

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 29, 1966.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation (No. 1),
Supply (No. 1).

QUESTIONS**PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS.**

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At present the only two items on the Notice Paper are the continuation of the Address in Reply debate and the formal notice regarding supply. I know that Bills cannot be introduced until the Address in Reply debate has concluded, but if Ministers could give notice of the Bills they desire to be considered early in the session it would facilitate the work of the House and enable members of the Opposition to do preliminary work on the topics coming up for consideration. Will the Premier ask Ministers to give early notice of such Bills?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I agree that it is desirable to have available as much information as possible, but I am unable to answer the question this afternoon because the Attorney-General has been sick, and much of this legislation is under his control. Unfortunately, I could not communicate with him on Monday because of his sickness, but I hope I shall be able to give more definite information about this matter early next week. I understand that the Attorney-General is still sick. Also, I have received a message today that the wife of the Chairman of Committees was taken to hospital this morning with appendicitis. An emergency operation has been performed and she is now out of danger, but that is why Mr. Lawn is absent this afternoon.

TEA TREE GULLY WATER SUPPLY.

Mrs. BYRNE: A resident of Erica Street, Tea Tree Gully, has brought to my notice that the pressure of the water supply in that area (and this is since June 13) has been poor and, at peak periods, practically non-existent. Will the Minister of Works ascertain the reason for this lack of pressure, and can he say whether it is temporary only?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Often we receive a complaint from a resident in an

area and find that the pressure is restricted to that one residence. I assure the honourable member that if she gives me the name of this person the case will be considered without prejudice to that person and, if it is a general complaint, the matter will be investigated to see whether it can be remedied immediately.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture the report that he promised me yesterday concerning whether the increase of the levy of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities to 91c would be sufficient to cover export losses?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The success of C.E.M.A. so far has led to some expansion in egg production. Estimates for the year ahead indicate a surplus of 22,750,000 dozen, an increase of almost 7,000,000 dozen or 44.07 per cent. In the face of this, C.E.M.A. had no alternative but to recommend to the Minister for Primary Industry that the commencing rate of hen levy from July 1, 1966, be 3.5c a fortnight. If maintained throughout the whole year, this will total 91c a bird, but the rate of levy will be kept constantly under review and, if circumstances warrant the action, the fortnightly rate can be varied.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I heard on the A.B.C. radio news this morning a statement to the effect that the Secretary of the New South Wales Egg Board had been seconded to C.E.M.A. for 12 months. As C.E.M.A. is an organization established primarily for the equalization of export losses (and not an organization in connection with local marketing, as such) will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain why this officer has been seconded to C.E.M.A.?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be happy to obtain that information.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understand that the purpose of the hen levy (as the Minister calls it) is to offset losses from the sale of eggs on the export market. Recently the levy has been increased by about 30 per cent. I believe that the theory behind the scheme is for the levy to be progressively increased should it be necessary to offset export losses caused by greater production. A limit of \$1 a bird is provided by the legislation at present. As the levy has almost reached that limit and as further heavy increases in the production of eggs are possible during the next 12 months, can the Minister of Agriculture forecast the effect on the plan if this limit

is retained? Will an approach be made to alter the legislation to raise the limit still further?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: True, there is a limit of \$1 on the sum that can be charged. If the present levy of 3.5c a fortnight a hen is continued, it is expected to reach 91c (although that is not certain), and it will be examined from time to time by C.E.M.A. Any suggestion of alteration will have to come from C.E.M.A. and will have to run the gamut of the Commonwealth Parliament before being allowed. Any suggestion I could make on what might happen would be hypothetical, and we will just have to wait and see. As I intend to raise it, I am sure the matter will be discussed at the Agricultural Council meeting to be held in Perth in a fortnight. After the meeting we may have further thoughts on the subject.

SEPTIC TANKS.

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently, I have had many complaints from residents of Valley View, on the northern perimeter of my district, about septic tanks flooding. These are more prevalent when the ground becomes waterlogged. As these people are naturally interested in knowing when they are likely to have the sewerage connected to this locality, will the Minister of Works obtain a comprehensive report from his department?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member has correctly said that people become concerned at this time of the year when the ground is waterlogged but, strangely enough, we often find that when a service is supplied, particularly in some country areas, residents are reluctant to have a connection made because it is so costly. Nevertheless, I shall investigate the matter raised by the honourable member and furnish a report as soon as it is to hand.

SOFTWOOD FORESTS.

Mr. SHANNON: I have received complaints from some of my constituents in the hills concerning certain steep areas which are unsuitable for subdivision but which would be ideally suited to growing softwood timber, and which are now excluded for primary industry purposes under the Land Tax Act. Such areas suffer by virtue of increased taxation, with the result that many of the areas are not now planted. As I understand the Woods and Forests Department wholeheartedly favours such a scheme because it helps to preserve our beautiful hills and to provide income from land that is otherwise almost useless, will the Premier ascertain whether or not the complaints are justified, and whether planting can be encouraged?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take up the matter with the Woods and Forests Department, as I entirely agree that planting timber in the hills would be beneficial.

POINT PEARCE.

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Premier ascertain how many Government houses are rented by Aboriginal residents at the Point Pearce Mission Station and, if any are, the amount of unpaid rents?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take up that matter and, unless the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is able to give the reply, bring down a report as soon as possible.

CHOWILLA RAILWAY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: As the Minister of Works is aware, a railway is to be constructed from somewhere near Renmark to the Chowilla dam. As I shall be visiting my district over the weekend and expect to be inundated with questions about the matter, can the Minister say when construction of the railway is likely to be commenced?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am grateful to the honourable member for that question. Yesterday I supplied him with a map (of which he had a copy taken), but I omitted to tell him that it was only a preliminary drawing and subject to survey. That survey is at present in progress, and the laying of the line will commence as soon as it is practicable. Certain physical work will have to be undertaken in order to provide the necessary service for the construction of the dam. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that specifications for the construction of the dam will be in the hands of all registered tenderers by September 30 this year, and it is expected that tenders will close in January, 1967. However, it will be about 12 months after letting the contract before any substantial works are commenced, because much preliminary work still has to be carried out in preparation for major works.

LARGS NORTH SEWERAGE.

Mr. HURST: I communicated with the Minister of Works in April in regard to a sewerage extension in the Largs North area. The connection fee has been paid by 19 residents. Can the Minister say when work is likely to be commenced?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This work is expected to start in September. Residents often pay the connection fee in the hope that they will get the service more quickly. However, it is unnecessary for them to pay the fee in advance, as the fee is not called for until the connection has been made.

ELECTRICITY FOR IRRIGATION.

Mr. McANANEY: People who use electricity extensively during the summer months for irrigation probably pay for it at a reduced rate because of the long hours of pumping. They are sometimes at a disadvantage, however, at the beginning and the end of winter when they have to pump for a week or a fortnight, and when they pump for domestic supplies, and electricity charges are then higher. These people pump mostly during the summer months when there is little demand on electricity supplies, whereas during the winter, when there is a greater general demand, they make little demand on supplies. As I understand a reduced charge is provided for industries using large quantities of electricity irregularly, will the Premier ask the trust to consider this fact and grant some concession to people using electricity for irrigation purposes?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In most cases the activities of the Electricity Trust are the concern of the Minister of Works. However, as the question has been put to me, I will obtain a report from the trust to see what can be done about the matter.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. COUMBE: About a year ago it was announced that negotiations would be conducted between this Government and the Commonwealth Government, towards the standardization of gauge, to construct a spur line from Port Augusta to Whyalla, with consequent benefit to the State. Can the Premier say what progress has been made on these negotiations?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I do not know what is the position, I will see whether a report can be furnished.

SWAN REACH TO STOCKWELL MAIN.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The Minister of Works recently informed me that the Swan Reach to Stockwell main (which was recommended by the Public Works Committee, the report of which was tabled last week) would be proceeded with as a matter of urgency, and that money would be provided in this year's Loan Estimates to enable the work to be commenced and proceeded with during the coming financial year. The committee's report states that a pumping station, store building, garage and three residences will be erected. The cost of building at No. 1 pumping station a store and garage is estimated at \$20,000 and of the three residences at \$40,000. The brickworks closest to the pumping station is situated

at Nuriootpa, in my district. That works, which has been established for over a century, is manufacturing an excellent type of brick that is in great demand. Will the Minister say whether, in the construction of the buildings to which I have referred and which I assume will be of solid construction, the use of locally produced bricks will be considered?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I cannot give any real assurance at this stage, it has always been the practice of the department to use the most economical material and it always does its best to use local materials. I shall have inquiries made and inform the honourable member of the department's intentions.

NARACOORTE ELECTRICITY.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked yesterday about the reticulation of electricity in the Naracoorte district?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust states that the transmission line from Keith to Naracoorte and the substation at Naracoorte have been completed. A limited supply of power is being provided to the Naracoorte corporation to supplement its own generating plant when required. A full supply will be provided by the trust, which will take over the local undertaking from the Naracoorte corporation when substation extensions at Keith have been completed. These extensions are progressing satisfactorily following some delays in delivery of equipment from the United Kingdom. Work is expected to be completed by October 1, 1966.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister did not refer to the projected reticulation of the rural areas of the Naracoorte district. As work is expected to be completed by October 1 to hook up with the Naracoorte undertaking, will the Minister ask the trust whether it intends to proceed with the erection of powerlines in the district before that date?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to obtain a report. However, I think that the trust is obviously anxious to sell electricity as soon as possible and that it will therefore prepare for early sales.

WHARFAGE CHARGES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It has been reported to me that the Minister of Marine is so popular in Portland, Victoria, that he may even be given the freedom of the city because the new wharfage charges imposed in South Australia have diverted a large volume of produce from South Australia to that port,

where there are no wharfage charges on outward cargoes. As a result, a new woolshed is to be constructed there to handle wool that previously came to Adelaide. Will the Minister say whether this matter will be examined to see what effect the very big increases in wharfage charges last year have had on the trade pattern of the South-East, whether there has been a diversion of trade from this State, and whether further trade is likely to be diverted to Victoria because of the high outward wharfage charges in South Australia, whereas there are no such charges in Victoria?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I presume that the Leader is asking me to do something that he himself, powerful as he was in the past, was unable to do, namely, to permit outward wharfage for no charge at all. I know the mild suggestion contained in the Leader's question. Strangely, the charges were agreed to by both Houses of this Parliament, and I would think that nothing would be done by this Parliament that was considered unreasonable. I will have an inquiry made along the lines suggested by the Leader, but I assure him that I could never recommend that outward wharfage be free.

TEA TREE GULLY FIRE STATION.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, a reply to a question I asked last week regarding the establishment of a fire station in the north-eastern suburbs?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague, the Chief Secretary, reports:

The board's architects are currently engaged in drawing up plans and specifications for a permanently manned station at Grand Junction Road, Northfield. Another station will be built within the next 12 months at the northern end of Glynburn Road, Glynde. Stations already exist at Penfield, Elizabeth and Gawler. Blocks of land are being purchased at strategic points for fire stations when required in developing districts situated near the metropolitan area. The Emergency Fire Service has established many active brigades around the perimeter of the metropolitan area. Altogether, we feel that the area referred to is well protected. Meantime, the whole position is being closely watched.

KEITH SUBSTATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In replying earlier this afternoon to the honourable member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), the Minister of Works indicated that there was a delay in the connection of electricity to Naracoorte because of the incomplete nature of the substation at Keith.

Will the Minister of Works ascertain the expected date of completion of the substation, whether in fact it is because this substation has not been completed that the Padthaway-Keppoch irrigation area is still waiting to be connected, and whether this area will be connected prior to October when it is intended to connect Naracoorte? As the Minister would be aware, the irrigation period will start prior to October, and those people are now ready for connection to electricity in anticipation of irrigating this season with electric power.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member's question touches on a number of aspects and I am sure he would not expect me to have a reply for him offhand. I will call for a report and let the honourable member have it when it is to hand.

EYRE PENINSULA ELECTRICITY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Can the Minister of Works obtain information for me on progress of the erection of power lines from Whyalla to Port Lincoln *via* the Cleve-Rudall area, where there is to be a substation? Can he also ascertain whether it is intended to continue with the erection of a spur line to Lock to serve the pumping station at Polda and, much later, to pump water to Kimba?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not know whether the honourable member is asking for delayed action, but I will try to avoid that. I shall obtain a report for him as early as possible.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PAYMENTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It has been reported to me that the Government has made certain *ex gratia* payments to officers of the Education Department to enable a reimbursement to be made of certain tax levied on those officers by the Commonwealth Income Tax Department. During my association with the Treasury I received many instructions from the Crown Solicitor's Department that no *ex gratia* payment could be paid unless it was first approved by a specific vote of Parliament. Can the Minister of Education say whether it is true that *ex gratia* payments have been or are to be made to officers of the Education Department and, if this is so, whether those payments will appear on any Estimates submitted to Parliament?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Leader is referring, I presume, to some payments that were made because, owing to an unavoidable delay in the accounting section, certain rises in

salary came into another taxation year and consequently would have increased the taxation on those officers in that year. Any payments made have been adjustments so that those officers should not suffer an injustice as a result of the higher income being received in that taxation year. The Taxation Department refused to make any adjustment to correct this matter. I am prepared to bring down a full report so that the Leader may see what has taken place.

SEAT BELTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last night when I spoke in the Address in Reply debate the Premier was not in the House and therefore I should like to express again my congratulations and appreciation to him on the announcement he made last Monday regarding seat belts. This I very much appreciated, especially coming from one who I thought at one time had doubts about this (and full marks to him for his action, if I may say so). I see in today's newspaper some comments from the Royal Automobile Association and from the Automotive Chamber of Commerce, both of which bodies have in the past opposed the compulsory installation of seat belts and both of which now apparently suggest that there should be a delay in making the proclamation to bring the provision into effect from January 1, 1967. Can the Premier give an assurance that there will not be any delay in this and that that will be the date on which this legislation will come into effect?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not intend to canvass one phase of this question in any circumstances, and I am sorry that it was raised. If the industry itself was not able to do what I have suggested should be done, I would be duty bound to hear any necessary deputation. It is not my intention to halt this matter, but I hasten to assure the honourable member that I still have to do some coverage if the industry itself is not in that position. As new cars made in this State already have the necessary anchorages, I cannot see that it is going to make any difference. I do not want to be the authority to specify which manufacturers are to supply belts or what type of belt should be installed, for I believe that that again is a matter entirely for the industry and not for me.

PORT ADELAIDE WATERFRONT.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A report in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

Yesterday the employment situation on the Port Adelaide waterfront was at its worst

for many years. Yesterday there were 850 watersiders out of work on the Port River, and there is no immediate relief in sight.

Although I realize that many causes for this lean time may be out of the control of the Government, can the Minister of Marine say whether the Government is aware of this situation, and, if it is, what are its immediate remedial plans?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Government is aware of the position on the Port Adelaide wharves. However, it dare not interfere with the functions of the United Kingdom Government, although the shortage of work on our wharves is obviously caused by the seamen's strike in the United Kingdom. I understand that that Government is doing its utmost to get the men back to work. We are concerned because valuable equipment needed for the Torrens Island power station is on United Kingdom wharves awaiting trans-shipment to South Australia, but has been delayed. This situation is something over which the South Australian Government has no control.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. RYAN: Often in recent weeks, especially near the end of the financial year, I have read press reports of an expected decline in Government building because of the lack of finance. Can the Minister of Works say whether there has been any decline in expenditure on Government building and, if there has been, whether the Government is taking the necessary steps to remedy the situation?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assume that the honourable member is referring in some way to an article that appeared in last week's *Sunday Mail*. I cannot appreciate what the people whose statements were quoted in the article really desire. I had heavy pressure brought on me by two persons, who were quoted and who are secretaries of building trade organizations, to accept a contract where the price was considerably higher than the one we had accepted. If we had bowed to their pressure less money would have been spent on public buildings in this State. Now, they accuse the Government of not doing what we should do about Government buildings. The Public Buildings Department has carried out the best possible programme with the finances available. The value of work now in progress under the jurisdiction of the Public Buildings Department for hospital buildings is \$19,000,000; for school buildings, \$15,500,000; for police and courthouse buildings \$1,250,000; and other Government buildings, \$12,000,000,

making a total of \$47,750,000. The programme for 1965-66 was valued at about \$22,000,000 and the department expects that a similar amount will be available for the next financial year. I commend the Director and staff of this department because they are planning to get the best possible value out of every cent made available, by drawing up a 5-year plan of expected work, so that when one job finishes another may be started by using all available funds. I cannot see how any improvement to this programme can be made.

