they can't get jobs.

In the past month an average of 30 a week have come to us looking for work. On one big city construction job, eight foremen have returned to tradesmen's or laborers' jobs to keep themselves employed.

Further references are made to the serious position.

Mr. Langley: What reference is made to the electrical trades?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member will get a shock when he looks at that. He knows that last year Parliament considered legislation which affected the electrical trades and which gave the industry protection from outside competition.

Mr. Langley: It does not operate yet.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe every member will recall the honourable member's contribution to that debate: I do not think we will ever forget it. This serious problem should receive the attention of Ministers and honourable members opposite. Paragraph 18 of the Speech, which is most intriguing, states:

Operations of the Electricity Trust have continued to expand, sales having increased by 12 per cent over the last 12 months.

This is what I want members to listen to:

In the metropolitan area tariffs have now been constant for 14 years and metropolitan tariffs are now available to all country consumers supplied by the trust.

Mr. Speaker, that was in operation before my Government went out of office. The interesting thing is that it now becomes the subject of a special mention in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, as though it is something that has just happened, when in fact it happened 18 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say only one other thing in conclusion. The Opposition saw with a great deal of delight (and I think every honourable member in Opposition joins with me in expressing appreciation of the fact) in

paragraph 26 of the Speech that the Registration of Dogs Act Amendment Bill was to be restored to the Notice Paper!

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): Mr. Speaker, the House has already shown its respect for recently deceased members. The only one with whom I had any real contact was the late Sir Frank Perry who, as we all know, was an esteemed and valued member of another place. Sir Frank lived in my district; in fact, I should probably say that I lived in his district, because he was a resident for very much longer than I have been, and he was, of course, at one time a member of this House, representing East Torrens when it was a two-member district. Sir Frank came from a distinguished family whose members have given service to the community in many spheres. He could truly be described as a captain of industry, and this over a period when the State's industrial potential was developing, thus ensuring the prosperity and security of the State and its people. His wisdom and his quiet persuasiveness, as well as his loyalty to his colleagues, is, I know, greatly missed in the Chamber which he so recently adorned.

Turning to something different, I should like to say that I think the community generally was pleased to see that the Commonwealth Government honoured so distinguished a citizen as Sir Arthur Lee, who for many years has been the Federal President of the Returned Servicemen's League. Sir Arthur also lives in the Burnside District, which I think I might justly claim, having so many distinguished people living or having lived in it, is almost a distinguished district. I congratulate Sir Arthur, and I am sure that this award met with general approval. The one person I particularly want to mention is Miss Huppatz, the Matron of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, who was honoured also by the Commonwealth Government and who, when I wrote to congratulate her, replied that she saw this honour not as a personal one but as one to the profession of which she was so proud. I am certain that the people of South Australia, knowing of the devoted service the nursing profession gives, are happy that she should have been so honoured.

I know, of course, that it is Labor policy not to award honours, but it seems to me rather inconsistent that it makes awards to people in various Government services. The comments I want to make in no way detract from the pleasure I derived from seeing the honouring in this way of three public servants who have

given service to the community and to their particular calling, but to me it seems a kind of inverted snobbery, because when all is said and done most of the people who are honoured in Birthday and New Year Honours are people who give voluntarily of their services to the community, and there is no other way than this type of award by which people can be given some distinction for those services. However, I am glad to see that at least there were three names in the State's Birthday Honours, and I congratulate those recipients, as well as the other recipients who were honoured by the Commonwealth Government.

I suppose what interests the people of South Australia most (because it will affect their security and their prosperity probably more than anything else in the future will do) is the natural gas pipeline, which has already been referred to this afternoon by my Leader. Everyone in South Australia agrees that it is wonderful to have found natural gas in commercial quantities. It excites the imagination, I suppose, of most people to realize that at last we have found natural gas here in our own State, and although long pipelines are no novelty in Australia, because we have them in different States of the Commonwealth, it is rather exciting and rather stimulating to know that the natural gas for the industry which will be developed here in South Australia will be brought from so far afield.

Although I understand that there are no real physical or geographical problems connected with the piping of gas from the North to Adelaide, I believe there are problems concerned with its financing. The Leader said this afternoon that he considered that the Commonwealth Government should finance this pipeline because it was in the national interests of Australia to do so, and I hope that that is the course taken. I hope also, in view of the Australian Labor Party's concern about the amount of foreign control in Australia's developing industries through finance and industrial know-how from overseas, that this Government will not resort to expensive overseas finance to bring this plan to fruition. This gas, with its resultant prosperity and employment for the people of South Australia, belongs to the people of the Commonwealth, and therefore it was most disconcerting when the Premier, on television shortly after his return from overseas, said that the way the pipeline would be financed was anyone's guess. I am certain this comment was made in the exuberance of his return, and that it was probably being caught on the hop, as it were,

that caused him to make this peculiar and rather irresponsible comment, because this is just not good enough, and the people of South Australia will be waiting with great anxiety, I suggest, to hear just what the Government has in mind.

If the people are feeling some anxiety at what might be the method of financing the pipeline, I suggest that it is not the only reason for their worry because other recent developments have been causing the public great concern. It is time the public was taken into the Government's confidence and told what were the financial difficulties that the Government had when it took office. This seems to be the one excuse given for slowing everything down at present. We hear it in public statements, over the radio, on television, and in personal appearances, and the public of South Australia is entitled to know the financial difficulties that the Government is supposed to have taken over from the previous Government. Last week the Leader quoted from a statement that had been prepared by the Under Treasurer prior to this Government's taking office in March of last year, and it made interesting reading. Allowing for the fact that seasonal conditions have not been good in the past two seasons (and we know this always contributes in some ways to the State's economic disadvantage), we have had periods like this before but we nearly always weathered the storm.

Everyone knows that South Australia was in a sound position until the present Government took office, and for this reason alone the public of South Australia should be concerned. Why have we suddenly found ourselves in difficulties in the short space of a little over 12 months? What have we seen happening in the last few months? Public works have been curtailed, and on April 23 the Minister of Works, when speaking to the Institution of Engineers, Australia, at a dinner in the Adelaide Town Hall, said that some of the State's capital works on which a start had been planned for the next financial year would have to be deferred. He said that works now in progress might also have to be held up for a time. Referring to "dark patches" in the economy, he said:

I know that many of those working with various Government departments are going to join me in real disappointment—if not now, then in the near future. I have come to the conclusion that we have more works in operation than it is economic to continue. Rather than have many works in progress at one time at a steady slow pace I am convinced that it

is far better to complete those on which progress is so advanced as to allow early completion.

He went on to say how much the engineers had helped the State to overcome its natural deficiencies, and that the future was filled with possibilities, and then said:

But between this time and the light on the hill there are dark patches.

There has been further confirmation in the last few days by another statement made by the Minister of Works in which he gave a list of public works that were to be deferred. House building has fallen off badly, as is shown in figures quoted by the Leader, and the building industry is in the doldrums. According to the latest report of the Housing Trust there have been fluctuating fortunes last year in its house purchase scheme. Earlier there was an increase over the previous period to the end of March of 479 houses being purchased under that scheme. It increased to 649, then to 725 at the end of December last year, but to March 31 this year there has been a decrease in sales of 512 houses.

Mr. Hall: And they are still available.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, and that is one of the many reasons for the decline in the building industry, because people are not buying houses that are available. There has been a big drop in the first quarter of this year, and I understand that one reason is that the banks are insisting on a minimum wage or salary before considering applicants for housing loans. Recently, I was told of young people applying for a bank loan for housing who were asked whether they had any shares and who were advised by the bank that they would not be considered for a loan until they sold these personal assets. This seems a harsh way to treat young applicants who are anxious and willing to set up a home, and it is a bad policy of the banks. Obviously, banks are taking a risk when they accept an applicant for a loan, but it is a bad policy to suggest to a young man who has painstakingly bought up shares from which he does not derive a great income that he should dispose of them. The bank should accept the assets as security and lend against them. The difficulty of securing a house is aggravated because people cannot secure bridging finance. The trust's April notes state:

Some houses are being built under the trust's rental-purchase scheme, while others will be sold under the ordinary house purchase scheme, where the purchaser obtains mortgage finance from a lending institution.

Young people today find it difficult to find bridging finance at a reasonable rate of interest. Unemployment figures have increased. Although the Leader gave total figures, I point out that there has been an increase in the last month of 687 people out of employment in this State. Those figures were given to me today and released by the Minister in charge of the Department of Labour and National Service.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Another 687 in addition to the figures I gave.

Mrs. STEELE: Although the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech claimed that there had been no increase in unemployment, there has been an increase month by month. In addition, few new industries have been attracted to South Australia and those which have had their openings in recent months were, in the main, attracted, conceived, and begun before the present Government took office. Whereas we have not attracted new industries to South Australia, we have lost some, Die Casters being one in particular, and some wine-makers are transferring their activities to another place. His Excellency's Speech, referring to the Premier's Department, states:

The recent decision of Chrysler (Australia) Limited to erect a multi-million dollar plant near Port Stanvae and inquiries from other sources are evidence of the success of this policy . . .

Mr. Millhouse: In advertising, that is called "puffing".

Mrs. STEELE: This is supposed to be evidence of the success of the policy and of the confidence in the State's prosperity on the part of industrial and commercial interests. About five weeks ago I attended a public meeting at the University of Adelaide at which the Minister of Agriculture was present in his acting capacity as Minister of Mines, and at which the Western Australian Minister for Industry (Hon. Charles Court), probably one of the most dynamic men in State Governments today—

Mr. Coumbe: A man who gets results!

Mrs. STEELE:—gave a public lecture (I think at the invitation of the Institute of Chemical Engineers). I am sure the Minister of Agriculture must have been impressed by this gentleman; he was able to substantiate every point he made by facts and figures, and showed a film that revealed exactly what was happening in Western Australia. He admitted at the meeting that he had learnt the rudiments of what he was now applying in Western Australia from

South Australia's present Leader of the Opposition; he said he had studied him carefully and had followed exactly the same methods. In fact, he said that he believed he had now improved on them, and quoted a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that, unless \$2,000,000 worth of new and vital industry could be attracted to the State each month, it simply could not compete with the other States of the Commonwealth. Charles Court said that was exactly what the Western Australian Government was setting out to do. However, the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech merely admits to having received "inquiries from other sources". We all know that the Opposition, when in Government, was denied the opportunity and the power to appoint a new Minister. We were told that the present Government's whole intention when it introduced the Constitution Act Amendment Bill was to establish a Premier's Department and to concentrate on attracting more industry to South Australia. Apart from the personal satisfaction of the Leader of the Government in being named the first Premier by virtue of an Act, I suggest that nothing has been done to justify Parliament's granting this power. To me and many others the Premier's Department is just an empty sham.

On returning from his trip overseas, the Premier publicly stated that public works were proceeding as planned by the Government, and was full of enthusiasm, for he had obviously gained much information from his trip. However, after making that statement, I think he must have been terribly dismayed when, on catching up with his newspaper reading, he realized that his Ministers had been making public statements about deferring some of the State's capital works and temporarily delaying other works now in progress. What sort of confidence is this supposed to engender in the public mind, in relation to the State's economy and stability, as well as its future development? What effect, too, must this have on South Australian industry itself, and on industrialists outside the State who may be interested in establishing here? I do not think the answer is difficult to imagine.

The people have quite definitely said, by means of a referendum, that they desire a lottery in South Australia, an undertaking mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. A commission will be established to conduct a lottery, a reference to which appears in today's *News*. I have no quarrel at all with the result of the referendum, but I believe that, at a time of financial stringency, money should

first of all be found for projects of more importance than lotteries and T.A.B. I think in April last year the Minister of Works said, when the question of lotteries was first being raised in the House, that on the basis of his discussions with people interested in lotteries and connected with their administration, it would cost about \$6,000,000 to set up the necessary machinery in South Australia. I thought at the time that that was a pretty extravagant estimate of the cost, but at a time when the State's economy is deteriorating (of which we have plenty of evidence), to talk of setting up a lottery to cost even half the sum (\$3,000,000) seems wrong to me. It will be interesting to see how much money will be appropriated for this purpose. Frankly, I cannot see that such a project will provide employment for many of those who are at present unemployed in South Australia.