BRUCE BOXES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday, by way of interjection the Minister of Agriculture indicated that information I had about Bruce boxes was probably incorrect. Can the Minister say whether the Woods and Forests Department was consulted before a report favouring the use of Bruce boxes was made, effecting the transfer of a large volume of work at present enjoyed by the department in providing dump cases for the fruit industry, as timber is to be imported from, I believe, the Philippines? Also, will the department have any difficulty in supplying dump cases required by the fruit industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall obtain a full report for the Leader.

PARA VISTA SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: On March 1 this year the Minister of Education informed me that planning was proceeding for a new infants and primary school at Para Vista. Can he say what progress has been made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A report from the Director of the Public Buildings Department states that detailed documents are expected to be completed next month to enable tenders to be called. At present, it is not possible to say when tenders will be called, but I shall inform the honourable member as soon as I can.

TORRENS RIVER COMMITTEE.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works obtain a progress report on the committee to be set up to investigate the future of the Torrens River, and ascertain what its future activities will be, and when it is likely to bring in a recommendation?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall call for a report and inform the honourable member when it is available.

KALANGADOO LEVEL CROSSING.

Mr. RODDA: Last year I asked a question about the Kalangadoo level crossing

at which a fatal accident had occurred. The Penola District Council is expressing concern that no action has been taken to provide flashing lights at this crossing. As it is a dangerous crossing, will the Minister of Lands confer with the Minister of Roads to see what action is being or will be taken to have flashing lights installed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report as soon as possible.

FAUNA AND FLORA RESERVES.

Mr. FERGUSON: As it is some time now since negotiations commenced between the Waratah Gypsum Company and the Lands Department for resumption of part of the company's lease for a fauna and flora reserve on Southern Yorke Peninsula, can the Minister of Lands say what stage those negotiations have reached?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The negotiations have been completed but a survey of the area has yet to be undertaken which, I think, will eventually result in 12,000 or 13,000 acres being dedicated as a wild life reserve. My officers and I (as well as local residents and South Australians generally) are grateful for the co-operation in this matter on the part of the Innes brothers of the company. I imagine that five or six months will elapse before the final dedication of the reserve takes place.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Opposition strongly supports the policy of making available adequate wild life reserves. Can the Minister of Lands say what action will be taken to fence these reserves? I point out that, without fencing, the areas now proclaimed as reserves become unpopular with surrounding settlers and, of course, do not provide much protection for wild life.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is the policy of the Commissioners of Wild Life Reserves eventually to fence and fire-break all reserves in this State. The Leader will realize that that is costly, because of the large areas that have been set aside for the purpose in the future. It will be a continuing programme; money has been allocated each year for this programme and, although progress is not as good as one might wish, I think 100 miles of fencing of reserves in this State has been completed (although I stand to be corrected on that figure). As I have said, it is intended to plough a fire-break one chain in width within the bounds of the reserve itself. The reserve yet to be dedicated will be given priority in relation to the other

reserves throughout the State, and will eventually be fenced. I think the Leader would agree with me that if we waited for finance to become available to fence reserves as soon as they were dedicated, we might find ourselves with nothing left in the State to reserve.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH MAIN.

Mr. NANKIVELL: His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech referred to further works on the Tailem Bend to Keith main, but as I have heard reports that the work may be curtailed on this project, will the Minister of Works report tomorrow, if possible, on what work is expected to be undertaken on this project in the next financial year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I cannot give a detailed reply at this stage, I think that construction work on the tanks will be continued. The honourable member may recall that when I met the Central Water Scheme Committee (of which he is a member) about 12 months ago, I said that I thought that progress on the main was slow and that it was doubtful whether it was economical to continue at the pace at which that work was proceeding. I believed that it would be advisable to stop that work and to return to it later with all pressure, with a view to completing it by the originally stipulated date.

Mr. Nankivell: Will the work on the tanks continue on a day-work basis?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand it will, but I shall check that matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It has been reported to me that because a cook working on the Keith pipeline had a two-year contract to cook for 68 men it was not possible for the Minister of Works to close down the works on a section of the pipeline. Can the Minister say whether the contract has been composed, or whether that is the reason why certain men have been kept upon a day-work basis?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have no knowledge of the question that has been cooked up, but I will see what I can find out about it.

STURT DAM.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: About a week ago I received a letter from a constituent, containing a suggestion which I endorse and would like the Minister to consider. The letter states:

Having read in the *Mail* of June 11 the cost of pumping water, I wonder if those responsible have thought what a waste has been spent in the building of the dam in the Sturt Creek above Darlington. I am led to believe that the water stored in the said dam is not to be used for household purposes—

which, of course, is the position—

and, if such is the case, why not spend more money in building a large tank at Bedford Park and then gravitate the water from the said dam for the sole purpose of watering the wonderful greens I believe to be playing areas.

I believe that refers to the Flinders university. The letter concludes:

Having seen sprinklers in operation, I would imagine that the quantity of water saved would more than compensate for costs involved in the building of such a tank, at the same time making it possible to use the water from the dam, otherwise wasted.

I think the suggestion is clear and, if practicable, a good one. Can the Minister of Works say whether this matter has ever been considered and, if it has not, will he have it considered to see whether it is a practicable proposition?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The department is always happy to consider suggestions. I am rather surprised at the implication that the Flinders university greens are watered from a reticulated system. I do not think that is the case, but I shall check that matter and have the suggestion examined to see whether it is practicable.

HOUGHTON SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say when the new residence being constructed for the Houghton Primary School Headmaster will be completed and ready for occupation?

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

YOUNGHUSBAND PENINSULA.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Stirling understands that a plan is afoot to subdivide Younghusband Peninsula into 380 shack sites. This peninsula is in my district, but is separated from the Narrung Peninsula by the Coorong, which makes access difficult. It is used by fishing people, and shacks, fisheries and shelters are erected on it. Can the Minister of Lands say whether my information is correct and whether there is any policy on the provision of shack sites in this area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Evidently the member for Stirling is better informed than I am on the possibility of shack site development in the area. I know nothing of the matter, but I will have it investigated and obtain a report.

GOODWOOD SUBWAY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Only a month ago, when the Minister of Lands was acting as Minister

of Roads, I wrote him a letter about the danger to pedestrians near the Goodwood subway. At the subway, the boundaries of the Districts of Unley and Mitcham meet. In the past, the member for Unley has been active in this matter, but nothing has happened and the situation is getting worse with increasing traffic. Apart from the usual courteous acknowledgement from the Minister's secretary I have heard nothing further. As this is a matter of some urgency because lives may be lost in this area owing to the danger to pedestrians trying to cross the Goodwood Road, will the Minister of Lands use his good offices with his colleague to try to get a speedy reply and, even better, some action to improve the situation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

SALT COMPANY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier seen a report today that the Leslie Salt Company, which was negotiating for the establishment of a large salt works in the North of the State, has transferred its activities to Western Australia? The report states that the industry is to be established at Port Headland at a cost of many millions of dollars and that salt exports of over 1,000,000 tons a year are expected. Can the Premier say why negotiations broke down in South Australia? Was it because of problems associated with the site or with economics? At the time of the last election, the Leslie Salt Company appeared to be disinclined to continue in South Australia and another firm had been invited to examine the proposition.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: With other people, I waited on the Leslie Salt Company and its representatives, and there was some plain speaking at that meeting. According to its report to me (which I am not prepared to doubt), the company had thoroughly investigated South Australian deposits and the ultimate possibility of export trade. The company found to its surprise that Mexico was using large bulk ships to deliver salt to Japan. Although I am not sure of the details, negotiations took place between the Western Australian Government and Japan in relation to iron ore exports as a result of which a large sum is to be spent at Port Headland on port facilities. Western Australia is much closer by sea to Japan than South Australia is, and the company indicated that even if large quantities were available in South Australia, and even taking into account possible storm damage in Western Australia, it would not be possible to establish in South Australia

and compete with Mexico. The company made it clear that it had nothing to hide and that its decision was arrived at on purely economic grounds. It also said that no hostility was involved and that it had been given every opportunity to establish in this State, but it was satisfied on economic grounds that it could not develop the scheme in South Australia.

PINE PLANTINGS.

Mr. RODDA: Last session I asked a question about farm afforestation, and during the recess much publicity was given to this matter. Many South-Eastern landholders are interested in this, and some have already planted sizable areas to pines, but they are concerned about the effect of these plantings on taxation and succession duties, which are Commonwealth Government matters. As there is a considerable scope for increasing the area that can be sown to pines and as these plantings will provide shelter for stock, has the Minister of Forests anything to report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I was pleased to hear the honourable member say that some landowners in the South-East had already planted pines. This is wise from their own point of view, as these trees make a very good shelter for stock in cold weather. Alleviation from income tax and from probate and succession duties has been considered constantly by the Forestry Council. Before I first attended this council I was told that the former Minister of Forests had told the council that what the South Australian Government would do depended on the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, and this seems to be the opinion of all State Ministers. The Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn) has made constant representations to his Treasury for this to be considered, but until the last Forestry Council meeting nothing positive had been done. It is generally thought by the Ministers that the initial move should come from the Commonwealth Government, which levies the major taxes—income tax and death duties. I was pleased to hear the honourable member say that considerable interest had been shown even by people who had not yet planted pines. I should be pleased if he would tell me how many people are interested and the area that can be made available, as I am sure this would give added interest to the case.

INSURANCE.

Mr. HALL: I understand that the Government contributes to the finances of the Fire

Brigades Board and that insurance companies are increasing their contributions to the board. I have been told that premiums charged by the companies are being increased by 2½ per cent to cover this increased contribution, yet outer suburban areas in general (and Para Hills in particular) pay a surcharge because of the absence of the board's attentions. People in these areas will now pay an increased premium for a service that is not provided. Will the Premier investigate this matter and obtain a report to explain the actions of insurance companies in this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report, but I am not sure from the question whether the Para Hills area is served by the South Australian Fire Brigades Board.

Mr. Hall: It is not.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Then, as in other fringe areas, including Mitcham, where the board's activities do not extend but where fire protection is given by the Emergency Fire Services, which are doing a tremendous job, there is an increase in premiums in relation to fire protection. That is the case as I know it, but I will obtain further information for the honourable member to see if anything can be added to my reply.

EASTWOOD INTERSECTION.

Mrs. STEELE: I have often referred to the very dangerous intersection of Fullarton and Greenhill Roads near the Electricity Trust building. I know that the Road Traffic Board has considered this intersection and that certain recommendations have been made, but I point out to the Minister of Lands, who represents the Minister of Roads in this Chamber, that I cross this intersection practically every day travelling to and from the city and, as a result, I know that if during peak hours a major accident does not occur soon it will be amazing, because there is a line-up of traffic on every road leading to the intersection. Everyone has someone on his right, and nobody knows who gives way to whom. I have seen some very close shaves at this corner. I know that this matter has been in the hands of the board for a long time. I understand that traffic lights have been recommended, but nothing has been done and I am frequently being approached by road users to find out when action is to be taken. Will the Minister of Lands take up with the Minister of Roads the question of having this matter expedited?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that for the honourable member.

TRAILER BINS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Minister of Lands will recall that last session when we debated and passed a Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill the question arose of exempting trailers used by citrus growers who use a bulk bin for oranges, together with a fork lift, because it was almost impossible to fit a mudguard. I understand that the Road Traffic Board exempted these trailers from the provisions of the Act. The orange season is now in full swing, but the exemption has been lifted on the grounds, I understand, that growers can purchase and fit a temporary mudguard. A number of growers have not been able to comply with these requirements because they do not have new trailers to which these temporary mudguards can be fitted. Will the Minister be good enough to take this matter up with a view to once again having the exemption granted?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain a report on this matter as soon as possible.

EUDUNDA RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On January 27 this year I asked the Premier a question about improvements to be made to loading facilities at the Eudunda railway station. The Premier was good enough to say that he would get a report from the Minister of Transport, but that report has never come to hand. Will the Premier take the matter up again with the Minister and obtain a report for me?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

FOOT ROT.

Mr. CASEY: The question of foot rot has been raised in this House many times, I think the most recent occasion being about six months ago when the honourable member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) referred to the danger of contamination by foot rot in railway vans. An article I read some time ago stated that the Glenfield Veterinary Research Station in New South Wales carried out exhaustive tests to discover whether sheep, particularly in that part of the country, were susceptible to foot rot through travelling in these vans. Those tests, which were carried out for several months, proved conclusively that these railway carriages in which the sheep were being transported presented no such dangers of contamination. In view of the research carried out at Glenfield, I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that perhaps details of the survey or the findings could be used by officers of his department. Can he say whether any research has

been carried out in this State on this question and, if it has, what the findings have been?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will refer the subject matter of the honourable member's question to the Chief Inspector of Stock. However, I assure the honourable member and the House that this matter is kept continuously under vigilance so that foot rot can be prevented and eradicated, and I am sure the department would have all the information referred to by the honourable member. However, I will bring down a full report.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday I asked a question on notice of the Minister of Education regarding the cost of transporting children by departmental buses, and the information he supplied was most interesting. Will the Minister look now at the schedules in respect of non-departmental buses? As the Minister knows, an upper limit is fixed, and that limit sometimes is not sufficient to cover the cost of the child. In some instances it involves a considerable hardship to a family, particularly a large family. Will the Minister examine the upper limit now fixed in respect of non-departmental buses, taking into account the costs which are now accepted in the case of departmental buses?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. It may be of interest to the Leader to know that I have already given this matter considerable thought, because I consider that these people need to have their position reconsidered. I might add that there has been no increase in the amounts they have received for many years, and therefore I should be very pleased to look into the matter further and make some adjustment when we have the funds available. I am sure the Leader will assist us in getting those extra funds.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 28. Page 139.)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I join with other members in paying my respects to the memory of those former members of Parliament who have passed away in recent times. I compliment the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) on his excellent address in moving this motion. The comprehensive programme outlined in the Speech covers many points that received scant

consideration for many years. I also compliment the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) on his speech seconding the motion. I am pleased to see that we have now established a Premier's Department, the object of which is to pursue all avenues that can result in the further establishment of industry in this State, more particularly the attraction of industry to country areas. A regional committee has been established in my district to consider these problems, and it has already been visited by officers from this department. The local knowledge of these committees can be used to materially assist this department to attract industries and to expand local industries. I commend the Premier and his officers for the establishment of this department.

It is encouraging to realize that the Government will continue to pursue policies making full use of the potential of this State in agriculture, mining, land settlement, irrigation, and forestry. Most of Australia has recently been affected by a disastrous drought, although this State has not been as seriously affected as Queensland and New South Wales. The loss of production throughout Australia is about \$100,000,000, but we are yet to feel the full effects that this loss will have on the community. Less grain will be carried on our railways and exported through our ports, and we all know what a serious effect this will have on the States' Budgets. The activities of the Mines Department have special significance in this State, which is singularly unfortunate in having few deposits of rich minerals, except iron ore. It is to be hoped that the drilling activities and investigations of the department will result in the discovery of minerals now in short supply. I congratulate the Premier on his initiative in undertaking a world tour to investigate the establishment of a natural gas industry in this State. We have tapped natural resources in Central Australia, and this tour by the Premier and the Minister of Mines has put South Australia in the forefront of the exploitation of natural gas.