During this session 16 new Bills are to be introduced; 30 Bills at present on the Statute Book are to be amended, and a number of others either are to be redrafted or are in the process of being drafted for later presentation to the House. At least two of these measures (lotteries and T.A.B.) will involve much expenditure in establishing the machinery for their administration. I am particularly interested in the erection of two new mental institutions (and I use the word "institutions" advisedly; I do not like the term, but it is difficult to discuss them as straight-out hospitals or training centres). For a long time we have known that the previous Government and the present Government were to pursue a policy of building two new hospitals, one to be called Strathmont and the other, Elanora. They were first planned and submitted to the Public Works Committee some years ago. These projects qualify for a subsidy from the Commonwealth Government, although I am not certain whether it is on the basis of \$2 for \$4, or \$2 for \$6. However, a subsidy is available for the capital cost of providing hospitals for this purpose. Under the Act passed for this purpose a couple of years ago, the money must be spent by June 30, 1967. The Premier (and I think that this followed my and other members' several questions on this matter) pointed out in the House that he had told the Prime Minister that the Government's present plans did not envisage spending this money on these hospitals by the expiry date, June 30, 1967. The present offer of the Commonwealth Government has been current for a little over two years, and this State has been dilatory in taking advantage of it compared with other States. I understand

that some hundreds of thousands of dollars have already been paid out under the same scheme that South Australia could benefit from with regard to Strathmont and Elanora.

When we were in power, our Government was partly to blame for this. I have spoken of this matter previously in the House, but this lag has been carried on during the present Government's term. The Act relating to such Commonwealth grants and subsidies has been in operation for about 16 or 17 years, but it is only this current offer that does not place an upper limit on the sum to be spent. I am not sure whether the subsidy is \$2 to \$1 or \$3 to \$1, but I understand that the Commonwealth Government will later this year be considering the whole question of Commonwealth grants for mental hospitals and institutions. Often last session (and last week on, I think, Thursday) I asked the Premier what the position was, because many people are deeply concerned that these two hospitals have not at least been commenced. The Premier last week said that he had no answer to give me. For some time he has been overseas and it could be that the answer would have to come from the Acting Premier; but I cannot think that even in the short time that the Premier has been back he would not have been aware in Cabinet of what had happened about this important matter.

It is some months since the Premier said he had written to the Prime Minister setting out the position. I can only assume that after a lapse of some months the Prime Minister would have replied to the Premier telling him exactly what the position was. Obviously, the only safe way to be certain of getting this subsidy is to make an immediate start. It would be tragic if South Australia missed out on this Commonwealth offer. We simply cannot afford to. We have had to miss out on one or two other things because the State could not match the Commonwealth Government's grants. This matter concerns sick mental patients, not only adults but also children, and it should be high on the priority list of public works to be undertaken this financial year. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to reconsider this question because, if it does not act at once, it will lose the grant coming from the Commonwealth Government in the form of a subsidy.

We know there have been delays. I read in the paper the other day that the architect who has been working on this project is already overseas. I do not know how many times the Government sends architects overseas to travel and gain information. Dr. Cramond, when he was the Superintendent of Mental Health in

South Australia, went to New Zealand with an architect from the Public Buildings Department. I suggest that the time for procrastination has passed and now is the time for action if we are to get any help at all from the Commonwealth Government.

There is a great need for improvement in our mental hospitals, although we have made great advances in recent years. These places are to train and rehabilitate mentally retarded children and adults. It would indeed be tragic if we in South Australia could not provide the same sort of facilities and services for doing this as those provided by other States with the help of Commonwealth Government subsidies. We cannot expect to attract the right kind of people to work in the sort of hospitals and buildings erected in the last century that are at present housing mental patients. I suggest they should be given every opportunity to rehabilitate themselves under the best possible conditions.

Finally, I refer to the deferment of public works, in particular to a matter concerning my district. The Paradise, Campbelltown and Athelstone area is acknowledged the fastest growing in the metropolitan area, as great housing development is taking place there. Ever since I have been in this place (now getting on for eight years) I have been fighting for the people in this part of my district to get sewerage in one or two places. More sewerage mains have been laid there than were ever anticipated when I first brought this matter to the notice of the then Minister of Works, but there is an area adjacent to the river, part of it being in the area represented in this House by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), who will be aware of this problem too. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has for some time considered the provision of sewerage facilities to these areas, but it has to come first of all to the area represented by the member for Enfield. I hope he will use his good offices with his Party and his Government—

Mr. Jennings: I am doing my best, don't worry.

Mrs. STEELE:—to press on with this scheme because, until it is completed in the area represented by him, it cannot go on into the area that I represent—Paradise, Campbelltown and Athelstone.

Mr. Jennings: I cannot think of anyone better to represent Paradise.

Mrs. STEELE: Thank you. I go back to some correspondence to see how far back those representations went to the Minister of the

day. I find I have a letter of 1962 referring to my earlier representations on behalf of the people living in the area of which I am speaking. The part to be seweraged is, first, Marden and Paradise. Each of these letters bears out the fact that the Engineering and Water Supply Department was ready to proceed with these works in the next financial year. That was way back in 1962 and the work has been put off time and time again because of the needs of other areas that have been requiring sewerage facilities for a much longer period. But last year I was assured by the present Minister of Works shortly after the present Government took office, and this in a letter dated August 2, 1965, I had written in connection with this scheme on behalf of my constituents. The Minister said in his letter (dated August 2):

The Engineering and Water Supply Department investigated and recently recommended a scheme—

and this had been told me previously— which is estimated to cost £187,000, and I am pleased to advise that Cabinet approval of this expenditure to enable this scheme to proceed has now been given.

Of course, the Campbelltown City Council, which is one of the two municipalities I represent, was pleased, and it wrote to say how delighted it was that I had received this reply from the Minister of Works. Then the position deteriorated. Earlier this year I received a letter from the Campbelltown council stating that it had received the letter from the Engineering and Water Supply Department which, in effect, meant that there would be a further delay of two years. Thus the Campbelltown sewerage scheme will be deferred until the 1967-68 financial year.

The area adjacent to the river has heavy black soil. For many years it was the centre of market gardening in the metropolitan area but much of this work is now done farther north of Adelaide. In this type of soil it is difficult to install a septic tank system and effluent is running in the streets. The position is even worse in areas of Athelstone, where, as the land rises and falls, it is even more difficult to dispose of the effluent. The sewerage of the area will be expensive for the Government, but I believe the scheme should revert to being high on the list of priorities because of the rate of growth in the area. I appeal to the Minister of Works to have another look at the matter to see whether he cannot make sure that action is expedited and the work commenced as soon as possible.

I was a little disappointed to read the other day, in a statement of the Minister of Works, that sewerage schemes were to be provided at Ingle Farm, an entirely new area commenced only in the last six months. Nevertheless, it will be considered ahead of an area that has been promised sewer connections for a long time.

Mr. Millhouse: In which district is Ingle Farm?

Mrs. STEELE: I think it is in the Barossa and Gouger Districts. I notice that areas in Tea Tree Gully, Highbury and other places are to be seweraged before Campbelltown. As far back as 1962 letters to the Campbelltown council confirmed that a sewerage scheme would be provided in the following financial year. Now, nearly five years later, no start has yet been made on the project. I appeal to the member for Enfield to do what he can to get that part of the scheme within his district started so that in time people living in my district will benefit.

I hope that the Government will look favourably upon my representations and that the Campbelltown council's persistent effort to provide its ratepayers with a sewerage scheme will be rewarded by the early commencement of a much needed system to safeguard the health of the community because, in the present circumstances, there is a serious health hazard.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): In supporting the motion, I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the mover, the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), on his magnificent speech. He clearly demonstrated to other members and to the public that he knows the area he has been elected to represent. He has been a force in the deliberations of the House that have concerned those people, and his representations have shown that the people of Chaffey are fortunate in having a member of his calibre to represent them. Opposition members do not appreciate what the Labor Government has done for people on the land since it assumed office. They say that the Government is not concerned about people on the land, but the member for Chaffey has done more for fruit-growers in Renmark and other Upper Murray districts than was ever done before.

Mr. McKee: They cannot deny that.

Mr. HURST: No, the results speak for themselves, and the member for Chaffey deserves congratulations for his representations to the Government on behalf of those people.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The Liberal and Country League can't find a candidate to oppose him.

Mr. HURST: It would be a waste of money to have a candidate oppose him as the people in the district have decided already that they will return the sitting member to this Chamber at the next election.

Mr. Ryan: Members of the Liberal and Country League have already been canvassing in Chaffey.

Mr. HURST: They can canvass as much as they want to: the results show what has been achieved and nothing can take that away from the member for Chaffey. All the people in the district, particularly those on the land, appreciate his efforts. I do not believe anybody will contest the seat and, if anybody does, he will be completely annihilated at the election.

Mr. Jennings: It will be a 100 per cent vote.

Mr. HURST: Yes. I also congratulate the seconder of the motion, the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), who has also demonstrated his ability to represent the people of his district. He has clearly shown that he is mindful of their problems and that he can give them the best representation possible. He is also assured of being returned to the House at the next election because of the vigorous manner in which he has successfully pursued matters brought to him. With other speakers, I congratulate His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on his wonderful speech.

Mr. Millhouse: Did you say "wonderful"?

Mr. HURST: It was a fine address, the subject matter of which was substantially progressive. I noticed the ease with which His Excellency presented the address. He knows that in the Government and in the Cabinet he has people he can thoroughly rely on to pursue the policy set out: he knows those men will conscientiously and diligently carry out their duties in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

I join with other speakers in expressing my condolences to the friends and relatives of former members of the Parliament (Sir Richard Butler, Mr. A. V. Thompson, Mr. Craigie, and Sir Frank Perry), who have passed away recently. I did not know Mr. Craigie well. As the Leader of the Opposition said, Sir Richard Butler served the Parliament for many years, and he will be remembered for many years. I understand that history shows that he was the architect of the electoral boundaries that brought about a situation whereby a Liberal Government was able to remain in office in South Australia for about 30 years.

Sir Richard's work and activity in the Parliament will live in the memories of members of this House.

The late Mr. A. V. Thompson, who formerly represented the District of Semaphore, which I now represent, was a sincere, honest worker. He represented a working-class area and no-one can say that he did not give his constituents the utmost service. He was very sympathetic, particularly to aged people, and many such persons in the district sought his advice and guidance. When he left the State Parliament, he continued his activities in the field of social service in the Commonwealth Parliament by seeing that these people received justice.

Sir Frank Perry, who was a member of another place, also served this State well, not only in the field of Parliamentary duties but also as an industrialist, and he will be remembered by the people for many years. I extend to the relatives of those former members my deepest sympathy.

We read in the Speech that it was pleasing that Her Majesty visited South Australia. The honourable member for West Torrens mentioned this, and I think one is safe in saying that Her Majesty felt quite at ease when she was here. She gave that impression at the functions she attended, and one must admire the dignity with which she carried out her duties. I consider that the care and guidance shown by our Premier created an impression that she will long remember. He saw that Her Majesty received the best of attention, which she deserved. We wish her well and hope that some day she will return and see the further progress achieved by a Labor Government. I foresee that future progress will be more marked and more conspicuous and Her Majesty will appreciate what a great Government we have.

The remarks in paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech are to the point. They show that the Government is mindful of the issues with which it is confronted and that it will continue to pursue policies designed to make full use of the potential of the State in agriculture, mining, land settlement, irrigation, forestry and other fields. This is an extremely important phase and, although some reference has been made to the breadth of the paragraph, I consider it to be sound.

Members opposite attempt to show that all the planning is the result of their work in former years, but they want to divorce themselves from any responsibility that flows from that bad planning. To be consistent, they must take the bad with the good. We realized when we went

into office, as did the people of South Australia, that many changes were needed. For example, what is the good of producing grapes if markets are not available to enable the people to obtain a reasonable return for their efforts?

The policy of the previous Government was restrictive. It concentrated on doing one or two things but never completely followed the job through. This Government is not only saying that it wants to put people on the land; it is taking measures to ensure them a reasonable return for the product. The people are entitled to that, and it is the responsibility of this and every Government to see that products can be sold at a reasonable price.

Another important phase that each of us is watching closely is the development of natural gas in South Australia, provided the economics are satisfactory. I commend the Premier, the Minister of Mines and their officers on their foresight in going abroad to study the position, because many facets of this particular industry need examination. It is of no use rushing in without first having examined every aspect of the project. The expenditure involved in sending those men abroad was a sound investment. They have obtained first-hand knowledge of the best methods, techniques and materials, or at least a guide regarding the type of material that can be used to bring gas to the metropolitan area and, if the opportunity arises, possibly to service some industries *en route* to the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hughes: That is the intention.

Mr. HURST: Yes, and it coincides with expressed policy of decentralizing industry wherever possible. The member for Wallaroo will agree with that, because he knows that there has been much jostling around in his district for many years. I consider that, for political reasons, there has been no attempt to do anything of an industrial nature within that district. The area has been permitted to slip and the member for Wallaroo has seen not one but literally hundreds of people leave the district to find employment elsewhere.

We saw that in the days of the shortage of labour in the metropolitan area. When employers were offering sums of money to encourage labour to the plants, a pool of labour and facilities was available for industry in the District of Wallaroo, but the opportunity was allowed to slip. Industries were forced to come to Elizabeth and to the metropolitan area and this deprived local residents of the opportunity of earning a livelihood in their town.

We know from questions that have been asked and from what has been said by the

member for Wallaroo that an oversea firm is taking some interest in this project, and I hope that that interest will ultimately bear fruit for the benefit of the district. I sincerely hope that the firm can establish an industry there to provide for the people in the area and so dispense with the necessity for them to take employment in the metropolitan area and thereby further aggravate the housing situation. After all, it is not always just a question of building houses: we want to see that the accommodation that we have is being used to the fullest advantage, and we want to ensure that everybody is provided with reasonable shelter. If we continually ignore the requirements of some of these places and force those people to leave and go to other districts, they leave houses behind, and this makes it more difficult for the State as a whole. I congratulate the Minister of Education on making it known that from the beginning of next year children in primary schools will be provided with free books. This is a most important move.

Mr. Hughes: And one that is highly appreciated by the people.

Mr. HURST: Yes. The children living in my district, which is a working class area, should not be deprived of the right of education through their parents not being able to afford books. Only this year the father of 10 children approached me on this subject. One of his children attended a high school and one a technical school, and he found that with the number of children he had to maintain on his rate of pay it was not possible to purchase books. I am pleased to say that when this matter was taken up with the Minister of Education the problem was solved, and I commend the Minister for his prompt action in that regard. The Assistant Headmaster of one of the schools involved told me that he was very pleased that the matter had been resolved because it had not been easy for him to see the children sitting there and not having the books to enable them to study. When all is said and done, education is a very important asset in any State. We all realize that this is an age of advancement and that the demands on education are becoming greater. Regrettably, this has not been faced up to by the Commonwealth Government, which has completely ignored its responsibility in this regard. With its present allocation of funds, the State Ministers have to cut down and try to make the money go as far as possible, but it is not going far enough or providing as much as we would like. However, the State is not to blame, for it is the

cheese-paring policy of the Commonwealth Government that has brought this about, and that Government must accept full responsibility.

Mr. Hughes: Every child should have the same opportunity to become educated.

Mr. HURST: Yes. How can anyone help their parents being poor? Indeed, many persons who had poor parents but were given the opportunity to study made good in many walks of life. Many of those people have advanced to the top and their knowledge has been sought by other persons. Ben Chifley, the greatest leader this country ever saw, was an engine driver who worked up from the bottom of the ladder, and no-one could dispute his knowledge of economics and finance. I see the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) smiling. I have no knowledge of his ever having been a member of the Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association; he apparently had the benefits enjoyed by the more privileged class.

Mr. Clark: But he is a very happy, smiling, affable gentleman.

Mr. HURST: Yes. Paragraph 13 of the Speech states that it is the intention of the Government and the Minister of Works to undertake sewerage works, and such works in my district are mentioned. I heard the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) say that a couple of years ago she made representations regarding sewerage. If the honourable member's constituents are given priority over some of my constituents who have been waiting for 14 or 15 years, I shall be asking the Minister a few questions. I believe my district needs the utmost attention, for apart from being a working class district it is the gateway into South Australia. Everyone knows that if we are to attract industry into this State we do not want visitors by ship seeing something drab and thereby getting a false impression, for this turns people away and prejudices them. It is the drab appearance at this main entrance by sea to the State that accounts for the difficulty in attracting industry here. As I say, this is a working-class district, and all my life I have fought for the underdog.

Mr. Hall: Only since you have been in here.

Mr. HURST: These people deserve something much better than they are getting; I am afraid they have been the victims of the attitude that because it is a working-class area certain things should not be done there. If we want to develop the State, it is only right and proper that our State's main inlet should look reasonable. I commend the Minister of Works on the completion of the new restaurant at the Outer Harbour. People travelling by

oversea liners receive the very best treatment, and when they come ashore they want something better than a cup of tea and a sandwich in a tin shed. If those people can have a decent meal they will look further and become interested in this State.

I notice from paragraph 14 of the Speech that further improvements are expected at Outer Harbour. I regret that apparently there is to be some curtailment in the work there, but there again I believe this is the result of unsound planning by the previous Government. Naturally, it will take this Government some time to get things back on an even keel again. I hope the Minister takes notice of what I am saying, because this is really important. Outer Harbour is the only deep sea port for passenger vessels in South Australia, and the best of facilities should be there in order to create a good impression.

Mr. Ryan: And at the moment it has the worst facilities.

Mr. HURST: Yes. The money that has been contributed from that district, which is the backbone of the State, has been spent in other districts.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think the scheme down there only came as a result of pressure from some of the shipping companies?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I think we should get our facts right about the curtailment of the Outer Harbour terminal, which arises through the need to provide for industry and primary production.

Mr. HURST: We would get more industry if we provided better facilities and encouraged people to come to this State, for once they had come and had a good look they would see what a fine State this was.

Mr. Hall: What would be the first improvement you would make?

Mr. HURST: A decent passenger terminal should be constructed, because migrants should be given proper facilities when they arrive. I notice that work is to continue on the Public Library and on the office building in Victoria Square, and these are important steps. More efficiency in Government departments would result if all offices were together. Some criticism has been made of the lack of house building, but the Housing Trust has done a good job with the money made available by the Commonwealth Government. Opposition members have not informed the House of the number of flats built by private enterprise that have not been occupied, and it would be interesting to find out the number of vacancies in these buildings today. There has been a

false investment by private enterprise in these projects, as now they cannot let the premises and this is affecting the building industry. These buildings have not been built according to the requirements of the people, and it would surprise members to know how many are vacant. This could affect capital investments and curtail activities in these fields, thus affecting all workers in the building industry. I should like to see more even planning so that the building industry would be assisted.

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

Mr. HURST: Some members have said that places within their districts have been waiting for some time for sewerage, but Semaphore Park has been waiting for 14 or 15 years. It is regrettable that, because of a problem in relation to LeFevre Peninsula, the work will not be done as quickly as desired. The delay is a relic of the bad planning of the past, and I sympathize with the Minister of Works because of the problems he faces in getting projects such as these under way. Although it is not possible to switch things around overnight, I hope that as a result of constructive planning this scheme will be commenced soon to benefit an area that is vital to the State. During this session the Government intends to introduce a Bill to provide for the abolition of the Harbors Board and the creation of a Harbors Department responsible to the Minister of Marine.

Mr. Jennings: You would agree with that, wouldn't you?

Mr. HURST: Wholeheartedly. Any undertaking of this size should be responsible directly to a Minister and not to a board. Although in the past the Minister has had to take the raps for anything the board has done he has not had the authority to act, so I think this change will be a step in the right direction and that it will assist Port Adelaide, Port Pirie and other ports in this State. The South Australian Housing Trust expects to complete 3,150 houses during this financial year. In the trust's latest report it is stated that at Ingle Farm the trust owns 1,040 acres on which over 3,000 houses will be built during the next four or five years. We must look to the future and plan accordingly, because land for housing within a seven-mile radius of the city is becoming very scarce. Ingle Farm is about the only available area within that radius on which a large number of houses can be built. Last year the Public Works Committee reported on the Upper Port Reach Development Scheme under which about

4,500 houses could be built. After examining that report, I think we shall soon have to consider its possibilities.

Mr. Shannon: This scheme would turn wasteland into first-class land.

Mr. HURST: It impressed me. This area is within seven miles of the General Post Office and, apart from providing for 4,500 houses, it would encourage the tourist industry as well as meet the demands of working people for houses in the Port Adelaide district. If one wants a house at present, unfortunately one has to go to Elizabeth and thereby incur excessive fares to get to work, as there are no proper transport facilities there. However, this matter, through the initiative of the present Government, will be investigated soon by a Royal Commission. It is difficult for people at Elizabeth who work shifts to get to work. The scheme will take about nine years to develop fully, but I believe we shall have to consider it soon. If it is possible to provide houses reasonably close to employment, this should be investigated, as it would save workers \$4 or \$6 a week in fares. This would also be a tourist attraction, and many countries of the world depend upon the tourist industry.

Mr. Millhouse: Which countries are you thinking of?

Mr. HURST: Italy and Switzerland in particular. Probably 50 per cent of the income of Rome comes from oversea tourists. Why should we not encourage some of this traffic to Australia, which is a developing country? We should develop our State in such a way that we can attract some tourists here and share in their wealth. It would be wise to invest money in my district to attract tourists.

Mr. Millhouse: In comparing Semaphore with Rome you are putting your sights a bit high, aren't you?

Mr. HURST: Rome was not built in a day, and that applies to this scheme, too. Possibly the honourable member's great grandchildren will benefit from this scheme.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It will be more modern than Rome.

Mr. HURST: That is so. Antiques are good to look at, but this would provide a modern touch and give a stimulus to this State. His Excellency said that the Government would continue to consider amendments to industrial safety legislation. We tend to forget the cost of accidents to industry. Indeed, no-one could accurately assess that cost in terms of money. Workmen's compensation should be adequate because, after all, the

worker loses the most in the long run if forced, through an accident, to go on to workmen's compensation.

The Government's policy for a uniform code for the marking and standardization of packaged goods will again be pursued; the proposal to introduce a Bill for this purpose is a progressive step that illustrates the Government's intention to implement its policy. I should like to see further action taken in regard to the standardization of measurements, threads, etc., in industry, because the consumer ultimately pays for any additional cost of production through lack of uniformity. I can recall, when working in industry, that because of an instruction given by the Department of Navy, when a screw had worked out of a terminal on a bell, permission was not given to alter the thread. Even though that occurred 20 years ago, the time it took to find a screw of the required size cost about \$32. Much of the time and money wasted could be obviated by the standardization of equipment, particularly in regard to weights and measures, threads, etc.

The appointment by the Government of a Royal Commission into the Licensing Act is, again, commendable and illustrates the Government's earnestness in fulfilling its promises; it does not simply legislate according to its own personal wishes. It affords the public of South Australia the opportunity to submit its views; those views will be passed on to the Ministry, and the Government will decide exactly what measure should be introduced. The Speech makes mention of not fewer than three Royal Commissions, one being to investigate State transport, which is an important question. The Government's action last year in introducing a Bill for the co-ordination of transport was an effort to raise additional revenue but, because of the attitude of another place to revenue-raising measures, generally, it was rejected and threw this Party's programme off-balance, despite the fact that the electors had endorsed our policy. The Planning and Development Bill is another progressive move.

Mr. Millhouse: I am just waiting for you to come to the Registration of Dogs Act, and hear what you can say about that. You are going through everything else.

Mr. HURST: Quite a few dogs are covered by that legislation.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Do you think they could be caponized?

Mr. HURST: The member for Mitcham is vitally interested in dogs. Indeed, I understand there is a dogs' home in his own district. A Planning and Development Bill is necessary in

any modern society. How can we plan cities and development, generally, without an appropriate Act? Without somebody in authority, development will not be orderly. Lack of planning in this regard can result in tremendous costs to the community. Planning will lead to greater efficiency and permit money to be spent in more important directions, and the public will obtain better value for its money.

I am pleased that the Government intends to introduce a Government insurance scheme. Those of us who have had experience particularly in regard to workmen's compensation will realize the necessity for such an undertaking. When one analyses the figures of the various States where similar schemes operate, one finds that a Government insurance scheme can be a revenue-making proposition as well as providing better facilities for the public. I do not have the figures for Western Australia or New South Wales at my disposal—

Mr. Millhouse: It is a pity you haven't the New South Wales figure, in view of what you have said.

Mr. HURST: The honourable member must be referring to the present Government in that State, for the figures that I obtained in regard to the former Labor Government show quite a lucrative return. It is not always a question of considering workmen's compensation: we must also consider the mental strain on the person concerned. His nerves can become so affected that he may have to be hospitalized, for which the State ultimately pays.

Mr. Jennings: What about the loss of production?

Mr. HURST: That, too, is an important consideration. All of the measures outlined in His Excellency's Speech will benefit South Australia in the long run, and it is refreshing to see such progressive steps being taken. Whether we agree to having lotteries or not, we must not lose sight of the fact that much revenue is leaving the State in favour of other States which can then use those funds to advantage. Why should we not make such a facility available here? South Australians have expressed the desire for lotteries.

Mr. Quirke: We could even have an opera house!