We hope that this field's potential will prove adequate for the use of this gas. We do not enjoy many natural resources, and I hope that some of the success obtained in the Gippsland Basin will be repeated in the Otway Basin off our southern shores. In the South-East we enjoy the natural resources of rich agricultural land and an adequate water supply, but we have created resources by the establishment of State forests, and the Labor Party can claim much satisfaction from its part in this establishment. The Government recently announced

that 2,631 acres has been purchased or approved in the South-East during the past 12 months, and a further 700 acres is being investigated. The Government is vigorously carrying out its afforestation policy in direct contrast to what was done in 1964-65 when no land was purchased by the previous Government. Many millions of gallons of water are wasted daily, and perhaps the day will come when this valuable asset will be used in the metropolitan area, unless an economical method of desalination is soon found. I have heard much about the benefits of the tourist industry to this State and I commend the civic authorities of Mount Gambier for their efforts.

I hope the Government will continue to make available subsidies for this work, as one of the main gateways to this State is the district of Mount Gambier, which has many tourist attractions. The tourist industry should be one of our main industries and everyone should be encouraged to foster it. Last night we listened to a tirade by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) on the so-called evils of Socialism. I believe these charges were also made when the first attempt was made to set up the Electricity Trust, although the Leader of the Opposition, with the support of the Labor Party, eventually accomplished this. The member for Mitcham has convinced himself that anything run by the State is evil, but the greatest contributions to industrial development in this State have been made by the full use of the Electricity Trust's resources: power is now connected to towns and farms throughout the country and living conditions have been made more pleasant for everyone in the community. This is all brought about by Socialism or, in other words, State instrumentalities. We heard a few figures last evening from the member for Mitcham which tended to put State insurance in a bad light, but knowing the honourable member's opposition to any matter dealing with State instrumentalities—

Mr. Jennings: And his ability to twist figures, too!

Mr. BURDON: —and his undoubted ability to turn figures upside down, I shall refer to some figures that I have extracted in relation to State insurance. In company with you, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Education I was privileged when in Western Australia about three years ago to be granted an interview with the Manager of the State Insurance Office in that State. We have received similar figures from the various Managers of State insurance offices throughout Australia. I have also been

privileged to discuss State insurance with the General Manager of the New South Wales State Insurance Office, and my colleagues have taken part in discussions with other State insurance Managers. In Western Australia, about \$211,000 has been paid into the Treasury, total reserves and investments amounting to nearly \$15,000,000. In Tasmania, the original capital of \$40,000 has never been drawn on; about \$1,252,000 has been paid into State revenue, and \$1,600,000 in investments. These figures reveal that handsome profits are being made by the various State instrumentalities.

Mr. Hurst: And helping development, too!

Mr. BURDON: The following figures will conclusively show how State insurance schemes have helped development. Funds held by the Victorian Treasury from operations of the Victorian State Insurance Office total about \$23,332,000 on which the Treasury pays only 1½ per cent. This figure has been taken from the same source as that used by the member for Mitcham, namely, the Auditor-Generals' Reports of the various States. In 1963, the Victorian operations of the State Insurance Office resulted in a profit of about \$1,774,000; in the same year, the Queensland Treasury received about \$1,648,000, with life funds of about \$57,707,000, and total assets of about \$105,764,000. The New South Wales Treasury received about \$1,000,000 and Loan funds are made available annually to local government instrumentalities of about \$5,000,000. The member for Mitcham has tried to misinform the public, because he does not believe that anything should be run by the State. I shall deal further with this matter when a Bill to establish a State insurance office is introduced and when certain tabulated figures in relation to this matter can be presented to the House.

Mr. Langley: It will keep the insurance companies honest, won't it?

Mr. BURDON: Yes, because a State insurance office can act as a brake, in the interests of the people of the State, keeping the figures at a reasonable level. The housing problem in my district is still causing concern. I hope that the Government through the Housing Trust will continue to build rental and purchase houses to the utmost of its resources, to meet the existing demand. I should like to draw the trust's attention to using fully local products such as limestone, hardwood, *pinus radiata* and cement bricks, as against imported expensive timber that is often quoted in trust contracts. Much has been said during this debate about deep drainage in various districts, but extremely good progress in this regard

has been made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in Mount Gambier. Indeed, I believe that work is ahead of schedule. During May, the Minister of Education made an inspection of the South-East, with good results, for in some schools, particularly in my district, matters that had been worrying some school committees were discussed and settled on the spot. A suggestion, which I believe the Minister is actively investigating, was made that an officer of the Education Department be stationed in the South-East, so that, with the co-operation of the Public Buildings Department, matters affecting schools in the area may be settled immediately, thus avoiding long delays and frustration on the part of school committees. I hope that decentralization in this regard will be workable and beneficial to all concerned.

During the Minister's visit an inspection was made of a site for a new primary school, and it would be interesting to know whether the Education Department intended to establish a standard-type school similar to our other primary schools, or whether it intended to construct a Samcon school, similar to one recently built at Kalangadoo. A significant break-through in education recently took place in Mount Gambier with the commencement of a class for trainee draftsmen at the Mount Gambier Adult Education Centre. The engineering fraternity welcomes that move and, although it is only a small beginning, let us hope that it will lead to further decentralization of education. I do not need to stress how popular adult education has become; one has only to examine the numbers that attend adult education classes to realize its popularity. Indeed, that has been demonstrated in my district. The removal of the infants school from the grounds of the adult education centre will give the department valuable space for further extensions and new buildings.

We must support the campaign for more money from Commonwealth sources, for, indeed, they are the only sources available. Whether we like it or not, almost the only source of revenue is by way of taxation. Everything we desire to have must be paid for. I appreciate the fact that the new Mount Gambier High School is on the list for replacement and that the time is approaching when it can, in fact, be replaced. I now wish to make one or two comments in an endeavour to enlighten the member for Light.

Mr. Hudson: I think you're an incurable optimist.

Mr. BURDON: Apparently I am not given much chance of doing this. Some remarks were made last evening about the evils of Socialism. The member for Light referred to what Ben Chifley had and had not done. I believe Chifley is recognized as one of Australia's greatest leaders. On June 2, 1949, in replying to Sir Philip McBride, who had been voluble on the evils of Socialism, Chifley said:

Every service he uses here is socialized. He would not be able to turn on the lights in his room or even to take a bath, if it were not for the socialized services provided by the Government.

I believe the member for Light would admit that the same position applies in South Australia. Chifley continued:

Such a policy is by no means championed solely by the Australian Labor Party. Mr. Playford, the Liberal Premier of South Australia, socialized its electricity undertaking.

Mr. Hurst: That was a good move.

Mr. BURDON: It was one of the best moves ever made in this State. The Labor Party in this State had a big say in that proposal. A certain member of another place changed his vote and did not receive his Party's endorsement at the following election. In his book *Ben Chifley*, L. F. Crisp writes:

The extent and some of the directions of Chifley's socializing efforts, however, spread dismay and anger amongst his opponents. In the years from 1944 to 1949 he was the prime mover (or one of the prime movers) in the re-establishment on a peace-time basis of a Commonwealth Shipping Line, the establishment of a Stevedoring Industry Board to direct that waterside industry, the founding of a public aluminium ingot industry, the constitution of a public whaling industry and the provision of a public monopoly of atomic energy raw material. His Government legislated for nationalized television under the Broadcasting Control Board, joint Commonwealth-State governmental supervision of the New South Wales coal industry (with power vested in the Joint Coal Board to enter directly the mining and open-cut branches of the industry), and the launching as a national enterprise of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Scheme.

The Chifley Government also initiated the nationalization of internal and Australian-owned sections of oversea airlines and the establishment of Trans-Australia Airlines. Crisp further states:

At the time of its commencement (the Snowy Mountains Scheme), the Federal Opposition not only decried the scheme but had the ill grace to boycott its inauguration by the Governor-General.

I believe only one Opposition member attended the opening. Crisp continues:

In April, 1955, however, Menzies, opening the Guthega power station, made some amends when he described the whole Snowy project as "a living memorial to the courage, enterprise and drive of Mr. Chifley".

I believe those remarks show the sort of man Chifley was, and I do not want to hear any more comments in relation to Chifley or his achievements such as we heard last night. What I have said this afternoon puts the picture in its true perspective.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the motion. I express my loyalty to the Queen and her representatives in South Australia. I trust that His Excellency Sir Edric Bastyan and Lady Bastyan have enjoyed their visit to England and will return refreshed to carry out their duties in the same efficient manner as they have carried them out in the past. In its first session the Government endeavoured to carry out many reforms. As an Opposition member, I appreciated the merit of some of them and supported them, as I had said I would do in last session's debate on the Address in Reply. The Opposition improved many measures by amendments, and strongly expressed public opinion also caused the Government to amend some Bills and withdraw others. However, the Government appeared to lose interest in many of its reforms (or perhaps it realized its inadequacies), and it did not press on with measures with the vigor expected from a new Government.

It is to be hoped that this session, with Cabinet members having spent the recess together, the legislation introduced will not have to be frequently amended by the Government as was the case last session. In the last Address in Reply debate I said that the Government had made certain rash promises. After an interjection, to be polite I withdrew that comment, but I now reiterate it. The Premier said last week that the previous Government had entered into commitments that were difficult for his Government to meet because it had not known anything about them. If the Government had been as active in Opposition as we are now, it would have known what the previous commitments were. However, although the information was available the Government did not know the extent of previous commitments. I said that unemployment would be the barometer of how this Government was faring, and that if those figures rose the Government would feel the cold winds of change. Already I think that barometer indicates that there is stormy weather ahead for the Government, because the figure at the

end of May was 6,714 as against 3,420 when the Government took office.

It is interesting to note that most of that unemployment is amongst the males, which shows that there has been a slowing down in industry. Our employment figures were the second best in Australia, the unemployment figure being .8 per cent as against Victoria's .7 per cent. Now our figure for unemployment is 1.5 per cent, being exceeded only by Queensland with 1.8 per cent, compared with the Australian average of 1.2 per cent. These things are very worrying. The figure has only been worse in the last decade during the short period of the credit squeeze. Unemployment figures are rising. When I asked the Premier a question about this last week he said that this was due to certain unemployment in the production of farming implements at Mannum. However, it is clear that most of this unemployment is in the building industry, for that is where the South Australian figures have fallen considerably below the other States. Why this is so, I cannot say, but it is up to the Government to see that it does not continue. In the 12 months prior to the Government taking office 17,900 more people were employed in primary and secondary industries, but in the following seven months there was an increase of only 2,300. Those are alarming figures to one who lived through the last depression under the Labor Government.

It was stated that most of this Budget deficit was caused through a bad year in South Australia. Admittedly it was poor in respect of total rainfall, but that rainfall fell consistently through the growing period, except at the end, and it was not a bad production year, for 45,000,000 bushels of wheat was cropped. In 1959-60 the crop was only 12,000,000 bushels, and that year stock numbers fell by millions, whereas this year they have remained more or less consistent. However, we finished up with a \$600,000 deficit that year, not a \$6,000,000 deficit.

Our population was increasing prior to March 1965, our increase being second only to that of Victoria. Many migrants were coming to this State, but the increase in migrants dropped from 1.96 per cent in September, 1964, to .85 per cent in September, 1965. The natural increase dropped from 11.52 per cent to 10.46 per cent, but I shall be fair enough to say that I do not blame the Government for that or expect it to correct the position. However, I hope the Government will take action that will give more confidence to the community so that it can expand as it

expanded in previous years. This is serious for South Australia as, under the taxation reimbursement formula, those reimbursements vary according to the degree of development. We find that Tasmania's tax reimbursements increased by 6.83 per cent this year. We all know that that State, which has had a Labor Government for 32 years, finds it difficult to maintain its population figures. The figure for New South Wales increased by 7.75 per cent, and that for South Australia by 7.77 per cent, while the other three States had increases up to 9 per cent. If the momentum is allowed to slow down and progress is retarded in a State, the position will be aggravated by this taxation reimbursement formula, and we will really get into the doldrums in South Australia if this confidence of the community cannot be re-established.

One of the main things in the Budget which caused the deficit was the big decrease in stamp duties. It is a bit hard to understand why this is so, because there has not been that great a slowing down in industry. I think this is a type of tax where, if the higher rate of duty is fixed, the law of diminishing returns operates. In other words, people do not buy certain things or do certain things if the rate of stamp duty is too high. I used to change my car every year, but this year I decided not to do so. When I hit a heap of rubble yesterday and was so hurt that I had to have six stitches in my nose, I nearly had to change the car over, but I think I can patch it up the same as the doctor patched me up. It was a question of whether I would change the car, but I thought of the \$40 involved and decided not to do so. There is an instance of \$40 being lost to the Government because I thought the tax was too high.

This also applies in business. Much of the trouble with concerns like the Reid Murray organization was caused because it was much cheaper to leave all the companies it took over as subsidiaries. Rather than transfer them into one co-ordinated body that could be controlled from the top, these subsidiary bodies were allowed to remain in existence more or less on their own. One cannot run a structure on that basis. If stamp duties were lower, we would find that there would be more efficient business management.

One increase in expenditure last year was in respect of welfare and other social matters, and nobody really objects to that increased expenditure if it is justified. We understand that the Attorney-General has a public relations officer, but judging from the reaction

one hears around the country I think he had better get another one. This reaction is so strong that at times even I have had to protest and say that the Minister is doing a much better job than people think. This public relations officer (I indicated last year that he was a very expensive item) does not seem to be paying off, and I consider that his salary is a waste of money to the general taxpayer. The matter of Ministerial control of departments was debated last year. I have heard rumours that various people working in the Department of Social Welfare get upset when the Minister alters decisions. Apparently it is to be a question of the whims of one man. Decisions should be consistent and uniform, but there is not necessarily a consistent pattern.

Mr. Langley: The job is being done now; they are not rubber stamps any more.

Mr. McANANEY: A definite regulation should be set out so that it is fair to everybody. If there is a Minister in charge who can make a decision according to whether or not he is feeling generous that day, or whether or not he is personally interested, that is bad. Although the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) referred to several Bills that would be introduced by the Government, the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill was definitely not mentioned in the Labor Party's policy speech, especially about a living area. Apparently the Labor Party thought that a person could have five sons on an area and do as well as one man on the same area.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Where was the reference to five sons in the policy speech?

Mr. McANANEY: That is the point: nothing was mentioned about a reasonable living area, and I was trying to prove that to the member for West Torrens, but the Minister has proved it for me. The Labor Party claimed that it would make it easier for widows and children: in some cases it did, but in many cases conditions would have been worse. The Government wanted to take money from the small estates that are essential to the future of this State, and if the confidence of these people is destroyed it causes increasing unemployment and a decline in population. That is happening in this State at present.

Mr. Jennings: Ours was a "Robin Hood" policy but yours was a "robbin" policy!

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member's policy is not a "Robin Hood" policy. Labor's policy is to take from the workers and to give to those who do not want to work hard. That was the spirit behind the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill in which the smaller

estates were hit. It was stated that the Labor Administration in a short space of time is leaving the other States behind. How can that be when population has fallen, unemployment is increasing, and taxation is growing? It is pleasing to see that the Strathalbyn District Hospital is now a modern hospital of 36 beds, and I pay a tribute to the women's auxiliary for the work it has done. When the Government subsidizes the efforts of these people, it results in the cheapest form of hospitalization that can be obtained. Another extension is to be made to the Victor Harbour Hospital, and I emphasize the good work of the St. John Ambulance Brigade, which is erecting a new building at Victor Harbour. Last Saturday a new telephone exchange was opened there and now people can dial Adelaide direct. It is pleasing to see such progress being made in the most progressive district in the State.