Mr. HURST: Possibly, but we should support one of our own and not try to purchase one from Sydney at an exorbitant cost. His Excellency's Speech also refers to a Bill to establish a totalizator agency board. Paragraph 32 states:

It is the intention of my Government to place before you legislation to continue the operation of the Prices Act.

That is an important and necessary measure which, I am confident, will receive much support from the people, because it is difficult to follow the pricing of some commodities nowadays. I often wonder how people manage to live under the present wages set-up. The Attorney-General did try to bring about some order in the matter of hire-purchase, but what is the position? We find today that companies, trying to short-circuit legal requirements, are entering into rental agreements with people who find that in the end they are paying twice what an article is worth. All these things have to be continually watched. Someone takes a step to do something and then it is found that many dollars have to be spent in another direction to counter what has been done, and further legislation is needed to follow it up. I commend the Government for taking this step. Then paragraph 34 of the Speech states:

A Bill to make provision regarding certain undesirable trade and business practices will be laid before you.

Here again this is an important matter. In my district I have repeatedly found that people are being summoned in respect of goods they thought they had purchased, and, fortunately, some of them have been methodical enough to keep the receipts. On checking, they have found that they have not been credited with money paid. There are all sorts of schemes and rackets used on the working people to try to pressurize them in order to get more money out of them, often to the extent that they ask them to pay certain amounts of money and then say to them, "We will talk turkey," and then possibly settle for half.

Only yesterday I was told that one of my constituents had questioned an account he had received from a South Australian firm that had been in difficulties. He went to court and he had the receipts. As a result of his representations to the court, a consent judgment was entered into between the parties and the Registry. He agreed to pay about half the amount, because the payments were adjusted monthly. He religiously paid his instalments monthly. About a fortnight ago he received an ordinary summons from this firm. He rang the solicitors concerned and told them of the judgment that had been entered into at the court, the cheques forwarded, and the money order numbers, of which he had kept an account. They said, "Tear up the summons and forget about it." Yesterday morning the

same firm had a warrant issued for his arrest. This is the type of transaction going on in many business houses.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) is smiling. There are some members of his profession who enter into this sort of thing who know the consequences for them. I say advisedly that, if any members of a profession are to charge professional fees for doing a job, they should do the job and there should be some big penalty for not doing it properly. This sort of thing is understandable if one goes to some backyard firm but, when reputable firms charge professional fees and people are continually worried (fortunately, in this case, this person knew sufficient about it and knew where to go and proceedings were stopped in time) there should be a big penalty if things are not properly seen to. But some people are harassed when professional fees are charged and this sort of thing happens. Often a receipt is lost and that is just too bad for the person concerned. I question the ethics of some of these people and the manner in which they keep their books. Far too many mistakes are made and the workers are the ones who suffer. The time is fast approaching when we shall have to look seriously at this situation.

Mr. Rodda: Aren't we all workers?

Mr. HURST: I can appreciate that the honourable member is fully in accord with what I am saying. When my Party brings measures before this House to try to rectify these things, members opposite should come over here and vote with us.

Mr. Quirke: What is the division—lawyers and workers?

Mr. HURST: I suppose some of them say they do work. There are good and bad lawyers and good and bad workers. In fact, there are good and bad in every field. If the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) feels that way, when the appropriate measures are introduced we would welcome him over to this side of the House.

Mr. McKee: Only temporarily.

Mr. HURST: Just for voting purposes; that would suit us.

Mr. Hudson: If he does not cross the floor, he lowers the standards of both sides of the House.

Mr. HURST: Getting his vote would be the important thing. Paragraph 39 of the Speech states:

A Bill to amend the Superannuation Act to provide for optional retirement at 60 years for males and 55 years for females will be laid before you.

I have heard some criticism of this but I know of private industries that do not give the option: they retire people reaching those ages in life. We all realize that, if a person is forced out at the age of 60, he has difficulty in finding suitable employment if he wishes to continue working. This Bill provides for optional retirement at those ages. It is almost impossible for a person forced out at 55 or 60 to find suitable employment to rehabilitate herself or himself in some other occupation. We have only to look at the advertisements for "Situations vacant". Seldom do we find any demand or call for a person over the age of 50 years. I see no reason why Government employees should not be permitted, if they so desire, to retire at those ages if they want to enjoy the benefits of their long service leave before they become too old to enjoy them. It gives me great pleasure to support this motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is a debate in which all members of Parliament agree in supporting the motion, and then agree to disagree. I do not think I have ever heard anybody oppose it—with the exception of the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) who, in his palmier days, did oppose it once or twice. Apart from him, I think every member of this House always supports the motion. We do it by talking about anything we like, either in praise or in blame of something, that has been done or has been left undone, or in agreement or in disagreement with something that His Excellency or anybody else may have said. There are few exceptions to that. I shall not be one of them tonight.

Let me come straightaway to the Speech that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor read last Tuesday in opening this session. The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon actually went so far as to congratulate who ever it was who wrote the Speech on saying so little in so many words. I think that the Leader was being over-charitable. I am afraid I cannot congratulate the Parliamentary Draftsman, who, I understand, drafted the Speech (as he has done traditionally over the years), for what was in it. Not one thing in the Speech was not already known or had not already been made public at some time or another. I had always believed that the Opening Speech was meant to be a forecast of the legislative programme for the session. The only forecast we got was simply a list of the titles of the Acts of Parliament that it is intended to amend. In any case no clue was given as to the nature of the amendments that

were to be made. Indeed, as the Premier admitted the following day in answer to my question, a Bill that did not even rate a mention (although the Government does intend to introduce amending legislation on it), was one of the Bills that caused great controversy in the last session—the Constitution Act Amendment Bill.

It is common knowledge that Australia's economy has been slowing down over the last 12 months or more. What members opposite seem not to understand or care about is that South Australia, of all the States, has been the worst hit by the slowing down that is taking place. The responsibility for this rests largely with the present State Labor Government.

Mr. Hudson: It rests with the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg prides himself on his knowledge of economics but let me warn him and other members opposite that South Australia is not naturally a wealthy State. As it has fewer natural assets than any other part of the Commonwealth, it is a great mistake for any Government to spend its money as though South Australia were a wealthier State than it is. Yet that is precisely what the present Government has done during the 15 months it has been in office. The former Government deliberately adopted a policy of State development. As the Leader said this afternoon, this was a policy that was first introduced by a former Premier (the late Sir Richard Butler), and it was adopted as a result of South Australia's experience during the great depression. That policy, which was fostered for nearly 30 years, was deliberately designed to husband the resources of the State to develop secondary industry to the greatest possible extent but, above all, to do that by keeping our costs down. The member for Glenelg, who comes from the Eastern States, is wagging his head. Does he deny that what I have said is true? Does he deny that the best way to compete with markets in other States is to keep costs down? I thought that was a truism.

Mr. Hudson: I shall try to be reasonably still without any facial movement so that I will not attract the honourable member's attention.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is being childish. If honourable members opposite listen to what I have to say they may learn something. It was the deliberate policy of both the Butler and Playford Governments to keep costs down and they incurred

occasional criticism because they were light on spending on social services. I do not deny that for a moment, and some of the criticism levelled at them from time to time was undoubtedly justified. However, those Governments believed that the best way to help all the people of South Australia was by raising the general level of prosperity within the State. They believed that if that were done then other things would follow naturally.

In that policy the two previous Governments were fairly successful; yet the present Government has deliberately turned its back on that policy. Of course, it has made an effort (as we knew it would from all that had been said over the years) to redress what it considered to be the deficiencies, especially in the field of social services, of the previous Government. Much has been said in the last 15 months and, although we have not got far as yet, the present Government has made an effort in this direction. It budgeted to spend money on these things, but worse still (and this is unforgiveable) it committed itself to spend money before it had collected it. That is why complaints were made in His Excellency's Speech. The Labor Party must have known that when it brought in legislation to impose higher succession duties and so on it would have trouble having those measures passed in a House it did not control. The Government was exceedingly foolish to budget to spend that money before it knew it could collect it.

It has been extravagant in other ways, too. One of the first things the Government did was to grant service payments to daily paid workers for no reason at all (something which has been calculated to add over \$2,000,000 per annum to the wages bill of the Government). I do not begrudge anybody extra money but we must make sure that as a State we can afford to do these things before we go about doing them. Yet, in a carefree way (and we saw how carefree it was when we tried to examine the details of what had been done) a mere \$2,000,000 or more was added by the stroke of a pen to the expenditure of the State. Nearly every Bill introduced last session increased the cost of one section or another of the community. Provisions for workmen's compensation, stamp duties, land tax and so on are examples that all members on both sides of the House and many people outside can bring easily to mind.

In these ways the present Government has been extravagant and wasteful and has forgotten the lesson it should have learned from its predecessor: that this is not a wealthy State in which money can be thrown about and that if

the Government tries to do this we will soon be, as indeed we are now, living beyond our income. Many of the things that the present Government wants to do in the field of social services are, of themselves, good; I do not deny that. However, they are only good if the State can afford to pay for them. If they reduce our ability to compete in markets in other States and overseas to the extent that we lose those markets, they are bad for the State. Yet, this is what is happening. Our costs are being raised.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What markets have been lost?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me give a few examples. These are not new matters; they have been mentioned this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Burnside. I am sure that it will be acknowledged by all members that the building industry is one of the most sensitive indicators of the health of any economy. Yet, what do we find in South Australia? I have figures from the May issue of the *Monthly Review of Business Statistics*, which is an authoritative document that is readily available. On page 32, building approvals are shown and figures are given showing the total value of buildings approved, including alterations and additions, in the various States for a number of years. I hope this is not special pleading. I simply take March figures because the figures for March, 1966, are the latest we have.

We find that in March, 1964 (that is March in the year 1963-64) the figure for South Australia was \$15,446,000, whereas the Australian total was \$133,470,000. According to my arithmetic, which my friend the member for Torrens has checked, that gives South Australia 11.6 per cent. By March, 1965, the month in which the Government took office, it had dropped to 8.6 per cent, and that drop continued. By last March it had dropped to 6.9 per cent of the Australian total. That is a very alarming trend. The member for Glenelg or other members may be able to explain away that example but perhaps they do not know or care to find out what is the general feeling in the business community in South Australia. It is a mirror of those figures.

Everybody knows that the building industry in this State is badly off at present. People are being put off. Not only are building contractors feeling the pinch, but all those allied occupations that depend on it are feeling it, too. There is a complete lack of confidence in the building industry and in industry and commerce generally in the State. I am told by

my friends that the present indications are that the position will get worse, not better. Some people have even said that their present experience is far worse than their experience during the credit squeeze in the early 1960's. This climate has been induced in the State by the present Government.

Let us leave this fairly accurate, even though general, picture of the feeling, and let us now look at the matter of employment (or, rather, unemployment) in South Australia. I think that figures on that matter, too, were given by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Burnside. I do not intend to cite the same figures but I have, again from the *Monthly Review of Business Statistics*, a table setting out unemployment, sickness and special benefits, and the numbers of people receiving those benefits throughout Australia. We find here the same trend as has been mentioned this afternoon and as we have found in the figures I gave regarding buildings.

Again, I take the March figures for the last three years, because they happen to be the latest I have. In March for the year 1963-64, South Australia had on unemployment benefits 1,151 people out of an Australian total of 21,955. As before, the member for Torrens was kind enough to check the figures, and the percentage for South Australia is 4.125. In March 1965, when the Government came into office, the figure had risen to 5.33. I grant that members opposite say that that is the responsibility of the previous Government, and to some extent it may have been, but what has happened in the 12 months since this Government came to office?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Mr. McMahon said that we must not have unemployment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let the incoming Premier listen to this. It is something for which he will be responsible soon. What was the percentage last March? It had risen from 5.33 to 9.82. It had almost doubled. That is another indication of the way in which things have slowed down in South Australia while this Government has been in office. I am not the only one saying such things as this: that is so obvious that it hardly needs saying.

A few elections ago I was opposed by Mr. E. H. Thorp, who is now Federal President and South Australian Secretary of the Builders Labourers Union. Nobody can deny that Mr. Thorp is a very good Labor man. He is a dedicated Labor man; he was so dedicated at the time of the election that he would not even have a drink with me after the poll had been declared. What has he to say about

this? Honourable members know the answer, because it was in last week's *Sunday Mail*. This is what Mr. Thorp, a Labor man of Labor men, said:

A strong plea for more concerted Government action to restore prosperity in the building industry in South Australia was made today by union leaders in Adelaide.

Of course, Mr. Thorp was not the only one to talk about this, but he said:

The building industry is part of the backbone of the State's economy, which is already weakened by serious droughts.

In other words, he was saying what I said, that the building industry was one of the most sensitive barometers of the health of the economy. He went on:

Instead of grappling with the problem on a sound basis, the Government is chasing shadows trying to stimulate the economy with lotteries, T.A.B. and 10 o'clock closing. These things are useless to men walking the streets without a dollar in their pocket because they can't get jobs.

On this occasion, I absolutely agree with what Mr. Thorp has said. Yet, we did not get a word of this in His Excellency's Speech at the opening of this session of Parliament, because apparently the Government does not care about that at all and certainly has not done anything about it. I am not saying I am against lotteries and T.A.B.; I am not, but these are mere fripperies. They do not matter two hoots compared with the health of the economy of this State.

Mr. Langley: Did you read the complete report?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and the member for Unley probably read it, too. I do not know whether he wants me to read it.

Mr. Langley: What about the electrical industry? Is that going bad?

Mr. McKee: Is the legal profession going bad?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are members opposite trying to explain away what Mr. Thorp has said?

Mr. Langley: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Do you deny that what he said is correct?

Mr. Langley: I shall answer you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will see if the member can answer it. I shall try to keep him up to that. I warrant that he cannot and that the member for Glenelg or any other member cannot. The weight of opinion amongst economists is that the economic trend in Australia in the near future is likely to be upwards.

Mr. Hudson: The general consensus of opinion amongst economists is that the present trend is the direct consequence of the present Commonwealth Government's actions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me give three reasons why the opinion I have stated is held by many economists. First, there will be a substantial increase in the States' works and housing programmes as a result of the recent Loan Council meeting. Secondly, there is likely to be an expansion in personal consumption spending although, incidentally, that will be brought about partly by a matter which will cause great headaches to Governments, namely the certainty of a rise in the basic wage. A rise of \$2.50 is talked about, although this is at present only a guess. However, there will be a rise, and it is expected to increase personal consumption. Thirdly, there is the rise in expenditure on defence. These things are likely to raise the general trend of the economy, but what the Government should be doing, and scratching its head about to see that it does it, is to see that South Australia also comes out of this and does not do what it is at present doing—gradually getting into a worse and worse position compared with that of the other States, which is what is shown by the figures I have quoted.

Let me give one other example, not a statistical one. The week before last I met here in Adelaide an English businessman, a former member of the House of Commons who was touring Australia. He came to South Australia in the course of his tour, but he could not wait to leave here to go to Western Australia because he had heard (and everything he had heard led him to believe) that that was the State that was booming at present. We heard something of this from the honourable member for Burnside, herself a Western Australian native, this afternoon. If members look at the figures they will see that as South Australia has been going down so a State like Western Australia has been going up in employment and so on. These things are, as I say, extremely disquieting, and South Australia is in danger at present of becoming permanently or semi-permanently depressed under the present Government.

Mr. McKee: You are being depressing now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I am depressing the honourable member for Port Pirie; it is about time he took notice of something. There is nothing in the Speech to contradict what I have said. We have the poor apology in paragraph 5 about new industries and the setting up of the Premier's Department. The only thing

the Government can point to is the expansion by Chrysler down near the oil refinery. That is the only thing we have out of that much vaunted Premier's Department and no doubt that was planned well before the election, because these things do not happen in a short time. This is exceedingly disquieting, and in the long run we will find that the worst thing about having a Labor Government in this State is the fact that it has raised costs and destroyed business confidence, and this will have a most adverse effect upon the economy of the State.

I shall not say any more about that. I want to refer now to one or two other matters that rated a passing mention in the Speech, and members opposite will be glad to know that I turn now to something a little brighter. I refer to the discovery of adequate reserves (we hope) of natural gas at Gidgealpa and Moomba. The problem now that those reserves have been proved is to get the gas to the place where it will be consumed, and that is particularly the Adelaide market. I understand that the size of the Adelaide market would not justify a pipeline to cost \$40,000,000 or thereabouts if it were not for the fact that the Electricity Trust's Torrens Island power station will be coming into operation. Incidentally, the site for this power station was bitterly opposed, I seem to remember, by members opposite when they were in Opposition. What would have happened if it had been built at Wallaroo, as I seem to remember some members advocated, I do not know, but it is only the fact that the power station is here that will make the Adelaide area a sufficiently large market to warrant the construction of a pipeline of that expense.

Mr. McKee: It could have been at Port Pirie.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is a typically stupid remark by the honourable member for Port Pirie, one which shows that he just has no idea of the realities of the economics of this thing.

Mr. McKee: You ought to go up there and see the expansion that is taking place.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Government is apparently seized of the importance of the discovery of natural gas, because it said so in its Speech and used this as an excuse for the trip the Premier and one other Minister had during the vacation. We have not yet seen that the trip has added to the Premier's stock of knowledge or wisdom on that matter. I am not criticizing anyone. I have noticed that the Minister of Agriculture, who appears to be trying to interject, is a little thin-skinned

today; I noticed it before when the Leader was speaking. What I am saying is that we have not seen any overt results yet from the Premier's trip. The only result is that every time we ask him a question about something that went on when he was away he says he does not know about it and has not caught up with it yet, but still no doubt these things will be taken care of in time.

One of the most important matters to be decided by this Parliament (and I hope it will be in this session) is the way in which the pipeline is to be financed. At present I have an open mind on this: I am not wedded to any particular method. All I am saying is that it is, I should guess, one of the most important matters that will come before us, and I only hope the Premier did profit in some way from his trip and that whatever scheme the Government does dish out will be a workable and an economic and a just one. I do not propose to go deeply into this, but some time ago Mr. Ron Southern, who is the President of World-Wide Camps and one of the chief officers in that company, sent me an outline of the way in which gas pipelines are financed and operated in Alberta, which is his own Canadian province. I have this very interesting document here.

Mr. Jennings: You could have asked the member for Burra about that.

Mr. Quirke: He knows about it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It may be that this is the way in which we should do it, through a statutory company. The Alberta Gas Trunkline is an Alberta company. It is an investor-owned pipeline company, and its sole function has been the transportation of gas for others. All the information is here in the document. Whether or not this is the way we should do it remains to be seen, but there it is.

Let me pass on from that one, which is a rather happier subject, we hope. The member for Port Pirie will be interested in this next topic because it concerns Socialism. I refer to the paragraph in the Speech which announced, I think a fortnight after it was put in the newspaper, the establishment of a State insurance office. Now this is what paragraph 28 of the Speech says about that:

My Government has received many complaints concerning the operations of certain insurance companies, particularly in the fields of workmen's compensation, personal accident and comprehensive motor vehicle insurance. As a means of enforcing satisfactory general standards of service to the public, in accordance with my Government's policy, a Bill to provide for the establishment of a State Government Insurance Office will be laid before you.

That is so much puffing, because in the policy of the Labor Party appears a plank in relation to a State Insurance Office covering all insurable risks. No matter what complaints the Government had had or whether it had any at all, it would still be under an obligation to introduce legislation setting up a State insurance office because that is theoretical Socialism and is in the Party's platform, so that it is bound by it.

Mr. Jennings: And it was in the policy speech, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I will come to that in a moment. Apparently the idea is to give competition to private enterprise insurance companies, but to me there seems to be plenty of competition between those companies. No-one will be a whit better off if a State insurance office is set up in this State.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That is why every other State has one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Minister, as an educated man with a wide store of knowledge, how those States are better off because they each have a State insurance office.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I have not analysed it, but the States are better off as a consequence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are they?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is losing his block, but I suppose I should not use that expression! I quote a fairly authoritative document, the report of the New South Wales Auditor-General, on the experience of the New South Wales Government Insurance Office to see whether he thinks everyone will be much better off when we have this Socialist affair. This report is not for a year in which New South Wales rejoiced under a Liberal and Country Party Government but for one in which the Labor Government was still in office for most of the time: it is for the year ended June 30, 1965. It states:

Net premium income for the year, \$45,958,344, was higher by \$5,154,600 than that of the previous year. Claims paid and adjustments for outstanding claims totalled \$43,491,406, an increase of \$5,252,548, while administrative expenses rose by \$442,114. As a consequence the underwriting result was a deficiency of \$705,736, compared with a deficiency of \$165,674 for the year 1963-64.

The New South Wales office does not do quite so well as the Minister apparently thought it did a few minutes ago. To be fair, there was an adjustment through investment income of nearly \$6,000,000, and when that is brought into account there is a small surplus. The

Minister should not be fooled into thinking this is the hen that lays the golden egg for the South Australian Government, because it is not. It is not a gold mine in the other States, either. These things are significant to a Government that is scraping the bottom of the barrel and complaining that it does not have enough money. Gone are the carefree days of the policy speech when the present Premier was made to say in his speech the ways in which the Labor Party, if it came to office, was going to finance its plans. Those days are gone, and the whole tenor of the Premier's speeches since then has changed. What was the Labor Party going to do? Its plan was:

(a) To strengthen the State banking system by amalgamating the State Bank and the Savings Bank.

(b) To provide that all Government and semi-Government institutions bank with the State banking institutions.

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

The Government has been in office for 15 months and those ways in which it was to finance things have not come to pass. The next paragraph of the policy speech is a gem, and it is something that the Premier may be able to explain now that he has had some experience of office. It states:

Additional funds will also be available on account of the normal growth in Government revenue and loan funds. The current trend of growth in Government expenditure and receipts is 7 per cent per annum and there is no indication that this trend is likely to alter. Last year Government expenditure exceeded \$280,000,000 and therefore we can anticipate cumulative increases of approximately \$20,000,000 each year for the next three years making \$120,000,000 increase in all.

Mr. Coumbe: I wonder who prepared that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Probably the member for Edwardstown (the Premier) did not, but I am sure he bitterly regrets that he said those things 15 months ago. Nothing could be more contrary to what His Excellency said in his Speech last week about the finances of the State.

Mr. Quirke: Have you any evidence that he sacked the author?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suspect that the author is sitting opposite me now, but that is enough on State finances. The problem of death and injury on the roads of this State, one of the biggest problems in the community, did not receive a mention in His Excellency's Speech. It is an irony of our time that the Labor Party, which has made such a fuss about

our involvement in Vietnam and the casualties being suffered by Australian forces, alas, in that war, should say not one word about this problem. The Labor Party has said that it is senseless slaughter in Vietnam. Whether we believe that or not, every member will agree that what happens every day on the roads is a far more senseless slaughter than anything happening in Vietnam. Because the Government does not seem to know or care, I remind it of the figures for South Australia. For the year ended June 30, 1965, 232 people were killed on the roads in this State and 9,777 injured. In the subsequent three quarters to September 30, another 72 people were killed and 2,585 injured. In the next quarter to December, 65 were killed and 2,071 injured. For the March quarter, 59 were killed and 2,023 injured.

These are appalling figures, yet we did not get one word in the Speech about any action to do anything about it. The only mention was that the Road Traffic Act, among other Acts, was to be amended. However, I must give the Government its due, because yesterday it was announced that the amendment to the Road Traffic Act, which was passed in 1963 and which made the installation of seat belts compulsory, was to be proclaimed, and for that I am grateful to the Government. It was about time it did that. I do not know, and it cannot be calculated, how many lives have been lost by the delay, as it is three years since the legislation was passed, but I am sure it would be a significant number. This, however, should be only the beginning of the tackling of this problem. Many other matters require attention. I hope the Government will attend to such matters as the classification of licences, working eventually towards a national licence in Australia instead of having six licensing authorities. Vehicle inspection is another matter on which much work could be done. These matters are of great importance in the community, because there is no greater source of heartbreak and waste than road accidents. However, that is something that, as I say, does not even warrant a mention in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech.

One final thought that I should like to express was prompted by an article which appeared in last Saturday's *Australian*, written by Professor Arnold Toynbee, and which was entitled, "The World Tomorrow". It is a forecast of what that eminent historian thinks is likely to happen in the world in the next 10, 20 or 30 years, and it prompts me to ask these questions. What should our aim, as a community, be during that same time? What sort of place do we desire

Australia to be in 10 or 20 years' time? What sort of a community do we desire for South Australia in that time? These are questions to which few of us, I think, give sufficient thought. It is not really good enough for anybody, either on the Government side or on this side of the House, merely to think from 12 months to 12 months—a legislative programme that will last for only one year. We should all try to look a little farther ahead than that. What sort of community do we wish to find in South Australia? Surely, it is one in which those sections of the community that are disabled through age, sickness or some other infirmity are looked after by the community. But that is not good enough. Social security in itself does not make for strength and health in the community, which is something the Labor Party and, in particular, the Attorney-General could bear in mind when framing legislation. Surely, we desire a community in which people can prosper through hard work, where talent is rewarded for those prepared to make every effort, and where those of us raising a family will be able to do so decently, knowing that they in their turn will have a chance to get on.