Land cannot be developed in the Lake Alexandrina and Murray River areas of my district because of the lack of water. When the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf water reticulation scheme is completed I hope that a branch line will be laid into that area to aid further development. If the present scheme in the Strathalbyn area proves sufficient to handle more farms at the end of the second year, I hope the Government will increase the scope of this scheme. The tourist industry is increasing in the Victor Harbour area with a new chair lift being installed on Granite Island. The Government should provide more money for this industry because it attracts many people to this State, and if more money were available it would pay dividends. In Victoria 2 per cent of the money collected for roads is used for the tourist industry, and resorts are subsidized to a much greater extent than they are in this State. Travelling salesmen in my district are causing concern. They do not produce what they say they are going to do, and some consideration should be given to salesmen's having to furnish a fidelity bond to ensure that they deliver goods they promise. When the Labor Party last year suggested the co-ordination of transport, I protested that it should not be elimination, but that is what the Government tried to do by eliminating private transport in certain areas. I think it is far better that an inquiry into the co-ordination of transport be undertaken by a Parliamentary committee. Indeed, that happens in America. I believe one member of the Commission is a legal man. We have five legal men in Parliament, a farmer who has been

associated with primary-producing organizations, and a man who has been associated with the railways. I believe that the railways should first be investigated, before investigating transport as a whole. A Parliamentary committee should take evidence here and in other States, and become conversant with systems applying elsewhere.

I have lived in the country for many years and know that the only trouble that ever arose in relation to taking produce to Adelaide was when the Government said a certain system could not be used. That is when difficulties arise. The Railways Department loses about \$8,000,000 a year, and our first approach must be to ascertain why that loss occurs. The railway to Milang brings in a revenue of a few thousand dollars, almost all of which is absorbed in keeping a station-master there. Nobody uses the railcar that runs to Milang four or five times a week, except when grain has to be picked up, when only one truck at a time can be connected to the railcar, because of the line's condition. Although money is being spent and time wasted in replacing sleepers on that line, it will never be a paying proposition. It would be much more economical to concentrate on the major lines that are a necessary part of Australia's transport system.

We on this side believe in competition and, if road transport and railways are to compete, I believe that the people who use the roads should pay for their cost. That is not the present practice; indeed, I think that one-third of the money collected for roads is by way of rates on properties. The sum paid by a property-holder in this regard has no bearing on the use he makes of the road. We should allow true competition between road transport and the railways, which can be facilitated only if the Railways Department obtains modern and efficient equipment.

It is gratifying to see the appointment of two young officers in the Highways Department as Assistant Commissioners. The promoting of younger people into administrative positions is an important feature of the Public Service. Only last week I met a young man who, I think, is an Assistant Superintendent in the Education Department, which is another example of the tendency to promote men on ability rather than on seniority. It is comforting to know that our roads are well built, but I think we have gone from one extreme to the other. Whereas 10 years ago roads were being built too low and not sufficiently straight, they are now often being built up four or five

feet and cutting through small hillocks. Can we afford this? I know of a road being built 2ft. above water pipes through which water will never flow. Local conditions are often not receiving sufficient attention. I could never understand why the road constructed from Eagle on the Hill to Adelaide some years ago did not curve gently and straighten out a short distance above Devil's Elbow, for that would have shortened the distance by half a mile and eliminated awkward corners. The freeway through Stirling is taking too long, and I believe it would have been better to concentrate on one road at a time. A bridge at Stirling has been constructed, which will not be used for three or four years, so that money will thus be lying idle. Further, during the winter when the ground at Stirling is always wet, \$200,000 worth of equipment stands motionless on the side of the road—equipment that could be used elsewhere in the winter and returned to the site of the freeway in a drier period.

Much trouble still exists in obtaining finance for small farms in the hills. I cannot see much future in the present financial stringency. We can borrow \$7,000 or \$8,000 to build a house in Adelaide, which is practically its full value, but banks are not prepared to lend anywhere near that sum on country properties. The Rural Advances Guarantee Act has made some achievements in this regard, but it still takes too long for decisions to be made. It is often extremely difficult for those making the decisions to assess correctly an applicant's character. When lending money to a person to buy primary-producing land, his ability to work and save are the two most important features to be considered, for land itself does not create wealth. I cannot agree with John Miles's article appearing recently in the *News*, which slated State Governments generally; I think the closer a Government is to the people, the more control it has. Unfortunately, we do not give district councils enough power in many cases. The article refers to duplication in Government departments, but I do not think that is the position. If there were Commonwealth control of education a State Deputy Director would still be necessary. The States would need to have the same set up but they would lose much of the control they have now if one central body were set up in Canberra. Mr. Miles said that there would be more efficiency in education if there were Commonwealth control. On that score it is interesting to note the position concerning transport. The Commonwealth Government has

about eight Ministers who have something to do with this subject; they over-ride one another, and the result of a central organization for transport is chaotic. This scheme is not so efficient as that which operates here.

Water rates are to be paid on a quarterly basis, and some people will find it difficult to meet this demand. I suggest that it might be possible to introduce the same system as applies to the registration of motor cars where, for the payment of an extra 10c, a person can register his car for six months rather than 12 months. Why should not the same principle be introduced in the payment of rates rather than a position created whereby additional manpower is wasted? Orderly marketing was discussed by the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren). Most members who have had experience on the land believe that orderly marketing is a good scheme and is beneficial to both the consumer and the producer. Stabilization schemes have not proved so successful. When a home price for a product is fixed, that goes into the cost of living index causing wages to rise accordingly. This means that the cost of production of an article increases and a producer receives the increased price for only what he sells on the home market. If a producer is exporting half of his produce he must be the loser because, although the cost of production increases on all commodities, he receives only a balanced-out price.

The member for Chaffey has been proved right on what he said about the present method of fixing wine grape prices. I agree that it has worked this time, but in the event of excess production I cannot see how it can possibly work. No secondary or primary industry in the world of which I know can receive a guaranteed price for production greater than the quantity that can be sold. When working out stabilization schemes this factor must be considered and some scheme must be devised to deal with excess production. Orderly marketing schemes can be successful only if as many middle people as possible are eliminated. The Potato Board encounters certain difficulties, and possibly it could be streamlined.

We commend the Government for assisting in extending the meat market at Light Square. This has proved successful as it has eliminated the wholesalers' margin and has resulted in better returns to producers. Also, butchers can see what they are buying and can buy more cheaply than they were able to buy through the wholesalers. Much double handling has been eliminated.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It is nice to get a little thanks instead of the kicks we got yesterday.

Mr. McANANEY: I have tried to kick the Government today. The member for Chaffey said that it was essential to have some measure of price control and that the retention of this legislation had always been a deterrent to unscrupulous people raising prices. He said that it was necessary to introduce legislation to prescribe land tax rates following the quinquennial assessment that has just been announced. I trust that the Government appreciates that if the present land tax rates are maintained, the collection of land tax will nearly double. Half of this tax is collected in the city but in certain cases it applies to the land. The price of wheat could be dearer resulting in an increase in the price of bread to the consumer. If we are going to maintain prices we should not increase them by Government action.

I support the suggestion of the member for Chaffey that the wine industry should have new co-operatives. The previous Government was mainly responsible for the present co-operatives, and the Opposition will help the Government provide more. It amazed me to see the Government institute a means test on the \$200 boarding allowance received by country students at a tertiary level. Country people suffer a disability because they must send their children to the city to board, and the means test results in many no longer receiving the allowance. Before the Government took office many children received free books. People with limited means got them and I believe British migrants, if they could not afford to buy them, had no trouble in getting them. They were available subject to a means test. Now the Government has provided that all children will receive free books, which means that even the children of wealthy parents will get them. Thus the poor will help pay for books for rich people's children and will be worse off than they were before.

I was speaking to a person who had been educated in Russia in the 1940's and who said that he had been allowed to keep his own books, even in a Communist country. In this State, however, children will not be able to keep their books and I strongly support what the Teachers' Institute said: that its experience showed that this practice was undesirable. I believe it would be better to provide a book allowance, because the provision of free books must limit the money available for other educational purposes.

Although I believe in extended education, why this sudden talk of a crisis in education? I admit that the failure rate at the university is far too high and that something should be done about it. In 1959 there was one university staff member to every 11½ students. In 1964 the ratio had been reduced to one staff member to every nine students. As regards staff and other employees of the university, in 1959 there was one of them to every six students; by 1964 the ratio was down to one to five. So it cannot be said that our tertiary education is in any way lacking. More money must be spent on education, but are things as bad as some sections of the community are trying to make out?

I have not seen anything in His Excellency's Speech about the redistribution of seats, but the Premier indicated that legislation dealing with that matter might be introduced. The way the Government is going now, I should be willing to face the next election on one vote one value, but that is not practicable, because a fair representation must be had for all sections of the community; and in that respect about two-thirds of the members would represent city districts. The Attorney-General has said that one justice of the peace can serve 250 people in a city area but only 150 people in a country area. That sort of proportion would give a fair representation in this House. It would be a disgrace to this 3-year Parliamentary term if we did not get together and come up with some sensible redistribution scheme. The one introduced previously by the Government was so vague, so unrealistic and so prone to be twisted that it could not possibly be supported. In the first year, what happened in the so-called country areas? There were 8,800 more voters in those areas in the first year of this Government, and that would increase the quota for each seat by 338. In the city area there has been an increase of 4,000 voters for 30 seats, which gives an increased quota of 133 for each seat. So in one year there is a bigger increase in the so-called country quota than in the city quota, and in a few years' time this tendency will grow rapidly with the development of the country areas. For instance, the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) had 3,500 extra electors last year in a country area; and it would not be long before the country quota was bigger than the city quota. This was done either in haste or for expediency. The Leader of the Opposition said it was "crook": it was crook either by design or by gerrymander. It was done through either ignorance or gerrymander.

When I first entered Parliament, I wondered why we had Parties. I looked at the Opposition and thought its members went about things in much the same way as we did. But the passage of time is beginning to crystallize the differences in our respective thinking. When I was speaking last year, I said that subcontractors performed a useful service to the community and at the same time had lifted themselves out of the rut. There was an interjection to the effect that by pulling themselves out of the rut they probably put somebody else into it. I remember that the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) said that one could not accumulate money without the help of the rest of the community; therefore the rest of the community was entitled to a big cut out of a person's estate when he died. But, if anybody desires to work hard and achieve something and accumulate wealth in the interests of the State, how does anybody else help him?

Mr. Hurst: Most of the hard workers get helped to lose it.

Mr. McANANEY: By pulling himself out of the rut and producing more, how does a man pull anybody else down while he is doing it? Certainly, if a man goes to the Arbitration Court and gets an increase in wages, somebody else must get less. If a group of manufacturers or retailers gets together and decides to get more than it is justified in getting in fair competition, it is pulling somebody else down; but the person who goes out, produces more and is willing to work is of benefit to everybody, because in the process he pays taxes and somebody else benefits. I remember that when I worked on the land there was sometimes a rather unpleasant job to do and I thought, "This is worth doing for what I get out of it." A pound's worth of wool would be worth 20c to me, whereas other people might get nine times that much out of it.

We said that receipts were a waste of labour and a lowering of standards through people doing nothing. The Hon. Mr. Bevan in another place said that the issuing of receipts would create employment and would therefore boost the economy. The more we create, the more there is for everybody. If people do nothing, we do not get very far. State ownership will be thrashed out this session. I am not opposed to State enterprises but I am strongly opposed to Socialism as a whole, the idea of a socialistic monopoly where the Government must control everything. I am against monopolies, whether private or Government, but I am not terrified of State enterprises as the Government is terrified of private enterprises, which they want to

abuse, knock down and restrict. The Government is terrified of the results of private enterprise. The more productive it is, the better it is for everybody. If there is to be State ownership there should be fair competition. Private enterprise should not have to pay more taxes than State enterprises pay. State enterprises should not be able to use cheap money borrowed on favourable terms from the public purse, with income tax concessions, to be used for public utilities, while the money for private enterprise has to be borrowed on the open market.

That is the whole process. If there is to be State enterprise, it should be fully competitive and operating under the same conditions as private enterprise. Then, if it is successful, we cannot complain about it: it is achieving something and doing some good. I cannot quite follow the honourable member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) when he says that the advantages that will accrue from implementing this scheme are the restraining influence the competition will have on private insurance companies, the savings that will be available to policy holders, and the low rate of interest on loans that will be made available by a State insurance office. One thing really contradicts the other, because if there are going to be low rates the policy holders will not benefit as much as they did before.

I have criticized the Government on where I think it has fallen down on its job. What we need in Australia are increased living standards. Some people believe that by going to the Arbitration Court and getting higher wages they are obtaining higher living standards. However, this is not so, and nobody is actually getting down to finding out how living standards can be raised. Basically, these standards depend on the natural resources of a country. We have natural resources here of which we are not making use. For instance, we have ample iron ore in Western Australia, but it is being sent overseas for use in the manufacture of goods there.

Mr. McKee: That is nothing to do with this Government, is it?

Mr. McANANEY: I am talking about living standards. People are now finding it difficult to buy houses, and the Government does not have the resources to enable it to carry out its public works. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a subject that can be discussed, and I intend to spend some time on it. This country cannot go ahead unless we have natural resources and we make the best use of them.

The questions of plant efficiency, labour efficiency, management, hours of work and such things are all important. We have the Arbitration Court which some people think determines the living standards of the people. I understand that Mr. Hawke is a brainy chap and that he might finish up as President of the Australian Council of Trades Unions. Mr. Hawke tried to prove that the workers' share of the gross national product had dropped from 64 per cent to 62 per cent, but I do not know whether that is accurate. The G.N.P. includes farm income, and we cannot determine whether farm income is wages or interest on the capital invested in it. At present it is practically all wages, because despite increased production the return to the farmer is becoming less and less. If we eliminate farm income we find that the workers' share of the G.N.P. has not varied from about 70 or 71 per cent. Despite increases in wages of perhaps 250 to 300 per cent, the increase in living standards has been only 31 per cent during that period, and that is due to the increase in the total G.N.P. Therefore, it would appear that increased wages do not affect living standards as much as does the degree of ability to compete.

One of the biggest problems we are up against in Australia today is the tariff situation. We are probably faced with Britain's entry into the European Common Market, and we find that most other countries are reducing tariffs. We are reaching the stage where we are producing the wrong goods. The Commonwealth member for Wakefield (Mr. Kelly) has said that it would be better to pay some people \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year to produce nothing rather than produce something that we could import more cheaply. We must be prepared to trade on the world's markets if we wish to increase our standards of living. We reach a stage when we are changing wheat into eggs. In the process of producing eggs we use manpower, and there is the stress and strain on the fowls and all the rest of it, whereas it would be much better to export the wheat and exchange it for goods from overseas. We look on Japan as a backward country, but she is learning these things; she is giving away the things that she used to produce when she had a low-living standard, and she is now leaving India and other countries to produce those things. Japan herself has gone into bigger iron and steel production, and we should be doing the same instead of trying to produce everything, which will only give us lower living standards.

I have often spoken in this House on the subject of a balanced economy. This is an economy that creates the conditions under which private enterprise can exist and where there is a demand for goods equal to capacity to produce or the labour force available. At times we have too little demand and we have unemployment and upset budgets and feel the need for controls. We then get the thinking that is based on Labor policy, that the Government itself must control things because there is this imbalance and things are not good. The Socialist policy is that under those conditions the Socialist must own everything and that there must be controls and forward planning. However, it has been shown everywhere in the world that this planning at the centre does not work. Indeed, Russia is getting away from it because it has been proved that it does not give the people the incentive to produce. The whole Labor policy of more controls and Socialism is based on the mentality that originated in the depression years. We can see from voting trends that the people aged between 21 years and 29 years are voting Liberal and Conservative in Great Britain because they are living in a more or less affluent society. It is the people aged from 30 years to 59 years who vote Labor and who believe in Socialism, because after the time they went through they are willing to face anything; that is where the Labor support comes from.