Mr. McKee: That hasn't been possible in the last 30 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know the member for Port Pirie does not like to hear these things, but perhaps he will bear with me. I do not have the answers to these questions, and I frankly doubt whether any member on either side has given sufficient thought to them.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: And to the question of thrift being penalized!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, certainly. In the long run, the Party that gives thought to these matters and then acts on them, the Party that looks for the ideals and aims that I have mentioned, will be the Party to gain the confidence of the electors of this State and of the people of Australia. I can say that so far as within me lies I intend to do my best to see that it is this Party. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I, too, support the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I do not intend to say much about the speeches that have already been made by other members. I have been used to critical speeches made from the Opposition benches; I have been listening to them for 14 years.

Mr. Nankivell: Making a few, too!

Mr. CLARK: I like to think, however, in company with my colleagues, who now by virtue of their worth sit on this side of the House,

that the speeches we used to make, although critical, made some sort of attempt to be constructive. We have just listened to a speech made by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), and probably the least said about it is the better. He, himself, realized that it was not very good, and he even had the decency to blush once or twice when speaking. He agreed with only one thing that the Government has done so far—its decision in regard to seat belts—but honourable members may realize that his reason for agreeing was that for once we agreed with him. He has advocated the use of seat belts for years; I am the first to admit that. If we do not agree with the honourable member, we are wrong; he sees only two colours—black and white, with no intermediate shades. Indeed, from what I have heard from him this evening, not only do only two colours exist for him but he has illustrated that he is colour-blind as well.

I congratulate the mover of the adoption of the Address in Reply, as well as the seconder. The mover, the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), has a stature in this House as well as in his district which has been proved and which has increased year by year since he entered Parliament. Indeed, that is evidenced by the speech he made.

Mr. Jennings: His stature will be further enhanced as a result.

Mr. CLARK: Yes. The seconder (Mr. Broomhill) is a young man whom we on this side welcomed into this place and who has shown much ability. I predict that he will go a long way in Parliament. I congratulate also the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst), who not only made an informative speech but interspersed it with a little humour and wit that made it easy to listen to. I hope I shall not be considered biased when I say quite frankly that I cannot find anything on which to congratulate Opposition members, but I live in hope of seeing better results in the future.

Mr. Jennings: You'd have to have a magnifying glass.

Mr. CLARK: They are prophets of gloom and decay.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have you no praise at all?

Mr. CLARK: Had I spoken later in the debate after the member for Alexandra, I am sure I should have been able, albeit with some effort, to say something nice about his remarks.

Mr. Jennings: Particularly if they were brief!

Mr. CLARK: Many honourable members may recall those hearty, back-slapping speeches made by former Government members in Address in Reply debates, but I have not heard so many of them this time. Probably because I have spent 13 or 14 years in the wilderness, I am happier to be criticizing than praising. I shall get back to a couple of parish pump matters affecting my district! I shall not attempt to put right the affairs of the State or the Commonwealth, for I think that is a problem that can be solved only by our united efforts. I have always believed that if we look after the things that we consider important and need doing most in our own districts, the combined efforts of the 39 members in this place, not to mention those of the gentlemen in another place, must surely do some good in each of our districts. If our districts are looked after in a good solid general way, then the whole State will be looked after. Some of the things I shall be saying may have been heard by members several times previously. They may think that what I say tonight is "old hat" and boring. If that is the case, they have my full permission for them to let me talk to other members. I hope the Minister of Works will listen to me and that my words will fall on the ears of the Premier and reach the Minister of Transport.

However, before coming to that, there is one thing I want to say about criticism we have received from the other side. I find that the present Government is being blamed consistently for errors and omissions of a Government in which it had no share at all—the previous Government. It has been interesting to me today to hear questions about the distribution of free books. When the previous Government was in office it never wanted free books; yet we find that now, peculiarly enough, it is full of criticism of us about it—not about our giving free books but about the way we shall do that. I thank the Minister of Education, who was this afternoon prepared to give the sort of answer that such questions deserve, because the members asking the questions are not seeking information. I always thought that the main purpose of questions was the seeking of information, but this question merely sought to catch the Minister, and the Minister is not so easy to catch. I am glad of that.

The first matter I raise, in connection with my own district, is the introduction of sewerage to the town of Gawler. I know the Minister of Works will be interested in this and that he has appreciated my thoughts over the years and will help me if possible. The answer I got from him this afternoon in reply to a question

was not very helpful but I understand from a conversation with him that we still have hopes. I am not the first to raise this matter in this Chamber. My predecessor, the late Les Duncan, whom many members will remember, hammered it as long as he could. Our efforts so far have not been very successful. I was interested to hear the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) speak about her sewerage troubles. If she went back through the volumes of *Hansard*, it would be a long and boring job to find out the many times I have spoken on this, the different questions I have asked and the innumerable answers and promises I have been given. But I do not want to go back into the past except to quote the following reply given to me on August 24, 1961, by the then Minister of Works to my query about sewerage for Gawler:

The sewerage of Gawler was referred to the Public Works Standing Committee some years ago but the committee's inquiry was adjourned pending the adoption of the Bolivar sewerage treatment works and the construction of the Elizabeth trunk sewers. Now that these are approved, the scheme for Gawler has been resuscitated and the proposals will be ready for resubmission to the Public Works Standing Committee within a few months.

The Public Works Committee is still waiting for it.

Mr. Jennings: That was a good many years before this Government took office.

Mr. CLARK: It is obvious that so far this apparent resuscitation that the Minister told me about has not been very effective. In fact, over that course of time one would have thought that the patient would die. However, the patient is still alive and well but I am afraid that the situation in which he finds himself is very sick. I am sorry that the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) is not here, because he has shown a great keenness on the use of the dictionary, a laudable thing. "Resuscitate" means to revive or restore or return to life. I hope that my mentioning this will mean bringing this matter back to life. I want the Minister to look at this resuscitation and do the very best he can to bring the patient back to the full vigour of life. I am no authority on whether or not the Government can afford to do this work, but I do claim to be an authority on whether or not this work is necessary. I know it is necessary and urgent, and I hope once more to give the House proof of this by quoting parts of the report made by the Health Officer of the Gawler Local Board of Health in early 1964 or late 1963. I know this is two years ago,

but the position has not improved. Indeed, many more houses have been built and the situation has worsened. I hope the House will bear with me while I quote parts of this report, which was made at the request of the Gawler councillors, who were naturally interested in the conditions under which the people in their area were living. It is not a pleasant or nice report but I believe it is illuminating. I was reminded today, on checking through my files, of a report I received some time ago prepared jointly by the then Engineer for Sewerage (Mr. Jack Murrell) and the then Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment (Mr. H. J. N. Hodgson), in which they said:

The septic tank is an instrument which has been devised for handling a portion only of the pollutional waste of a household and it has been devised especially for isolated dwellings which cannot economically be served by a sewerage system. It is not an instrument for the mass handling of the waste of a town and it does not remove the big body of filth from the vicinity of the house and, in turn, the town. It is considered that its adoption for country towns in South Australia in lieu of a sewerage system is very short-sighted, and a very retrograde step.

Unfortunately, over the years many towns have had to adopt the septic tank system or put up with something even worse than that.

Mr. Quirke: Or to put in their own drainage system.

Mr. CLARK: Yes; and gradually that has come about in Gawler, which leads to the fact I want to bring out in this report, which was unbiased and true. The report reads:

During the last two months I have inspected septic tank installations in practically every street in the Gawler corporation area. In almost every street the same situation is occurring, the soakage well is overflowing. The occupiers of the homes in the affected areas are using a great variety of ways and means in fighting the problem. Ejector pumps, hand pumps and even buckets are used, and in one street the effluent is merely siphoned out of the soakage wells into a gully on the other side of the road.

I submit that is not a pleasant prospect. The report continues:

I have interviewed many people throughout the town. Most are doing everything in their power to keep the effluent in their own properties, but in many instances this is literally impossible, and then we have the all-too-common sight of black, evil smelling offensive liquids running down the watertable. From the public health point of view, the matter falls into two main categories:

(a) Where effluent free from pathogenic organisms has to be pumped out regularly, e.g., daily or weekly. An overflowing soakage well presents a very real problem and certainly affects the

mental health of the people. Families with small children are understandably concerned; the back yards are not fit places for small children to play in; mosquitoes thrive in such conditions; friction is caused among neighbours when effluent seeps in next door, and many people realize that they are liable to be prosecuted if they allow the effluent to discharge into the street. All this is extremely worrying to people in the Gawler area.

- (b) Where soakage wells are overflowing continuously; the septic tanks are not working properly, and as a result raw sewage containing many solid particles is discharging on to the ground.

I am not reading this because of its literary value but because it is a plain down-to-earth report on the situation. The report continues:

In cases where raw sewage is being pumped out, this constitutes a positive danger to public health. I have seen evidence of extensive fly breeding in areas adjacent to soakage wells where small particles of solids are being ejected. The fly has been rightly called public enemy No. 1, when it comes to the transmission of diseases, and especially with summer approaching. Large areas of Gawler are unsuitable for septic tank systems because of the impervious nature of the soil; in some parts of the town, however, there are deep layers of porous sand, which may allow effluent to reach subterranean water supplies. The following are some specific streets or areas in Gawler, which have very poor soakage, and where in many instances the yards of houses develop into sodden, sponge-like areas unless given constant attention.

Jane Street, Willaston is a very poor soakage area. The subsoil is of limestone-clay mixture. Of the 12 houses inspected, 11 found it necessary to eject or pump their wells out, mostly three or four times a week. A number have installed varying lengths of perforated pipes, but this usually only gives temporary relief.

Lyndoch Road and East Terrace, Gawler East: Another very poor soakage area; solid rock appears just below the surface. Eight out of 10 houses were having trouble. The hospital in this area has an electric pump, operating practically full time, discharging the effluent into cultivated ground.

Gozzard Street, Gawler East: A very bad soakage area; effluent is being siphoned out from wells in a number of premises. In Coombe Street, Gawler East, extremely poor soakage area effluent being pumped on to farmlands adjoining the South Para river by means of rubber hoses placed across the street.

It can be seen that all kinds of methods are being used by the householders to try to clean up things that it is not possible to clean up. The report continues:

In Jane Street, Lyndoch Road, Gozzard Street and Coombe Street the fall of the land is to the front thus considerably decreasing the amount of land available for soakage purposes.

Duck Flat Housing Trust area, Gawler West, including Marsh Avenue, Lynch Avenue, Richards Avenue, Rice Avenue, etc.: This area has more effluent disposal problems than any other in the corporation area. This is a densely populated area and the majority of the houses have very small back yards. The wells of two out of every three houses inspected have to be pumped out at least once a week, and on many occasions a highly unpleasant odour is noticeable by just walking along the street.

Ey Grove, May Terrace, Housing Trust area, Gawler West: Similar conditions exist here; at least half the wells have to be emptied regularly.

Murray Street, Gawler: Even in the main street the problem exists, a number of shops going to great expense to provide suitable effluent disposal facilities, and only meeting with moderate success.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation and it is difficult for even the Speaker to hear what is going on. I ask members to extend courtesy to the member speaking.

Mr. CLARK: I am partly to blame, Sir, because I know that a report such as this is not of great interest to members. However, it is of interest to those in the area seeking relief from these problems. The report continues:

Other areas and streets: Some of the other areas inspected which are having many difficulties include Cowan Street, Church Hill, Hill Street, First Street and Third Street, Gawler South, and the railway station. This report mainly concerns the adverse effect on the average family living in the town. Mention has not been made of the effect on industries, but it should be added that:

(1) Timer Fashions Ltd., employing about 7 males and 180 females has been forced to install soakage wells, bore holes and perforated pipes on the banks of the South Para River to dispose of the effluent from its clothing factory.

(2) National Tyre Service has also made use of the South Para River banks in the same way.

Whilst I have been a member of the House, industries employing 15 or 20 men or women have often been inclined to come to the town of Gawler but, when they found that there was no easy way of disposing of effluent, they lost interest. That is one reason why I am anxious to see the town sewered. This would be in the interests of the health of the people, and it would attract industry.

Mr. Quirke: The same conditions apply in many country towns.

Mr. CLARK: I think the honourable member admits that the picture I am painting is gloomy.

Mr. Quirke: I could draw a more lurid one.

Mr. CLARK: Possibly I could make my picture more lurid, but I think it is lurid enough. The report concludes:

From the foregoing it may be seen that the health and comfort of the citizens of Gawler is being seriously affected by the poor soakage conditions: the situation is indeed becoming untenable. The only solution is for Gawler to be connected to the Engineering and Water Supply Department sewer mains.