If a country can achieve a balanced economy I do not think its people will feel the need for Socialism and planning. We get planning in private enterprise, but it is on a more limited basis. When I was talking recently to the secretary of a retail firm in Rundle Street he told me that his firm had a plan made up to 1980 but that every six months it varied that plan. The firm gets its accountant and its retail man in and, according to any change in circumstances, the policy of the firm is changed. However, that cannot be done on an overall basis at the top. All a Government can do is create the conditions under which there is that balanced economy and then each section of the community can work out its own destiny to fit into that. That is more flexible and adjustable than these rigid five-year and ten-year plans in other countries have been found to be. An endeavour to plan ahead was made in the Vernon Report, but changing circumstances prevent our knowing what will happen, and action must be taken at the level of the individual. Excessive demand brings about more industrial disputes and the movement of labour, resulting in decreased production, increased prices,

increased overtime payments and the destruction of the incentive to companies to maintain price stability. Those circumstances in turn bring about price control, which is advocated by Government members and, unfortunately, by some members on my side of the House. However, it is only at that stage that price control is needed, because we should work to bring about the correct demand and the right degree of balance.

I commend the Commonwealth Government for the work it has done over 18 years in endeavouring to keep a balanced economy. During that period, there has been an affluent society and an opposition to too many controls. Government policy of freezing bank deposits causes uncertainty. The banks do not know when deposits will be freed and, consequently, they are not able to lend. In a time of slackening down in industry, they do not know what action the Government will take. There is uncertainty about whether a man who arranges an overdraft will use the money to boost the economy or whether he will invest it in the short-term loan market.

The problem is not solved by having an unbalanced Budget and budgeting for a deficit because of a slowing down in industry and commerce. The experience in South Australia has been that the result is a deficit of much more than what was expected. Attempts to get a balanced economy have also been made by the lowering or raising of income tax, as circumstances required. This affects the wage-earner immediately but does not affect provisional tax or those paying it until one year has passed and by that time the prevailing conditions may require action in just the opposite direction. Here again, the results are not achieved quickly enough.

An endeavour to control by indirect taxation is usually made when we are facing inflation but that indirect taxation further inflates cost of production, as happened in Great Britain when their oversea funds dropped and increased costs occurred at a time when that nation did not want that to happen. One of the worst experiences in Australia was during an inflationary period when import controls were operating. The varying of interest rates does not have quick results, because no-one knows what the effect will be on the borrowing of money. The increasing of interest rates brings about inflation but still does not solve the problem.

The balance is delicate and the Socialist principle is based on extensive restriction and control. However, human nature is unpre-

dictable and we have to accept the position as it is. We probably need a reservoir on the availability of money. In any case, we ought to aim for a balanced Budget, because such a policy does not affect the amount of money available or the dealings of private enterprise. In times of surplus demand it should be necessary to float long-term loans at permanent rates of interest and to publicize the issue of special bonds and the issue of short-term loans at varying rates of interest. In times of lack of demand, however, the long-term loan raising should be reduced, with no publicity for special bonds, the non-issue of short-term loans, and the repayment of the short-term loans as they fall due. The variation of rates of taxation does not bring about balance, nor does the increasing of Government expenditure. On the contrary, Government expenditure should be kept at an even level.

The offering of loans at permanent rates of interest in an endeavour to attract money from the public by way of bond investment requires the money market to be brought under the control of the Treasury and a lack of demand gives rise to difficulty. I understand that leading authorities are thinking of the credit control of Treasury bills and I consider that a monthly assessment would give a steady balance to the economy. In these days when we are able to land a rocket on the moon, I think we could make the necessary computations to ensure full employment and the adjustment of industry to fit into that pattern.

Mr. Quirke: That will be a dreadful day!

Mr. McANANEY: There will be a high standard of living, but I do not know whether the honourable member will be happy or not. In that economy individuals will live a balanced life in which people will not be regimented with restrictions on industry and on the freedom of the individual. The general public will not know what is going on with this indirect form of control: the rate of employment would be steady and conditions would allow private enterprise to continue without control. These conditions would be directly opposed to Socialism. I support the Address in Reply, and I am sure that we shall have an interesting session. If similar legislation to that of last year is introduced, public opinion will convince the Government that some of these things are not acceptable. That is how democracy should work for the benefit of everyone.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): The honourable member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), with his boisterous and fire-eating speech, almost put me to sleep. It was a marathon effort, and the honourable member should be a contender for the leadership of the Party, or for the presidency of the showman's guild, or perhaps he could secure a position as economic adviser to the Shannon party in Rhodesia.

Mr. Jennings: Perhaps Soekarno could do with him, too!

Mr. McKEE: He is well fitted for several positions. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply, and join with previous speakers in expressing sympathy to the families of former members of Parliament who passed away during last year. The Speech opening Parliament always attracts public interest because it outlines the Government's proposals for the coming year. The matters contained in His Excellency's Speech indicate a busy session, and the proposed legislation dealing with social and other matters is important and long overdue. These changes are eagerly awaited by the people of this State. It is just over 12 months since the Labor Government took office, and during this time we have received fairly strong opposition from members opposite and their colleagues in another place. It is amazing that members opposite, finding themselves in the unfamiliar position of being in Opposition, suddenly consider—

Mr. Nankivell: We did not have much experience of it.

Mr. McKEE: —that many things are wrong with South Australia, although they had control for over 30 years. When things are different they are not the same. As a Government we welcome strong opposition. No one who voted the Walsh Government into power (and a great majority of people did that) would be pleased if Liberals praised Labor's legislation. An early complaint came from the member for Burnside about the slum-like conditions of the ramshackle Adelaide Railway Station, and this brought comments from the public. One person described it as a monument to Uncle Tom's rule. It is only one of many monuments to Uncle Tom's rule, and the Labor Government will continue to bring about changes that are desired by the majority of the people of this State. Opposition to legislation which is desired by the people, and which helps the future development of this State, will cost members opposite votes at future elections and will reduce their ranks in this House and in another place. Towards the end of last

session, Opposition members quietened somewhat because they realized the effect their opposition was having on the public, and that it was losing the sympathy of the people, because they were rejecting good, common-sense legislation that would benefit the public. Opposition members should consider this aspect.

Mr. Clark: Do you think they are capable?

Mr. McKEE: I suggest this to assist them, particularly if they wish to continue sitting in this House. They will not do us any harm in future.

Mr. Ryan: The public will decide how long they will stay here.

Mr. McKEE: Obviously they will thin out, and probably they will all go out if they carry on in the way they have carried on with sensible legislation. The capitalist press is another source of opposition to the sensible legislation of this Government. It is obvious that members opposite have close friends on the press, particularly the *Advertiser*, which has done its utmost to misinterpret legislation and distort the truth. It has purposely withheld the true facts in an attempt to confuse the public. Glaring examples of this were reports in relation to succession duties and road and railway transport legislation, but we expect this because it is only natural to expect this type of opposition from a capitalist press. It is time the press realized that the people who keep it going want to read the truth for a change. What would happen to the *Advertiser* if working people suddenly stopped buying it? All the attempts by the press to bring the Labor Government into disfavour have met with little success; they have not even put one little dent in the confidence the people have in the Government of their choice.

As the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) has just resumed his seat, this may be an opportune time to refer to an issue he raised last night. He appears to have adopted a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde attitude recently, and the "jackal" came out last night when he made a personal attack on the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), whom I think he accused of being out of his seat frequently. He should know that the member for Chaffey was a pilot who flew Lancaster bombers during the last war and that while on one operation he had to bale out at high speed from a low altitude, as a result of which he suffered a severe spinal injury that makes it difficult for him to be seated for very long.

Mr. Hurst: Especially when listening to speeches made by the member for Light.

Mr. McKEE: That would not have helped. I was pleased that His Excellency referred to the proposed scheme to construct a new oil berth remote from the centre of Port Pirie. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, will be pleased about this, as this is on the boundary of your district. Members who know the situation at Port Pirie will realize the danger that exists from the present oil berth and will know that something must be done to eliminate it. The present berth is only a stone's throw from the main street and a few hundred yards from a school attended by between 700 and 800 students, so it can be realized that if an accident occurred a major disaster would result. Some may oppose the proposal on economic grounds, but the danger outweighs any other consideration. We frequently read of serious accidents in various parts of the world when ships are being fuelled or unfuelled, and recently an accident occurred in one of the Eastern States. Because of the serious danger, I urge that serious consideration be given as soon as possible to the proposal to construct this installation on a new site.

I am happy to say that the future of Port Pirie seems to be very bright. The town is now undergoing an extensive industrial upsurge, the momentum of which is yet to be felt. In the next two years far-reaching events will take place. The extension to the Broken Hill Associated Smelters has been described by the management as the most important new development in the 50-year history of the company. When this is completed by the end of 1967, it will provide permanent employment for between 350 and 400 additional men and will increase the payroll of the company to about 2,000. As a result, the population of Port Pirie will be increased.

The construction of the standard gauge line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie is well advanced. It is expected that it will be completed by the end of 1968, when it will be possible to travel from Brisbane to Perth via Sydney, Broken Hill and Port Pirie without break of gauge. This will be a great asset to Port Pirie. Another development in the town is the reconstruction of the waterfront. Port Pirie will soon have a first-class port.

Mr. Jennings: It needed it, didn't it?

Mr. McKEE: It did. Port Pirie is recognized as one of the most important ports in the Commonwealth, as it is an outlet for the production of the Broken Hill mines. Coupled with the activities I have mentioned is the employment created in the building of about 400 houses to serve the increased work

force, so it can be seen that Port Pirie is entering a period of prosperity and advancement.

Somehow or other the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) and the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) found in His Excellency's Speech a reference to this phoney war in Vietnam. Possibly, the statement made by a colleague of Opposition members is causing them some concern. I am opposed to the conscripting of our young men under 21 to fight, and possibly die, in this undeclared war in Vietnam. Although the matter may be a Commonwealth issue, I am concerned to know that young lads from my district and throughout the State are being forced against their will to fight in this civil war that does not concern us. Clearly, most Australians (including a Commonwealth Liberal Senator) believe that the only justification for intervening in the affairs of another country is on the invitation of a genuine Government. Of course, the entire case for American and Australian intervention should rest on that point.

Mr. Casey: What about the Commonwealth Government's refusal to allow the people of Australia to see Michael Charlton's film on the Vietnam war?

Mr. McKEE: This is an undeclared war in which prisoners do not receive the protection of the Geneva Convention. We see on the television people being temporarily taken prisoners, disembowelled, and left lying in the jungle. Of course, that may be why the film was banned.

Mr. Quirke: How can it be banned?

Mr. McKEE: Prisoners are not protected by the Geneva Convention, and it is frightening to see sadistic practices on the television.

Mr. Quirke: It hasn't been banned.

Mr. Curren: It just hasn't been shown?

Mr. Jennings: No-one has been allowed to see it.

Mr. McKEE: It seems that a debate has developed on the side.

The SPEAKER: Many of the references to the Vietnam war have been made on the side and should not strictly have been permitted. Although the Address in Reply debate has a wide scope, and although references are permissible, I ask speakers not to develop them.

Mr. Jennings: What about asking a few galahs on the other side to keep quiet?

The SPEAKER: I do not direct my remarks only to the member for Port Pirie, but to speakers generally. The honourable member for Port Pirie!

Mr. McKEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I seem to have become involved in this, and I shall have to dig my way out of it. The whole world knows that South Vietnam's is a puppet Government kept in power by foreign arms and aid ever since its inception. It is perfectly clear from American, French and British press reports that corrupt military dictatorships are representing nobody's wishes but their own. If the Australian Prime Minister can convince Australians that this is not a "phoney" war, he will have no trouble whatever in securing volunteers to fight it. It has been proved in the last two world wars that Australians will not shirk their duty when the cause is justified. It is an undeclared war, for whose profit? Past experience shows that arms manufacturers and others make huge profits for which our voteless boys are expected to fight and die. I strongly support the stand taken by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Labor Party and Senator Hannaford.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech forecasts legislation of great importance to the State, and I look forward to the debates that will follow. Indeed, I believe that members opposite will have their work cut out resisting this legislation, because it is desired by the people. I have much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply and, like other honourable members, express my sympathy to the relatives of former members of the House who have departed this life during the year. I knew all of them well. I suppose Sir Richard Butler had little to thank me for because, when he left this place as Premier and contested the Commonwealth seat of Wakefield, it was the transfer of my preferences that destroyed his chances of becoming a Commonwealth member. However, that left no mark of enmity between Sir Richard and me; he was a gentleman through and through, and a courageous man in every respect who achieved mightily for South Australia. This State can well mourn his passing. Few men in South Australia engaged in industry, provided so much employment, and contributed to the development of secondary industry on such a massive scale, as did Sir Frank Perry. He, too, has left his mark on the State.

Many of us would not remember Mr. Jack Craigie; he was an exponent of single tax and knew the meaning of "Progress and Poverty" backwards; indeed, it was really his text book. Although I was not in the House

during his term, I knew him before I was a member, as well as after he left the House. He was an opponent worthy of anyone's steel and could reduce the steel of many a critic to scrap iron, because of his forcefulness and persistence as a debater. His speeches often delighted the members of this House. He represented that part of the West Coast which is now the District of Flinders.

Mr. Bert Thompson was a member of this House when I first became a member, and I had a deep regard for him. He was perfectly honest and upright, sincerely believing in his Party and what it stood for. He was courageous when he expounded its policies and showed courage at all times in his speeches. He addressed himself to every Bill that came before the House, and if members look at *Hansard* for that period they will find that the index of his questions and speeches is almost as large as that of any Minister of the Crown at that time. He believed that all members of Parliament should be interested and thoroughly understand all Acts dealt with, and this he attempted to do. I honour his memory. His Excellency's Speech is notable for its staccato brevity.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: We didn't want to tire him out.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Minister has something there. I have often felt sorry for the Vice-Regal personage as he has had to wade through long speeches at the Opening of Parliament. However, little explanation was contained in the Speech and everything was left to the imagination. The last three paragraphs of the Speech state:

45. A Supply Bill providing \$36,000,000 for the Public Service of the State during the early part of the next financial year will be laid before you.

46. In addition to the matters to which I have referred, my Ministers have under consideration Bills dealing with anatomy, audit, births, deaths and marriages, companies, Crown proceedings, dentists, firearms, health, irrigation, justices, land agents, legal practitioners, local government, marketable securities, mining, money-lenders, motor vehicles, national parks, pistol licences, police offences, police regulations, prisons, road traffic, stamp duties, underground waters and other matters.

47. I now declare this session open and trust that your deliberations will be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the State.

Never in the history of Parliamentary procedure has so little been said that contains so much room for argument. I should like to have had some information on what Bill will be introduced on anatomy.

Mr. Ryan: You will admit that we are going to be busy.

Mr. QUIRKE: I add to that, that we will never get through the work in 12 months.

Mr. Ryan: Are you going to start delaying tactics?

Mr. QUIRKE: No, but I think the Government is trying to do too much in too little time. Opposition members cannot be denied a full analysis of any measure before the House, nor can Opposition members be denied the right to discuss measures and query them in Committee until they are fully understood. If all the matters included in the Speech are going to be dealt with, we will have a busy 12 months indeed.

Another factor is that much of what has to be done is a healthy legacy the Government received from the Playford Government. The Government has found that it is not easy to govern and I am not attempting to write it down in any way. It was in the political wilderness for 30 years and, on coming into office, had to scratch around without the benefit of any administrative knowledge; not one member of the Labor Party had served in Government. Therefore, I do not believe any great criticism can be levelled at the Government for the way it has carried out its duties; but criticism can be levelled at the things it is trying to do. Nevertheless, the way the Government has responded to the urgency of the position is to its credit. In saying that, I do not mean that Opposition members will not exercise their prerogative to find out and endeavour to destroy anything they think is not to the benefit of South Australia.

Reference has been made to legislation introduced last session to increase succession duties. I oppose succession duties and have never supported them. They are the last and the bitter end of pernicious legislation designed to extract money from people. I do not think a Government is entitled to tax people in this way despite what the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) said last session. He said, in effect, that people do not make money without the assistance of other people and that, when they die, they owe something to those who assisted them. I do not agree with that in any way. Many people, without any great assistance (except from people who buy their products), make money through their own terrific efforts and through the efforts of people they employ. If they have not treated their employees fairly then they owe something to those employees,

but not to the whole of the community. I do not believe in succession duties because, if the monetary measures of any country were properly administered, there would be no need to raise money in a way that aims at the right of succession of the family of the deceased person. Of course, the way the Bill was introduced and the methods used to raise the money were particularly bad, and the Bill deserved to be destroyed. I hazard the guess that if a Bill in the same terms is introduced this session it will again be destroyed.