That is not my conclusion but I agree with it entirely. I make the appeal (and I know that it will not fall on deaf ears) that sewerage for Gawler be provided as soon as possible and that the matter be referred to the Public Works Committee, as I know this step must be taken.

Mr. Coumbe: The committee will give it a sympathetic hearing.

Mr. CLARK: Other projects to go before the committee in which I have been interested have received a sympathetic hearing.

Mr. Ryan: You could vote for it yourself.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, and I would. I wish to refer to another district matter in which I am extremely interested. That is the transport service to the city of Elizabeth. Honourable members on both sides of the House have said that Elizabeth is now in the metropolitan area, and probably it is. Personally, I hope it is not. However, if it has become a suburb of Adelaide, most of the people in the area, including myself, want to know why it cannot be treated as other suburbs are in the provision of metropolitan travelling facilities. The people are anxious to have a bus service between Adelaide and Elizabeth. Such a service has been advocated for years, not only by myself but by responsible citizens of Elizabeth.

I am not complaining about our train service, although there was a time when I did. The present service between Adelaide and Gawler is good, and I take only some of the credit for that. I expect that all honourable members have been through Elizabeth, and the city is a credit to the Housing Trust, to local government in the area and to the many citizens who have worked hard to make it a success: I offer this praise, even though Elizabeth brings me much work.

Anyone who has visited Elizabeth must have realized that it does not lend itself to convenient travel by train. Many of the people who live there work elsewhere and much of the city is a considerable distance from the railway. Residents of about three-quarters of Elizabeth who work in Adelaide must first catch a bus to the railway station early in the morning and in many cases they have to catch another bus after arriving in Adelaide to travel to their place of

work. Similarly, after the day's work is over, they again must use three means of conveyance. This is not only a waste of money, but also a considerable waste of time.

Generally, the most desirable parts of Elizabeth are those farthest from the railway line. As a result, many people living in those parts have been forced to purchase motor vehicles, simply because the train and bus services are not convenient. Unfortunately, many who were forced to buy motor cars could not afford them, and that led, as all members will be aware, to difficulty regarding keeping up payments, and so on. I also consider that the enforced travel by car has meant the loss of much revenue to the railways, because men usually do not travel alone to the city; they prefer to bring others in their cars.

When I was in New Zealand recently, I was impressed by the efficient transport system there. The railways and the buses are operated by the Government and are a part of the Government Transport Department. When I have raised the matter of a bus service to Elizabeth previously, I have been told that the time was not ripe for it. However, I think the time is ripe for this change.

Mr. Quirke: It is a bit over-ripe!

Mr. CLARK: Yes. I am glad the member for Burra agrees with me. There is a large population in the area now, not only in Elizabeth itself. Those who travel along the Main North Road know the colossal development that is taking place on either side of that road. Many people do not realize that the development of private subdivisions in the Salisbury area has probably been as extensive as the Housing Trust development at Elizabeth. There would be many passengers for a bus service from places *en route* as well as from Elizabeth.

I consider the introduction of a bus service inevitable and, if that is so, the sooner it comes the better. I have tried to put the case before the Government for serious consideration for sewerage at Gawler and for improved transport to and from Elizabeth. I know that these are bread and butter parish pump things, but make no excuse for having raised them.

Mr. Quirke: There is no bread and butter about one of them.

Mr. CLARK: No, hardly. I now wish to refer to the opening Speech of His Excellency. I agree with and endorse everything said by other members regarding the first three paragraphs. I also record my regret at the passing of former members who died since Parliament last met and express my thanks for their

services. I wish to say a few more words about our old friend, the late Bert Thompson. I was pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak with genuine sincerity of the worth of Bert Thompson, who served in this Parliament as well as in the Commonwealth Parliament, and I support what the Leader said.

I also agree with his praise (even though it was said partly with his tongue in his cheek) of those who prepared the opening Speech. I consider it an illuminating document and I think most South Australians regard it as such. Criticism of what is going on in this State has been confined almost entirely to those gloomy Jeremiahs who cannot possibly see anything good in the work of a Labor Government and who find it impossible to be convinced. I think that is why most of them now sit on the other side and, in my humble opinion, they will stay there for a considerable time. I support, with great pleasure, the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I join with other members in expressing my sympathy to the relatives of members who have passed away, and I add my appreciation of the work they did for the people of South Australia while they were members of this Parliament. I welcome back the Premier and also the Minister in another place. I believe that it is the right and proper thing for senior Ministers of the Crown, and perhaps not only senior Ministers for that matter, to go overseas, because when they go overseas they represent South Australia, and I think it is their responsibility to do this on behalf of the people. I did hear a most disquieting rumour that one socialistic back-bench member was organizing a coup, but I am pleased to see that our Premier is still in his office.

Mr. Speaker, I took some time off in the last few days and I read some of your earlier Address in Reply speeches. I found that on one occasion you congratulated a member on the other side of the House on spreading himself rather widely and speaking on national issues rather than confining himself merely to local or parochial issues. I should like to have a little to say about one of the great controversial issues of the present time, controversial not only as between Parties but also within one Party itself. I refer to the Vietnam issue. In January or February of this year I attended a public meeting in what I think is called the Greek Orthodox Hall, and the two

principal speakers at that meeting were two senior Commonwealth Australian Labor Party members. They were there on that occasion representing the A.L.P. and, Mr. Speaker, they presented the case for the A.L.P. The part of the whole function that interested me most was the fact that the hall accommodated about 800 people and the two speakers had made sure that the centre block in the audience was completely filled with their own supporters. The noisy and vocal element was confined to the sidelines because this solid block of Australian Labor Party supporters had, by obvious pre-arrangement, got into the hall early. It was most distressing to me, as a believer in the Party system of government and administration, to find that A.L.P. members were so bitterly rent amongst themselves on the Vietnam issue.

Mr. Ryan: How about Senator Hannaford; is he in conformity?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My friend, the honourable member for Port Adelaide, draws my attention to the fact that a certain Liberal and Country League Senator has expressed divergent views, but I point out that as a member of the L.C.L. the Senator is quite entitled to do so. If he were in the A.L.P. he would be expelled or his endorsement would be withheld at the next election. What impressed me about the sort of interjection and the sort of cross-fire that took place between the two prominent Labor speakers on the platform and, I presume, Democratic Labor Party supporters on the sidelines, was the rather poor taste of some of the interjections. I do not object at all if members of the A.L.P. are professed atheists, but I do take exception to the sort of statements those two Commonwealth members made. The sort of thing to which I objected was the remark "Mr. Posa and his 13 supporters". I believe that is very offensive.

Mr. Ryan: Is this anything to do with the Address in Reply?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. I am disappointed that A.L.P. speakers adopted that particular line. I was distressed, too, to see in the newspaper a day or two later that one of these Labor speakers some years earlier in his career had been barred from going to Woomera on the ground that he was a security risk, and he was so barred from Woomera, Mr. Speaker, during the time of a Commonwealth Labor Administration.

Another most interesting public meeting was held in the Australia Hall rather later this year. I refer to the meeting in the Australia Hall, which was held in the Australia Hall, and I refer to Mrs. Langley. This will be a Beauty. I refer to Mrs. Langley. This will be a Beauty. I refer to Mrs. Langley. This will be a Beauty.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is. The member for Unley got a mention in the press, I think the following day. I should like to read part of a newspaper article describing this particular meeting. The article states:

Hundreds of wildly jeering hecklers, shouting, chanting and stamping their feet, gave the Leader of the Federal Opposition (Mr. Calwell) a rough passage during his 50-minute speech at a protest meeting against conscription in the Australia Hall, Angas Street, last night. At times they seemed on the verge of erupting to a point at which the meeting would have to be closed.

Mr. McKee: Do you agree with the conscription of voteless boys?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It goes on:

Cheers from Mr. Calwell's supporters added to the din. In contrast, the Deputy Leader (Mr. Whitlam) and Senator Bishop were given an attentive hearing. A dozen uniformed police and additional plainclothes men helped to keep order among the capacity crowd inside the hall and another 1,000 listening to a relay of the meeting in Moore Street.

It was rather interesting that the police radio system became confused with the amplifying system, and instead of hearing the speakers inside the hall the crowd outside were listening to police messages.

Mr. Langley: Not all the time. I was outside.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand that at that time there was some division between the Commonwealth Leader of the Labor Party and his Deputy, and to fill in time between the departure of the Leader and the arrival of the Deputy a South Australian Senator filled the breach. However, the people outside in the crowd did not realize he was a South Australian Senator, and they kept calling "Bring on a South Australian". Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Leader did arrive in due course; the Leader still had not departed, and there was the almost unprecedented incident, I understand, of the Leader and the Deputy Leader shaking hands in public. The article goes on:

Half an hour before the meeting began the hall was about one-third full. Then a side door was rushed by the anti-Calwell brigade—the article does not say whether they were Whitlam supporters or whether they were L.C.L. supporters—

there was a scuffle and they burst into the hall. . . . The chairman of the meeting (Mr. Hurst, M.P.) said at the start, "I can control the meeting, and I do intend to do this this evening."

And, Mr. Speaker, the crowd cried out "Hallelujah". I have almost finished my comments on this Vietnam issue. The last point,

which will greatly interest this House, concerns an article from the *Sydney Morning Herald* dated March 31. It is of special interest to the honourable member for Glenelg, and I recommend that he listen to it with some care. It states:

Student supporters of the Vietnam war yesterday broke up a meeting at Sydney university held to launch a fund to supply medical aid to the North Vietnamese. However, \$10 was collected for the fund amid jeers and cries of "Communist" and "Traitors", mainly from members of the Sydney University Regiment and engineering students. During the meeting, which was attended by about 350 people, students threw apple cores, banana peels and oranges as student fund organizers tried to speak.

Mr. Speaker, here is the sting of the article:

The fund has been organized by the university Australian Labor Party and Socialist Clubs which have a combined membership of about 150.

Here is a branch of the Australian Labor Party not refusing to aid the Australian cause in Vietnam but openly helping the cause of the enemy. I believe one member of this House gained his political understanding in the University of Sydney Australian Labor Party Club.

I was interested to notice in the Treasurer's explanation of the Supplementary Estimates that he commented on the lower earnings of the Railways Department in this financial year. I quote an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* in March last year, when the Premier forecast a bright future for the Railways Department. The article stated:

The State Government was planning to attract more passengers and freight to the Railways. The Premier was opening the biennial conference of the South Australian Division of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen at the Trades Hall. Mr. Walsh said not enough was being done at present to go out and get business for the railways. Freight movement on the railways has been static at almost 4,500,000 tons for almost ten years, and surely we could exceed this in our expanding State. The Premier said the railways must also go out after passengers, and that he believed that people could be induced to travel by rail (and I agree with that). The Government intended that the railways should earn at least another \$2,000,000 a year. The Premier said that the State Government turned down a proposal for a silo at Appila because it was nowhere near a railway system. No doubt the member for Rocky River will expand on this theme later in the debate. Paragraph 100 of the report of the Paine Transport Commission of 1951 states:

The Reed Commission in 1938 trenchantly rejected the suggestion that the railway system was outmoded and due for closing down.

Experience since then, including a period when war conditions strained every system of transport, has shown that the position in that respect is unchanged. The need remains, however, and grows more urgent with the passage of time, to make the railway services more efficient and more attractive. Not only is that an obligation attaching to any public service, but where competition has to be met, efficiency and the practical display of a desire to give good service are effective weapons to combat that competition.

Last year I drew the Premier's attention to the poor rail service existing on the Adelaide-Freeling-Kapunda-Endunda line.

Mr. Burdon: How many years did your Government have to fix up these things?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am trying to make a constructive contribution to this debate, and give advice which could be followed by the Railways Department. At least two members of this House depend for their Party preselection to this Parliament on the goodwill of the railwaymen's unions. An old-type Barwell car leaves Eudunda at 6.23 every morning and takes more than two hours to get to Adelaide. For the return journey it leaves at 5.21 p.m. and reaches Eudunda more than two hours later. It has no air-conditioning and no comforts. The patronage is small, but that is understandable. The Minister of Transport told me that the Chief Mechanical Engineer is working on a design for an improved car for this run, similar to the type 400 now on suburban runs but with facilities making it more suitable for country runs. The particular facility which it does not possess at present and which it should have is air conditioning. To put the blame where it belongs, I do not think the fault lies with the Government or with the Chief Mechanical Engineer. It lies with the leaders of the railwaymen's unions, because they should be making a constructive approach to these problems. I quote from a letter published in the *Advertiser* on April 11, signed by a gentleman who endorses himself as the South Australia Divisional Manager, Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen. It is evident that the railwaymen's unions are not thinking broadly and are not forward looking, and I blame them in part for our declining railway services. The letter states:

Postal and other workers who take direct action in the fight to preserve their pay or conditions or improve existing ones are condemned for the inconvenience they cause other people, and are urged to go back to the conference table instead (and this was the time of the postal strike). It is because of failure at the conference table that direct action is

used, and the workers can see no other alternative which will bring results. Automation which now has a very wide meaning, poses one of the biggest threats to the well-being, in the first place of the workers, and in the second place to industry itself. The fact that postal workers, a normally very reliable part of the work force, were prepared to enter into what might have been a long and bitter struggle over this issue, should cause concern because it is a foretaste of what to expect when the labor force in Australia is made to suffer from what should be a benefit to everybody. The workers are not resisting automation, they welcome it, but they rebel against automation being used as a means of taking away their livelihood and creating low-wage conditions.

Here, we find a trade union leader dragging the red herring of automation across the trail, instead of doing something constructive within his own union to promote the interests of the railways and to improve its services to the general public. If the trade union leaders (and I stress leaders and not unionists themselves) were to do something about improving the railways service, the \$2,000,000 deficit which the Premier thinks can be made up could, in fact, be made up.

Mr. Clark: How could the leaders improve the service?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: They could start by improving the facilities in respect of the new-type 400 cars that are to be used on country runs, including the Kapunda-Eudunda run. If they do not do something about improving rail facilities, the leaders will find that some future Government (perhaps the Government that comes into power after the next election) will provide efficient road services that will result in less revenue for the railways. Having exhausted that argument—

Mr. Jennings: You've exhausted us, too.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I should like to turn to another controversial issue—at least controversial within the Australian Labor Party, and not controversial within the Liberal and Country League. It is an issue on which at least one member opposite thought he saw the opportunity to stick a knife into his Commonwealth Leader—State aid. Some weeks ago an interesting programme was organized at the University of Adelaide called the "Teach In", at which Senator Gorton was one of the principal speakers representing the Commonwealth Government. He, of course, is the Minister administering the Commonwealth's activities in education.

Mr. Jennings: I think you should quote Senator Hannaford.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: One of the prominent Labor speakers was Mr. Bryant, a Commonwealth member from Victoria who, I understand, is Chairman of the Victoria State High School Advisory Council and also the Secretary of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Labor Party Committee on Education.

Mr. Clark: He was a high school teacher, previously.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I believe so. I had the pleasure of meeting this gentleman when I was in Canberra two or three years ago at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. I ask members to listen to what he said on this matter:

An interesting crisis has developed in Australian education—it is what I would call the gimmickry of State aid. For instance, in this city St. Peter's College has received £16,000.

He is referring to grants received from the Commonwealth Government, and continues:

It is a noticeable place for battlers I should think.

I believe at least one Socialist member opposite however much he may believe in equality of opportunity, is sending his sons to St. Peter's College. The extract continues:

The fees are £78 or thereabouts per term. The question I want to know is this. Why should the people who conduct that establishment receive on terms different from public servants public money to spend? I believe that the essence of this contract is that public funds should be publicly accountable for. This is the reason we chopped off Charles I's head, and I believe we have stepped into this field on a very slippery path. Unless we take a close look at it and examine all the ramifications and implications of it, and everybody involved in it takes a very careful look at it, we will step on a path that may bring both systems to ruin.

I listened with great interest to what the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) had to say in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply last week, and sought by interjection to lead his thoughts on to road and railway co-ordination. However, *Hansard* did not catch the interjection, or the comments made by the Minister of Lands following my interjection. I should like to read part of the commentary on a meeting held in my district about six months ago, written by one of the executive members of the Saddleworth Sub-Branch of the Australian Labor Party, and appearing in the *Gilbert Valley News*. The gentleman concerned was reluctant to submit any details of the meeting to the newspaper; indeed, I know that one of the directors of the newspaper had to apply some pressure on the executive to have him render a report of the meeting. The

gentleman was a farmer; I do not know why he should belong to the A.L.P., but he was obviously embarrassed by the information given to the meeting by the Minister of Lands. The article states:

The Lands Minister at the Saddleworth transport meeting. The Saddleworth branch of the A.L.P. held their meeting and Christmas social in the Saddleworth Institute recently. After a discussion lasting over several months with the Kapunda sub-branch it was decided to form a district committee for the electorate of Light.

I am pleased that the A.L.P. has seen fit to form a sub-branch in my district, and shall be pleased to address it at any time it cares to have me. The article continues:

After a short meeting the Minister of Lands (Mr. Corcoran) outlined the Transport Control Bill to a public gathering and stated there had been a great misconception of the Bill. He said that the idea behind it was to seek more long-term hauls for the railways. He also said that controlled routes around Adelaide would be a problem and that the first 50 miles of these routes would be free. Primary producers carrying their produce on vehicles would in certain cases be liable to pay a tax. He further stated that permits would be freely available. How dramatic and prophetic are those remarks! The article continues in a much more interesting strain:

The Minister of Transport would shortly release a list of controlled routes and the routes for tax on various commodities.

This was all before the relevant legislation had been considered by Parliament. What the Minister said when speaking to the Road and Railway Transport Bill in the House last year does not tally with the newspaper report of what he said at the Saddleworth meeting. At page 3278 of *Hansard* the Minister said:

I for one would not be a party to, and I do not have to ask my colleagues if they would be a party to, any preferential treatment for any member of the Parliament whatever his district. I assure the Leader that it is not the Minister's intention in this case to exempt any district in this State from this charge.

Later, he changes his tune somewhat. Obviously, the Minister of Lands did not know much about the Bill. He says:

The Minister is responsible to this place for the operation of the legislation. If he makes a decision which (as the Leader of the Opposition has suggested) is crook or could be crook, he would be held up to ridicule in this Parliament. Then he continues with this gem, after saying a few minutes previously that the Minister would not exempt any district:

It is possible to go anywhere on Eyre Peninsula without paying road tax, and it is possible to travel the length and breadth of Yorke Peninsula.

I shall say little more about road tax, except that I am pleased to have Ministers of the Crown visit my district; but, if they give wrong information, I take strong exception to it. The member for Chaffey, who is still not back in the Chamber, was the only Government member who had the courage to attend a public protest meeting. He addressed a public meeting at Berri and went to take his place on the platform along with my colleague the Hon. Ross Story, also a member for the district. The member for Chaffey said, "If the member for Midland, Mr. Story, stays here and speaks, I will not speak. I will play cricket but I want to be the only man to use the bat. If a Liberal member of Parliament speaks, I will not speak." In deference to the member for Chaffey and to make sure that the public meeting had the exposition of the Bill that the honourable member was able to make, my colleague Mr. Story generously yielded and agreed to take his seat in the body of the hall.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: But he is not the member for that area.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: But he lives nearby.

Mr. Clark: He had a couple of tries to become a member, but was rejected.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Somebody asked the member for Chaffey straight out by way of question at the end of the meeting whether he would vote for the Bill or not. The honourable member said, "I have been elected on the Party ticket and I must vote the Party way." I think it is the biggest mistake the honourable member has ever made in his political career. I also heard that he was the third person to speak on that platform that evening and, when he got up to speak, he said he felt as though he was attending a dinner, that they had had the soup course and the entrée, and that he was now the main course. From reports I have heard, I think the meeting would have liked to make him the barbecue, not the main course. When the honourable member was speaking in the debate last week, he threw out a challenge to me. On page 70 of *Hansard* he made a remarkable statement, to which he did not give much forethought. He said:

The present Commonwealth Government lacks the vision of the Chifley Government which, with great foresight, set up the Snowy Mountains Authority . . . The Chifley Government started this scheme, and I challenge the member for Light on that statement. The opening ceremony, when the first sod was turned, was boycotted by every Liberal member of the then Commonwealth Parliament, with one exception. No doubt this scheme began operating when the member for Light was still in short pants.

I am happy to accept the honourable member's challenge, even though I may have been in short pants.

Mr. Jennings: You should still be!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was pleased to note the reference in His Excellency's Speech to the slight economic recession that has taken place in South Australia.

Mr. Clark: Did you answer that challenge?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am coming to it. The member for Gawler is too premature. Members on this side of the House are well aware, although members opposite may not be, of the severity of the drought in New South Wales and Queensland, which is no doubt one of the primary causes of this present recession. I believe that northern New South Wales and Queensland is having the driest season ever known. It is an enormous area. The Darling

River basin extends from Charleville in Queensland to Wentworth in New South Wales. To give members an idea of the productivity of this area, let me say that it carries about one-third of Australia's sheep population and grows 28 per cent of Australia's wheat crop. It is easily understandable why the severe drought in New South Wales and Queensland is having such a marked effect on employment.

Returning now to the member for Chaffey, I took the trouble to look up a speech made by Mr. Fairbairn (Commonwealth Minister for National Development) to find out what he had to say about the Commonwealth Government's contribution to financing water schemes and water conservation.

Mr. Burdon: When did he discuss it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On March 23, when he said in the Commonwealth Parliament:

The River Murray Commission is one way in which we have helped them. We bear a quarter share of the cost of storage on the River Murray. Not only have we done that, but with the last dam that is being built on the River Murray, the Chowilla dam, we loaned money to New South Wales because it said it was unable to find its share. We made available an amount of \$9 million to ensure that work on this enormous dam of five million acre feet proceeded. We also acted in this way to enable New South Wales to proceed with the construction of the Blowering dam. We arranged for a loan of \$21 million so that the Blowering dam could proceed on time and be able to store much needed water for the Murrumbidgee River.

Reference was made to the then Prime Minister (Mr. Chifley) turning the first sod in the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Scheme, but what the member for Chaffey did not say was that the Labor Prime Minister just before he went to the

polls and was defeated was in such a hurry to get his name written on a plaque somewhere that he was determined to start the scheme even though the engineering survey of the area had not been done. So he turned the first sod and, after the scheme—

Mr. BURDON: I think the honourable member is being very uncharitable.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not being uncharitable. When the dam was finally built, this sod was $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles upstream and well under water. We could consider the record of the Australian Labor Party in water conservation and just how little it was able to do in 20 years in office in New South Wales. In that time, New South Wales was able to build only one dam, the Keepit dam. It made a start on the Menindee Lakes scheme, but I believe that two of the dams burst.

Mr. Hudson: That is completely untrue.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Glenelg will have plenty of opportunity to speak later. Labor members would much prefer to waste money on an opera house than to go ahead with a water reticulation scheme.

Mr. Hudson: What about the Warrangambie dam?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The New South Wales Labor Party spent \$600,000 digging a hole in Chalmers Street, Sydney to start an underground railway; some time later it spent \$1,200,000 to fill up the hole. I believe the eastern suburbs railways system is still incomplete. So far the New South Wales Labor Government has spent \$4,000,000 on that, and its only economic worth at present is for growing mushrooms.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without referring to my erstwhile Liberal colleague, the member for Frome (Mr. Casey). At page 136 of "The South Australian Elections, 1959" by R. Hetherington and R. L. Reid appears a most interesting reference to the Liberal and Country League background of the member for Frome.

Mr. Hudson: You are a sweet little boy, aren't you?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, I am only sorry that the member for Glenelg was not in the State at the time to which I am referring; I believe he has been in South Australia only a couple of years. The article states:

It is probably this concern with choosing the right candidate that saved the seat of Frome for the A.L.P. in the by-election. The executive—

I stress the word "executive", which is a group of people in Trades Hall—

passed over candidates with long service in the A.L.P. and endorsed a candidate who had not been active in the Party and who had, for business reasons, been paying a yearly subscription to the L.C.L. But he lived in the district as has his father before him, he was a farmer yet had lived in the main town of Peterborough for many years. Despite opposition within the Party, the executive—

no mention is made of Labor Party members in Frome—

persisted in its choice. It may be that, in its attempts to woo the electors, the A.L.P. will finish up with a Parliamentary Party to the right of the Party machine that put it there.

I suggest that the member for Frome will become so right wing before long that he will cross the floor and rejoin his colleagues in the Liberal and Country Party. A distinguished and famous precedent exists for this. We all remember that the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Winston Churchill, changed parties a couple of times. In 1924 he left the Liberal Party to return to the Conservatives. He is on record as saying, "Anyone can rat, but it takes a certain amount of ingenuity to re-rat". I shall be pleased to welcome the member for Frome when he takes his place in the Liberal and Country League team, as he will certainly do after the next election.

Mr. BURDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 29, at 2 p.m.