Last session the Government also introduced the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill, which was designed to penalize one section of the community: it was unfair and wrong. The Government has found out that money is government and government is money. It does not have sufficient money to carry out the projects it wishes to carry out. I will not criticize the Government for not having the money, nor will I say why it does not have it. No State Government in Australia has sufficient money to undertake necessary projects, and certainly South Australia has not. The Government cannot get sufficient money to provide for the continued progress of the State by measures that will build the economy only to a stage where people work in industry, where they are taxed when they buy a house and in every other way so that much of what they earn comes to the Government in taxation. I believe that to be wrong and unnecessary, and this Government is finding it out. The idea put forward by the Attorney-General here one day was that the only way to get money was to seek it from the people—"our wealthy friends", as he called them. Even if we took all they had, we would not get sufficient money to finance the programmes that South Australia needs. Socialist ideas are that we can extract from the people who have accumulated it sufficient money to run our Government, to build up State enterprises, and to provide water, power and all that sort of thing. But we cannot get it that way.

Recently there has been mention of this vast combination of Conzinc-Riotinto of Australia Limited. These people say it is necessary to drag money in from overseas because there does not exist in Australia a pool of savings sufficient to finance our enterprises. That is true to the extent that a pool of savings of such a size does not exist, but that does not mean that this country is penalized to the extent that it cannot do anything that is physically possible, provided it

has the material means and the labour with which to do it. It is well recognized that it can do anything if it is physically possible.

We are getting into a mess with housing—and not only in South Australia. I am not saying that the present Government is responsible for this mess: the whole system in Australia is responsible for it. Prices of houses are increasing all the time, thus making it almost impossible for the ordinary worker to buy a house. We know that some houses today are not readily saleable. When people apply for money with which to purchase a house, they are often asked to sell any little securities they may have: in other words, they have to get down to the bare bones in order to qualify for the money needed for purchasing a house. Having decided to buy it, a person over a period of 40 years is likely to be pensionable before finishing paying for it, and in that time he will have paid double the value of it. Is this position excusable? Is it necessary? I venture to say, as I have often said, it is not excusable. This applies not only to housing but also to pipelines for water and gas, and to roads and railways. The way the present Government tried to bolster railway finances was to increase railway traffic to return the Government \$2,000,000. Also, the Government said there would be some income from licences, which would mean still more money. But what happens? We only perpetuate the existing conditions. I maintain and have maintained for long that we have been distinctly unfair to the Railways Department in expecting it to carry the burden of debt charges except that which has been written off on the sinking fund. The deficit is \$7,000,000 but less than \$2,000,000 is a trading debt: the rest is interest. There was one worthy economist who, in giving an address over television, laid it down rigidly that one must not spend money on anything that is not economic. If we had observed this edict, we would never have built the railway line to Peterborough, Minnipa or anywhere else in South Australia.

Mr. Hudson: We would never have had many things.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes; that is what I say.

Mr. Hudson: I know. Somebody has to say that.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but the honourable member would not believe in that?

Mr. Hudson: No.

Mr. QUIRKE: Thanks very much. The railway lines to Pinnaroo and on the West

Coast and all other railway lines in South Australia have been built for years, and they have contributed greatly to the development of this State. In fact, in the early days, before road motor transport, the railways were the only form of country transport. They carried on, and the economy that was built up was based on the transport of goods by those railways, for which they received no recognition or any part of the results of production. It is time to stop all that sort of nonsense. When a Government like this Government says, "We will attempt to collect \$2,000,000 anyway by making a sectional charge on road users", and in so doing it prohibits the transport of goods by road (which is what it wants to do) and puts them on to the railways, what is the reason? To destroy the economy of many people in order to cancel out of existence money that goes to pay the debt, the debt incurred for the benefit of South Australia down through the years ever since we have had railways. Yet the Government's line of thinking is, "We have to meet that condition by still further knocking about the people of this State." It is absolutely wrong. The proposed gas pipeline to Adelaide is another matter. We do not know how we shall do it. South Australia should build that pipeline. Do not tell me that it cannot be done—because it can be. I shall not say now how it can be done. A new Budget will be before us shortly, and I shall be able then to enlarge on all these things. The member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) in her speech referred to British Columbia, a province of Canada. I have here a little paper published by the Government of British Columbia. One sends in one's name and one receives from that Government a copy of this paper. Listen to this! British Columbia has 1,600,000 people, and in March, 1952, what is called the Social Credit Government took office. In 1952, its State debt was \$222,000,000 and its fixed assets totalled \$188,000,000. In 1954, two years later, the debt had been reduced to \$184,000,000; in another two years it was down to \$156,000,000; by 1958 it had been reduced to \$95,000,000; in 1959 it was down to \$71,000,000; and in 1961 it had ceased to exist. Its fixed assets, which in 1952 totalled \$188,000,000, had increased by 1965 to \$846,000,000. I shall not tell members how this is done: I shall merely give them the figures. If it is possible to do it in British Columbia, why is it not possible to do it in South Australia? The same federal idea exists

in British Columbia, and there are limitations attached to it because they have the same limiting factors as we have under our Financial Agreement.

I shall now tell honourable members something else that will interest them. Every person in British Columbia who is buying a house gets a straightout contribution of \$110 a year. Local government, which, like our own local government, always has insufficient money, is heavily subsidized. Our local government is getting as heavily in debt as is the State; it is forever seeking to borrow money. British Columbia has 1,600,000 people, a few more than we have. Let us look at some of its other figures. In 1953 the expenditure for health and welfare was \$61,000,000, and in 1965 it was \$169,000,000. Education, which in 1953 received \$28,000,000, received \$141,000,000 in 1965. The expenditure on highways rose in that period from \$36,000,000 to \$104,000,000, and on general government it rose from \$36,000,000 to \$58,000,000. In 1953, the total amount disbursed among the people of British Columbia by that Government was \$233,000,000, whereas today the figure is \$507,000,000. In addition, it has now wiped off every penny of its national debt.

Mrs. Byrne: Isn't that inflation?

Mr. QUIRKE: It is the very antithesis of inflation.

Mrs. Byrne: Why didn't previous Governments here follow that system?

Mr. QUIRKE: I preached that, too, but with as little success as I will get preaching it to this Government, unless the member for Barossa sees the light. If she is interested in the welfare of people and wishes to find out how this thing is done, she can join forces with me. During the Budget debate I will illustrate to honourable members how simple this thing is.

Mr. Casey: You might even get a listener.

Mr. QUIRKE: I hope so. Let me contrast our efforts here. At June 30, 1965, our State debt was \$1,060,000,000, equivalent to \$1,006 a head of population, an increase of \$46 a head during the year under review. The increase certainly will not be any less under this Labor Government; in fact, it will be more this year.

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

Mr. QUIRKE: Before the dinner adjournment I made a statement to the effect that the pipeline to bring gas from Gidgealpa or anywhere else in South Australia ought to be built by the South Australian people. I am certain that that can be done but am not going to discuss the pros and cons now; that

will be more appropriate in the Budget debate. If a pipeline costs \$40,000,000 dollars, with an amortization rate of about \$3,000,000 a year, cheap gas will not be available from the field under existing conditions. It would probably be no cheaper than coal gas obtained by the orthodox method.

However, such should not be the case. This country has major assets, including known mineral deposits, and millions of dollars worth yet to be discovered. Who would have thought ten years ago that unlimited wealth was lying dormant in Western Australia? Who would have thought the same time ago that beneath the arid north lay supplies of gas and probably of oil that are almost inexhaustible? Those resources belong to Australia and the Australian people but we are ever ready to give up our birthright for the proverbial mess of pottage. It is time we changed our ideas. Efforts must be made to see that the gas from that source is supplied cheaply wherever it is used, particularly to the Electricity Trust so that the trust's already low rates for electricity will not be endangered. That authority has done a magnificent job in maintaining the supply of electricity in this State at a cheap tariff and nothing should be done to increase that cost.

It might be better to leave the gas where it is rather than have people making a profit out of the pipeline and the gas, as well as having a quick amortization over 20 years. The benefits to this State of the high British thermal unit value of gas for industry and the production of power defy description. South Australia is notably short of sources of power, although valiant efforts in the matter of power supply have returned vast dividends, particularly in cheap electricity, when the sub-bituminous coal at Leigh Creek was harnessed for the supply of energy to Adelaide. If we add to that the high calorific value of oil, or gas in default of oil, we have difficulty in calculating benefits that will accrue to industry.

We must ensure that the value of assets provided by Nature is not diverted into the coffers of people other than the consumers in such a way that the consumers have to pay a high price for electricity and the products of industry. Such a high price would not in any way tend to reduce the upward spiral of costs, which has demanded an upward spiral of wages. This upward movement has gone on for years and no-one can forecast where it will end.

There will be much talk of statutory reserve deposits and the banks will want their cash, working balances, Treasury bills and other Government securities lifted because they cannot lend sufficient money. Then \$40,000,000 will have to be paid to the banks in order to give them a lift with their liquidity so that they can lend money. However, they do not lend money; they merely extend credit. It does not cost them anything, except their administration costs, and anybody who believes otherwise lacks education on that matter. The Commonwealth Bank tells us how it is done and I have read in this House how we trade in it as a commodity and make it a first charge on everything we produce. If I had said that 26 years ago, when I first came into this House, I would have been told that it was heresy and financial blasphemy. Now there is not one word of opposition to it.

We want somebody with the courage to put it into operation and the Australian people can do that just as other people are doing it in other parts of the world. Do not tell me that the vast technological advances made by European countries such as Russia were based on this form of finance. If we have the people with the skill and administrative capacity to put in the scheme and if there is sufficient labour available, then it is possible to bring the scheme to fruition. The only thing that is not difficult to bring into existence is the credit structure to enable it to be done. I have been saying that in this House for 26 years. If I am wrong, will somebody show me where? I challenge anybody, in this House or outside, to show that I am wrong.

Mr. Hughes: As a Cabinet Minister did you try to influence your colleagues in this way?

Mr. QUIRKE: No: it would have been about as hopeless as the effort I am making now. One has to have the will to study and think this out. Evidence can be collected anywhere now: I gave some today and I can give more, and I will.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: A financial agreement exists between the Commonwealth Government and the States.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is the thing that dams everything. It is possible to get around it and it does not preclude the State doing it if it has the will, as British Columbia has done.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The State would have to go outside the agreement to do it.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but it could be done. The State Bank conforms to the demands and does not do anything outside them. It does the

same as private banks. I have no quibble with private banks nor am I smashing at anyone. They are there for profit. They exact their profit and that is the first charge on industry. We have to do something about it: no Party politics are involved in this to bring it to fruition, but it would benefit the whole of the Commonwealth. We have to do something today.

Mr. McKee: Is it a Socialist policy?

Mr. QUIRKE: It is Australian policy, but it is not Socialism. That is where I disagree with members opposite. They preach Socialism, but if they had a scheme like this they could forget that nonsense because it would be non-existent.

Mr. McKee: What would you call it?

Mr. QUIRKE: You could call it Social Credit.

Mr. McKee: Douglas Credit?

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not agree with the full plan of Douglas, because he went too far. He laid down a broad outline only of a scheme from which a person could take what was necessary for his particular interest. He was a remarkable person and his broad outline has never been destroyed, although some of his theorems have gone by the board.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: In a country like Australia it would be necessary to have a Commonwealth-State agreement.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but get the first movement of it in a State, and it can be impressed on anyone.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How could we convince Mr. McMahan?

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member could not do it; that is why there must be an illustration of the possibilities of it. It does not hurt anyone: it is a philosophy more than anything else.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Should any State go outside that financial agreement?

Mr. QUIRKE: The Government is completely impotent and cannot do it. Someone has to try it, and there must be demands from the various States. The Labor Government will not be able to carry out its programme because it does not have the money. I am not blaming the Government for that. The building of a new high school has been approved for Clare by the Public Works Committee. I do not know when it will be built, but I know that the Government cannot afford to build it. I am not blaming anyone because the Government does not have the money, and there is no place from which it can get it.

It cannot be obtained by increasing stamp duty and the other pettifogging announcements that have been made recently.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We rely on the Loan funds.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Government will not receive sufficient from that source, but perhaps it could make a start with the other States of Australia to see what can be done about making a united demand on the Commonwealth Government. Australia has no vision splendid for her young people, and no-one can deny that. The majority of people in this State are herded into Adelaide and there is an outcry that we must increase the educational facilities and that more people must go to universities. What are we going to do with them and where are they going to work? If a bricklayer were a Bachelor of Arts he may be a better bricklayer, but would he want to be one?

We educate the people, but for what purpose? Are we going to build vast dams? We cannot do anything with the Ord anyway. Sir William Hudson of the Snowy Mountains Authority, has a vision splendid for Australia that possibly he will never be called on to carry out. How did the Commonwealth Government build the Snowy Mountains scheme? It boasted that it was built with taxation money, and so it was, but the Government took the money from the taxpayers and then lent it to the authority. The first charge on the water and electricity that comes out of that scheme is the debt charge on the authority, yet it was built with taxpayers' money! Sir William Hudson told me that when the first electricity was generated he was not allowed to use it to bore the remainder of the tunnels, but it had to be fed into the mains and then back to the authority and charged to the authority, in order to make certain that the electricity that comes from the authority and the water that goes to water the plains of New South Wales (and we won't get any of it)—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes we will.

Mr. QUIRKE: All that we will get will be harmless. We get a percentage of the water that comes into the Murray River, and that is all we will get. The people of Western Australia contributed to the Snowy Mountains scheme, but they will not get anything from it. This water will have the charges on it that were originally taxation collected from the people of Australia.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The first money given was a straightout grant by Mr. Chifley: it was not a loan.

Mr. QUIRKE: It was not much because the total is \$900,000,000. Since then every bit of money has been a charge and every bit of electricity used has been charged against the authority. It has now become an annual charge for electricity and for water used for irrigation. Is there any sanity in that? Of course there isn't, but these things are supposed to be done in the interests of the Australian people. Yet at every turn in this financial order the people have to pay. It hits the young man when he wants a house. There is no earthly reason why a man buying a house for \$8,000 when he is 25 should have to pay \$16,000 for it by the time he is 65, when he will be receiving a pension and his house will have worn out, anyway. Can any member on either side of the House say that this is a fixed and immutable law that cannot be altered?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It would be nice to get rid of the debt on the railways.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and the interest is being paid on lines that were discontinued years ago. The railways never gained any advantage from the increased productivity they helped to bring to the country. There will be no benefit from stopping truck operators from carrying goods on the roads. Underneath all this is the real problem of the advancement of this country. We are bashed down in a maelstrom of debt, and everyone is having the life hammered out of him because of the debt structure that hangs over the country like a London smog. I make no apologies for bringing up this matter and I am willing to debate it anywhere at any time with anyone. If I can be proved wrong in my assumption that it is possible to do these things without harming the economy of this country I shall be prepared to admit it, but nobody has yet proved or attempted to prove me wrong. It has been said that this will cause inflation, but it will have exactly the reverse effect. A person who saves \$1,500 for a house is given \$500, but by the time he gets it the house will probably have increased in price by that much.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But if a person does not get the \$500 he still has to pay the extra, doesn't he?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but if he got that money from the State Bank or Savings Bank and, as in British Columbia, a credit issue was written off, that would be the sort of thing we want, because in writing down the debt the rent would be written down, too. That money would not be inflationary, because it would cancel the debt out of existence. This principle can be used in this way to relieve all costs. I

mean not that the money should be handed out flamboyantly but that it should be handed out where it is needed to check costs, to keep down the price of a house so that it is within the reach of the man who wants it, to build the Chowilla and other dams, to build beef roads and other roads, and to harness rivers. These are the ways it should be fed into the economy, as these are the charges that are killing us today. This is not inflationary. When an overdraft is paid off, this is done with money that is earned. The sum that is paid off goes out of existence, and the same applies to the charges I have been speaking about. The same applies to farmers who produce, say, \$200,000,000 worth of produce and have an overdraft of \$100,000,000; when the overdraft is paid off that sum goes out of existence. What I have suggested would have a steadying influence. The economy can be given a lift at any time if this is done instead of our waiting until advances are made to such an extent that they cause an upward spiral in costs, when a credit squeeze is necessary to bring down prices. However, they are never brought down; increases may be stopped but prices start from that point later.

After 20 years I am still preaching financial blasphemy and heresy, and I shall continue to do so for as long as I draw breath, because, unless we alter the scheme, the future of Australia will not be one in which young people will be looking over the horizon at a vision of plenty but one in which they will look at a suburban existence in which they are harnessed to cities. All the splendour of their youth will be burnt out in jobs that are of practically no importance to the people of this country. We must exploit this country to its utmost, and we do not need to go overseas to get the capital to do it. I do not object to some overseas capital coming here so long as we retain a controlling interest. We need to buy machinery that we do not make here, and we do not want to make all the things we need, because we must trade with other countries if they are prepared to buy from us. There is no other way to work overseas trade. However, I will now leave this subject. From the time I was knee high to a grasshopper I never thought I would see the day when an ordinary hen egg would cost 5c.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Of course, the cost of living has increased by five times.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know that, but we are still providing cheap breakfasts overseas. The export price is 12c a dozen, I believe.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: There are many other costs before eggs reach the consumer.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know that, but all we get is 12c, so the costs incurred before the eggs reach the consumer are heavy when they bring the cost up to 60c. I know this has to be, but in this respect we are the victims of our own economy.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: As with other produce, the oversea price is lower than the home price.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, this applies to dried fruit, butter and other things, but is it vital that this be so? Under the existing system, it is, but under a radically different system it could be altered. I shall deal now with wine grapes. A few years ago people used to drink brindle, which was half muscat and half port, and they thrived on it. The worst thing that can ever happen is to fix the price of wine grapes, whereupon the grapegrower thinks he has the winemaker where he wants him. Of course, the winemaker is at least as much to blame as anyone else; I have told winemakers that they have brought it on themselves. However, nothing has been achieved. It is all right this year, when wine production is down 6,000,000 gallons and every grape needed. With a bumper crop, however, it will be a different story.

What happens if, the price of wine grapes having been fixed at, say, \$48 a ton, a winemaker agrees to pay, and stipulates gordsos at 15 baume, but cannot obtain them? Can we compel anyone to take the grapes? Sugar in grapes represents money, particularly when the grapes are processed into brandy, because that brandy is first sugar, and fermentation converts it into alcohol. Dry red and white wines are made from low baume grapes, but the lower the baume of the grape to be processed into a sweet wine, the more expensive the process becomes. The more sugar a grape contains, the less required in fortifying spirit, because sugar converted into alcohol makes its own fortification. I do not look on the price-fixing of wine grapes as a solution to the problem, nor on more co-operative wineries on the river as solving anything.

One co-operative industry should have its own brand on the market, but that is not done; it is preferred to sell the product to the big proprietary wineries. Most winemakers have a little of their product on the open market but it is only a pint-pot compared with the total wine made. A Nuriootpa winery has worked to this end magnificently, and a winery

at Clare has its own outlet. The co-operative river wineries which compete with each other should be just as co-operative in their sales as they are in handling the product. A co-operative winery that may commence competing with the others is no solution to the problem. However, a blending centre that established its own line would have gone far towards easing the problem now confronting co-operative wineries. We can still over-produce; wine grapes are still being planted, and the problem will inevitably recoil on our heads.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There must be a limit to what can be planted in irrigated areas.

Mr. QUIRKE: But wine grapes can be planted in other areas, too. Turning now to transport, I point out that I advanced a theory last year that the public transport system could be rearranged to provide for travel right through Adelaide in each direction during peak periods, one bus following the other, and charging a fixed fee of, say, 10c. Oh, no, that would never work! It could not be done; it would never pay! However, passenger buses will never pay any more than the railways will pay. We must relieve Adelaide's traffic problems and forget all our ideas about making something pay. What I advocate would, indeed, pay indirectly, by removing the heavy costs to the city created by the thousands of cars that traverse Adelaide daily, carrying only one person. One has only to stand on any main arterial road leading to Adelaide to see 80 per cent of passing cars carrying only one person. That is wrong, but existing transport facilities do not encourage motorists to leave their cars at home. Motor buses are run on lines almost as fixed as those on which the tramcars ran. Would-be passengers often must travel long distances in wet weather to reach a bus stop, and it is not a pleasant job having to paddle, say, three-quarters of a mile to reach a bus stop and waiting to be picked up.

Mr. Hudson: Do you still travel that way?

Mr. QUIRKE: No.

Mr. Casey: A glaring example of that exists in King William Road, opposite this building, where people wait in the open for a bus.

Mr. QUIRKE: The public puts up with it, but it is wrong. We should send an order to Japan or some other place for a fleet of small buses (maybe 400 or 500 of them). The Tramways Trust's vehicles at present in use are magnificent units, but cost about \$40,000 each.

We must pick up people in between the main routes, using smaller vehicles and delivering passengers to different parts of the city.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You have to have drivers for these vehicles.

Mr. QUIRKE: Of course you do, but surely the driver is not the obstacle.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We cannot run it at a complete loss.

Mr. QUIRKE: It will never be made to pay completely.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There's a reasonable chance of paying the wages of the driver of a large unit.

Mr. QUIRKE: Outside the peak period those large units are empty.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But three small buses would have to take the place of three drivers.

Mr. QUIRKE: The capital outlay involved in that is a mere bagatelle. I am not worried so much about the cost: I am concerned with emptying this city of the surplus motor cars that are now cluttering it up, and being able to breathe the air at 5 p.m., free of the smell of carbon monoxide that poisons the atmosphere. We must reduce the distance that a person travels from his house to where he boards a vehicle.

Mr. Hudson: Do you favour suburban re-development?

Mr. QUIRKE: So long as people could be transported. Let us consider the Wattle Park Teachers College. If a student boards in an area north of the college and travels to it by bus it costs him 60c for the return journey; no cross-country bus service is available. My son, with others at the Wattle Park college, has to go to Warradale to teach (and they are paid for doing it), and these students have to put up with a time lag caused by their need to change buses to get there.

Mr. Hudson: I suppose he put it on his old man to get him a car!

Mr. QUIRKE: Of course, and it worked; he has a car. I looked at what was involved and, as I could afford to buy him a car, I could not in conscience let him go to the trouble involved in travelling early in the morning and late at night, changing buses three times, and then teaching in a school. That would not have been right, so he has a motor car. However, everybody cannot afford to do that. If there were a bus service that could get my son within cooee of the place where he teaches he would probably use it—it would be cheaper than running a car. I

do not know the answer to this problem, but perhaps people should be encouraged to use small vehiclees, which would reduce the distances involved, instead of taking their cars into Adelaide.

Many parking stations are proposed for Adelaide, and during last week three proposals have been made known. Parking stations are already established on top of the Central Market and next to Miller Anderson's and John Martin's. There is talk of a station being built on top of the Adelaide Railway Station and, apparently, the South Australian Hotel is to have one. These stations will not do the job at all because the number of motor-cars is increasing faster than these places can be built and, in the future, cars will still have to be parked around Adelaide streets even though \$20,000,000-odd worth of city property has been cluttered up with car parks. This problem needs more than superficial study and now is the time for careful study to be done. The people must be offered an alternative to taking their cars to Adelaide.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Good public transport.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Some people have a good transport service and only have to walk outside their house to get a bus.

Mr. QUIRKE: Some people would want a service even better than that.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The public transport system is not that bad.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am talking about too many motor cars being used. It needs only the traffic lights to fail and one mug to do the wrong thing, and a whole intersection is jammed until a policeman comes along and sorts out the trouble. Such a situation can develop quickly into a maelstrom of hate with people arguing the point with one another. I do not know whether any city in the world has yet overcome the problem. Sydney and so many other cities have a far worse problem than has Adelaide and, in each case, the problem is rapidly becoming worse. However, the design of our city lends itself to some system that would alleviate the position and render unnecessary the cluttering up of the streets with these vehicles.

I have spoken in nearly every Address in Reply debate since I have been a member of the House, and I may have the opportunity to speak in only one more. If all the words spoken over the last 26 years by me and all other members who have spoken on these

motions had remained unspoken, there would not have been a ripple in the political life of Australia.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): In supporting the motion, I congratulate both its mover and seconder on their fine contributions to the debate. I congratulate them on the way they delivered their speeches and on the subject matter they raised which was to the benefit of their electors and to the whole of the State. Members on this side have always maintained that the Address in Reply debate was important and, by and large, most members recognize this fact. Of course there are inevitable, and even notable, exceptions, but they are to be pitied rather than criticized because, apparently, they do not have what it takes to make a genuine contribution towards the welfare not only of the people they represent but also of the people as a whole. Like most members, I frown on anyone speaking along the lines to which we had to listen last night when a member opposite conducted more or less a smear campaign. I suggest to that honourable member that he should heed the words of his Leader, who once said quite openly (it was heard by many members) that any contribution, political or otherwise, that this honourable member made would be purely coincidental.

First, I wish to deal with rail standardization, which was mentioned briefly by the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), as it affects part of his district. Most of the line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie is in my district. When in Opposition, Labor Party members strongly advocated, and even moved a resolution (which was supported by the whole House), that representations should be made to the Commonwealth Government to standardize this line. Satisfactory progress has been made, and it is to be hoped that the standardization will be completed on schedule. When the work is finished a complete link will exist from the east to the west of Australia. This is highly desirable at a time when we are finding that transportation costs must be kept to a minimum in order to satisfy the requirements of industries that have sprung up not only in the Eastern States but also in South Australia. Now we find that Western Australia is booming industrially, and will continue to do so in the years to come. But, of course, in order to gain a true perspective of the railways system in Australia, we have to look at the present position of the co-ordination of transport. We discover that over the years startling figures have been produced because of this

co-ordination of transport, to such an extent that over the last 12 months the tonnage carried has risen. The forwarding agents are mainly responsible for this. They, of course, have a contract with the railways whereby they go out, pick up the goods, cart them to the rail-head, and load them into vans in several ways, either in bulk on certain types of van or by containers on other types of van. The flexivan (as it is commonly known) caters for several types of commodity, both refrigerated and unrefrigerated.

The total tonnage handled through these forwarding agents between Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide during the financial year ended June 30, 1954, was only 77,461 tons, whereas for the financial year ended June 30, 1965, it had soared to 604,703 tons. So it can be seen that in that 11-year period the tonnage had increased eightfold. Of course, the aim of all railway systems throughout the Commonwealth is to get some type of co-ordination of transport, by road and rail. Most States have been more or less free in their railway system compared with South Australia. We, unfortunately, have been bogged down with our change of gauge. We have three different gauges in South Australia, which is not the case in any other State. Unfortunately, this has been the greatest barrier to our railway network and its revenue-producing avenues not only to the previous Government but also to the present Government. However, when this standardization from Broken Hill to Port Pirie is completed, I can see nothing else but a tremendous increase in the quantity of goods carried on that line, which would of course naturally increase the railway revenue. Not only that, but I think the time has come (and I commend the Government for setting up a Royal Commission into transport in this State) when we cannot ignore what they have in other States, and particularly in Victoria, where last year I discussed their regulations with the Secretary of the Transport Regulation Board. The Road and Rail Transport Bill that was introduced into this House last year was only minor compared with the type of regulation in Victoria today. For example, road transport in Victoria is not in any circumstances permitted to bulk carry, or carry in any shape or form, cement between Geelong and the city of Melbourne. Over there, a Liberal Government, which has been in power for many years, found that this type of legislation was necessary to protect the railway interests in that State.

Victoria being a much smaller State in area than is South Australia, not only has it no complications because of different rail gauges: it has a 5ft. 3in. network, and now it has a direct link with Sydney with a 4ft. 8½in. gauge. Because it is not complicated, Victoria's railway transport system is easy to manage whereas, unfortunately, we have these breaks in gauge. Several years ago I inspected the bogie system operating in the Eastern States, and particularly in Victoria. Over there, they are finding that this is probably the answer to the problems of unloading and loading goods carried between States.

It is to be hoped that this type of system will be built and used in Australia in future years. Strangely enough, I understand that it has been used in Russia for 30 or more years, but only recently have we cottoned on to the idea here in Australia and put it to good use. It has the effect in Victoria of cargoes not being handled at all. For example, the forwarding agent seals his container and puts it on to the truck, and it is not touched again until it reaches its destination in Sydney or Brisbane. This is what the railways require—an incentive to people to use them.

Concerning the development of industries, over the past decade South Australia has increased its production, particularly of manufactured lines, to a staggering extent. Nevertheless, it has not been alone in this field, because most States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, have probably outstripped us, mainly because they have a better access to world markets from the big ports on the east coast of Australia. We have to have a really wide appreciation of the position in which industries find themselves in any State today. This applies not only to our own State but also to the other States of the Commonwealth. What do we find in industry today? Competition is particularly strong between companies and between manufacturers in any field. We more or less encourage competition in order to get a better product and to try to force the price down so that it becomes more competitive and the product more accessible to the general public. The Premier is to be congratulated on setting up a Premier's Department soon after he assumed office, with the idea of channelling all the information regarding industries into this department. I think we can go further and appoint an officer, a person whom I would call an industries promotion officer, although he could be called an industries development

officer. Such a man should be appointed, and he should have free rein throughout the State. This man would have committees, such as the Industries Development Committee, to which he could always refer. I understand that you, Mr. Speaker, have been a member of that committee for many years. No doubt that committee could supply this officer with much information about the State in general. I think he could visit the main towns in South Australia and so become absolutely conversant with the State as a whole and be able to negotiate on behalf of the Government with oversea manufacturers who wished to establish industries here.

Mr. Hughes: Mr. Bellchambers is such an officer.

Mr. CASEY: Although Mr. Bellchambers has been appointed to such a role I do not think he is a full-time officer. I have no doubt at all that he is most competent, but I think the amount of work he is required to do in other spheres in the department is just too much. I have no doubt that in past years we lost industries because we could not find the time to negotiate properly or to give all the information required and perhaps a little finesse here and there that a full-time officer probably would be able to give. I think other countries of the world have adopted this idea, and I have a sneaking feeling that Western Australia appointed such an officer not long ago. If we wish to entice industries to this State we must have a man competent to deal exclusively with industrial businessmen. Last year I travelled through Ireland, which is a very backward country, both in primary and secondary industry.

Mr. Quirke: Are you speaking of Northern Ireland?

Mr. CASEY: Unemployment is one of the big problems in Northern Ireland. Of course, it receives a grant of about £12,000,000 to £14,000,000 sterling a year to help its economy, and British industries are establishing there. A tremendous sum is coming into the south from West Germany, and industries are popping up in cities like Dublin and particularly in Cork, which is going ahead quickly even on our standards. Of course, the Irish people are finding that they have to restrict the money coming into the country so that the whole of the economy is not bled by oversea capital. I am pleased that they are awake to that possibility.

Mr. Freebairn: Mr. Ford used to have a factory in Cork.

Mr. CASEY: As far as I know, Ford cars are still manufactured there. As well as our own manufacturing industry in this State we have our rural industries which are probably our most important ones. We on this side are aware that much of the gross national product of Australia depends to an enormous degree on our primary industries. I think members would find that without our primary products such as wool, wheat, meat and dairy produce we would not be able to maintain the industrial growth that has taken place in this country since the second World War. Strangely enough, most of our primary products have shown a remarkable increase since then, more so than at any other time. For example, the volume of foodstuffs exported from Australia since 1947-48 has doubled, and it has increased by a remarkable percentage of 60 per cent in the last five years.

Mr. McAnaney: Yet the net farm profits have fallen considerably.

Mr. CASEY: I have not gone into the full statistics. However, without this primary produce we would obviously not be able to expand industrially, because industrial expansion is tied up with rural expansion. South Australia has been unfortunate in the last year because we have had a very lean year with our cereal cropping. I take this opportunity of thanking the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) for supplying me with figures. As members know, the member for Ridley is an expert in these things and has much information at his fingertips. In 1961-62, South Australia produced 30,712,000 bushels of wheat; in 1962-63 production totalled 34,993,000 bushels; in 1963-64 it was 51,593,000 bushels (that, of course, was the boom year); and in 1964-65, another very good year, the figure was 49,875,000 bushels. In 1965-66, because of adverse seasonal conditions, the crop was poor. Of course, the farmer cannot plan readily from year to year for he does not know how the season will turn out: if the rains come he is home and hosed, whereas if they do not come he is down the drain. Production for the last year was down to 36,151,000 bushels.

Mr. Shannon: How much is that above the average of the State for the last 20 years?

Mr. CASEY: I could not say.

Mr. Shannon: I could.

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member will be able to explain that. I did not say there was a drought; I said it was a lean year. I think the acreage sown has increased in the last 20 years, because much more land has come into production in that time.

Mr. Shannon: The only figures of any value would be those showing bushels to the acre.

Mr. CASEY: I do not know what the member for Onkaparinga is trying to imply, but I think he realizes that, if we got 36,000,000 bushels last year from a large acreage—

Mr. Shannon: What acreage?

Mr. CASEY: I could not say, but I think the acreage would be considerably more than it was 20 years ago. I do not know what members are trying to insinuate. The only point I tried to make was that our wheat production last year was much lower than it was in the two previous years. As I have said, in 1963-64 production was more than 51,000,000 bushels, in 1964-65 it was 49,000,000 bushels and in 1965-66 it was only 36,000,000 bushels, so there was a decrease of 13,000,000 bushels over the previous year and of 15,000,000 bushels over the year before that.

Mr. McAnaney: A big crop was carried on the railways from June to December, so the Government got the revenue from that.

Mr. CASEY: Members opposite are talking nonsense. I cannot see the significance of what they are saying. If the honourable member had been listening to what I said originally, he would be able to follow the text of it. I suppose we have all the great wool and wheat growers in the State on the Opposition benches and they are going to expound their theories in one way or another. They are trying to make, in the words of William Shakespeare, much ado about nothing.

I am pleased that the member for Gouger, now that he is perhaps going to take a different role, has seen the light. The rural industries of South Australia are playing an important part in the overall development of the State. As I pointed out previously, we would not have been able to develop industrially as we have done without the rural industries of the Commonwealth. I do not hear any dissentient voice from the Opposition, so they must be happy about that.

Mr. Quirke: And you must be correct.

Mr. CASEY: That is right. I am thankful.

Mr. Freebairn: Have you permission to say this?

Mr. CASEY: There is nothing controversial about what I am telling the House or about the policies of this Government. The Government realizes the difficulties, not only in the rural industries but in the whole State. We on this side always look at the complete picture,

not at one particular section, whereas members opposite are at times inclined to look at one section only. I think our rural industries are in a fortunate position today. The season has opened well. I do not know how the member for Stirling ranks as a wool producer but I know that the member for Victoria is a producer of good wool. He received good prices at the Adelaide wool sales last year, and I think he was happy about them.

It is difficult to make estimates regarding prices and annual production, and the whole gross national product of Australia fluctuates considerably. I think the responsibility for the fluctuation rests with one-sixth of that gross national product. In order to explain this more fully, I point out that vast mineral resources have been discovered in Western Australia in recent years. Iron ore deposits in the north-west of that State are being developed to a large extent and iron ore is being shipped to Japan. Also, coal from Gladstone in Queensland is being shipped to Japan. Gas and oil are being found in many parts of Australia. As the member for Burra said, nobody knew 20 years ago that these resources existed. This fact has helped to upset the economists and the Australian economic outlook in the last decade, because we do not know from year to year what the gross national product will be. I consider that the dairying industry, in which I know the member for Onkaparinga is vitally interested, is in a sorry plight today. The member for Onkaparinga, the member for Mitcham and the member for Gouger almost had a stand-up fight last year over margarine. I would prefer to eat butter any day. I have never liked margarine. When I am at home, I enjoy fresh milk. I think it was the member for Mitcham who said something about "Kangaroo" brand butter being sold in England, and how someone thought it was made from the milk of kangaroos. When I was in London last year many people told me they ate "Kangaroo" brand butter, and said that it was about time Australia had a brand name that was typically Australian. I did not hear anything about its being made from the milk of kangaroos. People were happy to know that this butter was an Australian product, and they said it was first class.

Mr. Shannon: The Australian Dairy Produce Board handles this product.

Mr. CASEY: That is a good thing. However, our quotas for England are diminishing year by year. At one time in Great Britain our butter was priced at an all-time low of 240s.

sterling a hundredweight, which was about 2s. a pound. It has improved slightly, and now the price is 300s. sterling a hundredweight.

Mr. Hall: What does it sell for?

Mr. CASEY: I think it compares with the price at which it is sold here.

Mr. Hall: Who gets the profit in the United Kingdom?

Mr. CASEY: That would be a matter between the board and those receiving it there, as there would be certain expenses for the work done. The outlet we have to consider today is South-East Asia, and I do not mean the industrially backward countries. It has been proved that the large industrial countries import most goods. America imports a tremendous quantity, as does Australia, and the best market we have in South-East Asia is Japan. That country has a large dairying industry, but our exports of cheese to Japan are increasing every year. Unfortunately, our exports to Great Britain are decreasing, and I understand that England will join the European Common Market within five years.

Mr. Shannon: Are they waiting for Charlie to die?

Mr. CASEY: I do not know about that. We could not compete with common market countries, and will have to look to other countries. Our best market today in South-East Asia is Japan, followed by Hong Kong, and then the Philippines. In the last few years sheep from South Australia have been exported to Western Australia. At present, the sheep population of this State is about 17,000,000, better pasture development in the South-East and other parts of the State being responsible for this slight increase in sheep numbers. Recent developments in Western Australia, particularly in the last few years, have resulted in a market that is estimated to require about 16,000,000 sheep for these newly developed and developing areas. That is a healthy outlook for our rural industries.

It is apparent that tourists are finding the outback popular, and this has been reflected in recent surveys made by organizations throughout the Commonwealth. The Australian Automobile Association has undertaken a survey known as "Operation Capricorn" to foster the tourist industry in outback areas. In South Australia we have a pleasant tourist resort at the chalet at Wilpena Pound in the Flinders Ranges. The many members who have visited this place have thoroughly enjoyed the hospitality at the chalet and the scenery. The outlying areas farther to the North and into

the Far North-West are becoming popular with South Australian people and those from other States. Certain small tourist organizations conduct safaris in four-wheel drive vehicles for five or six people. These camping trips could develop in this State because we have some of the most picturesque scenery in Australia, particularly to the north-west of Oodnadatta and to the north and north-east of Wilpena Chalet. Well defined tracks will have to be built into these outlying areas. It would cost an enormous sum to lay bitumen roads, but they are not required in this area, for they would not stand up to conditions in such a vast and uninhabited locality. Indeed, most of the tourists using their own vehicles in the area would require nothing more than a track. The tourist potential in this part of the State should be exploited. People will soon be readily jumping at the chance to visit many of our remote outback areas that abound not only in wild life but in natural fauna as well.

Much has been said about a gas pipeline from the Far North to the metropolitan area, but I was shocked to hear the Leader of the Opposition say what he did because, if he had been genuine in 1964, when the life of the Gidgealpa field was estimated at 20 years, he should have been making plans to construct a pipeline from the North, not only from Gidgealpa. Even if he were inclined to be a little hesitant in regard to Gidgealpa, he should have concerned himself with Mereenie. I agree with his remarks that the pipeline represents a national obligation; it is the Commonwealth Government's duty to come to the party. However, I became utterly sick and tired of hearing question after question asked about the potential of the Gidgealpa field. Gas has recently been discovered in Victoria, but if some groundwork had been undertaken in 1964, we could have been 18 months ahead of other States in planning our approach to the Commonwealth Government on this matter, sitting in the box seat on negotiations to construct a pipeline.

Mr. Heaslip: When will Melbourne receive gas?

Mr. CASEY: I do not know.

Mr. Heaslip: Have a guess!

Mr. CASEY: The point is, we knew in 1964 that the potential life of the Gidgealpa field was 20 years.

Mr. Heaslip: We did not!

Mr. CASEY: I am sorry to disagree with the honourable member, but what I have said is true. However, we now find that we shall

have to compete with Victoria (and perhaps other States as well) in our approach to the Commonwealth Government. At the time, the Leader's tongue was in his cheek; he is genuine now, but he missed the boat. Naturally, he is only human, and I do not speak about him derogatorily. A long session lies ahead of us, and legislation will be introduced that will benefit the whole State. I am indeed interested to see that a Bill will be introduced to establish a totalizator agency board, in which I have a stake. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. There is no better note on which I could commence than that of the visit to South Australia by Her Majesty the Queen Mother, for we all know what that did for South Australia. Indeed, the affection shown to Her Majesty by South Australians illustrates the meaning to them of the ties of the Throne. It is a little over 12 months ago that I first spoke in the House at a time when we were contemplating the Labor Government's first term in office in South Australia for 32 years. That session was historic and record-breaking. I have heard His Excellency's Speech described by some honourable members as the best yet and by others as the worst ever in opening Parliament. The varying expressions concerning the Speech clearly demonstrate the opinions of the two Parties, although I must not forget here to include the Independent member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott). The Speech, containing 47 paragraphs as well as a host of messages warning members, in effect, of the busy time ahead, has a sting in its tail. Paragraph 46 refers to not fewer than 45 Bills in addition to referring ambiguously to "other matters" to be considered.

Even to a simple country soul like I, it seems that we are due to burn some midnight oil but, like my colleagues, I am looking forward to the session. We have already heard some fine speeches made from this side of the House, and no doubt some analytical and searching examinations will be made concerning what the Government has achieved thus far and what it intends to introduce this session. The Opposition's function is to oppose, and undoubtedly there will be some heavy clashes during the session. However, we should all remember that our differences are purely political and in no way personal. I appreciate

how well I have been received in the House by members on both sides of the Chamber.

Members have referred to the passing of the Hon. Sir Frank Perry. I met him only once when I first entered the House as a member. I join with the expressions of condolence that have been made to his family. Reference has also been made to the passing of Sir Richard Butler, Mr. Albert Thompson and Mr. E. J. Craigie. Mr. Craigie was the member for Flinders, a district on Eyre Peninsula where I was brought up, and I remember him from my boyhood days. I first set foot in Parliament House as the result of a visit arranged by Mr. Craigie. Because of illness he was not here that day and I was shown around by Sir John McLeay, who was then the Independent member for Unley and is now the Speaker of the Commonwealth Parliament.

During last session some members suffered bouts of illness. We were all pleased when our friend, the Minister of Lands, recovered from a serious illness and returned to be elevated to such a high position. His promotion shows the esteem in which he is held by his Party, and the care and attention he has given to the duties of his office and the manner in which he has discharged them show that he has quite clearly vindicated the confidence his colleagues placed in him. We are pleased that the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has recovered from his indisposition, and I look forward to his contributions to the debate. His beliefs on certain matters are different from mine but he expresses them fearlessly and I look forward to hearing what he has to say this session. The member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) has fully recovered; we are pleased to see him here and look forward to benefiting from his great knowledge.

The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) underwent a major operation and now seems to be better than ever. No doubt we shall hear some of the mighty, devastating utterances for which he is famous. I remember visiting the House several years ago and hearing the member for Adelaide in the full flight of his oratory. I think he was getting encouragement from the then member for Light (Mr. Hambour) and the sparks were fairly flying. As a matter of fact, the honourable member nearly put me off ever contemplating becoming a member of Parliament. It is good to see him in fine spirits again. We are glad to see him fit and able to occupy his position in the Chair of the House from where he will give us the benefit of his impartial and efficient approach to what is not an easy task.

Speaking of those of our number who suffered illness last session, I am reminded of the durability and resilience of the human frame. For the Ministers it must have been an arduous task to be up all night and back at their offices next morning, looking their impeccable selves, to deal with the business of the day. On this side of the House some of our senior members gave us a fine example of stamina. The Leader of the Opposition got better as the nights wore on. Of course, the wily fox is always most dangerous after midnight. This applied, too, to the members for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) and Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), who made a fine speech at 2.45 a.m., and also to the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg). All these gentlemen are crowned with canescent splendour yet met their chores with a youthful enthusiasm that gave the complete lie to such an adornment. Here we had a practical example of minds with all the benefit of wide knowledge and long experience in State affairs, clearly examining the legislation before the House and forcefully setting a pattern with enlightening argument. I think this is something of which young members like myself and the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) should all be mindful.

For your part, Mr. Speaker, I believe I said in my maiden speech last session that I had the pleasure of first hearing you when you addressed a gathering at Naracoorte, and at that time I formed a high opinion of you and decided you were a man with the interests of everybody at heart. It was a particular pleasure to me to see you elected as Speaker of this House. I did not visualize then, Sir, that you were on the threshold of such a long and arduous task and I think it must have been the excellent start you had in your early days in the South-East and the subsequent toughening up process of the North that physically endowed you to stand up to such a strain. Of course, with your long associations with Parliament, you were able to preside over this House during a long and difficult session with distinction to your district and with credit to yourself.

Much has been said about the speeches of the mover and seconder of the motion. I listened carefully to the speech of the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), who dealt with matters affecting his district. I do not know a great deal about the wine industry, but as I listened to the honourable member I could not help but feel how important each industry is to the State's economy and be impressed with the

incumbency devolving on each one of us, as members of this House, to appreciate and understand the needs of others. In a general way (although I did not agree with everything he said) the honourable member set a good example as he dealt with district matters, but I noticed that he did not relish some leading interjections from this side of the House. I cannot blame him for that because, perhaps, it is not good practice to buy into fights so early in the session. I appreciated his remarks and enjoyed his speech. I also enjoyed the speech of the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), who took a moderate line and dealt with district matters.

My Leader referred to paragraph 6 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. Of course, brevity is the soul of wit and, although this paragraph is small, it refers to matters that are important to the State. As the Leader said, it is a simple statement encompassing wide and important components of the State's economy. It states clearly that the Government will continue to pursue policies designed to make full use of the State's potential in agriculture, mining, land settlement, irrigation, forestry and other fields. We seem to have this ambiguous phrase into which anything can be read, but we shall see what unfolds as the months pass. What is contained in paragraph 6 is a commendable declaration and I sincerely hope the Government will be able to give effect to the encouragement of the expansion in the fields mentioned.

Mr. Nankivell: It says "make full use of".

Mr. RODDA: Yes, but, if they can encourage and make full use of, we shall get somewhere. The availability of money seems to be a limiting factor that could place some current restriction on what are desirable ideals for the State's development.

Mr. Jennings: Didn't you listen to the member for Burra?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, I listened to what the member for Burra had to say. We also had some worthy utterances from the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) but, in spite of what they said, I wonder where this money will come from.

We have already had mention in this House of the Kimba water scheme being deferred and some slowing down on the Keith to Taillem Bend water scheme. Since becoming a member of this House, many things have puzzled me and, indeed, have gone right over my head. I cannot say that I have become proficient at understanding the ramifications of the financial

statements of the Treasury but at least I pay due respect to what I have heard my Leader say on many occasions (and I think the member for Burra made a similar remark this evening), that finance is Government and Government is finance. From being a practising man on the land, I know from experience the necessity of keeping costs down and the need to plough back profits, if any.

Mr. Ryan: If you do not understand, you cannot criticize.

Mr. RODDA: I am not criticizing; I am trying to be helpful. If a man has no profits to plough back, of course he has to borrow funds to get projects going on a "first things first" basis and in such a way that it will step up the payable production, thereby adding to one's income. This may be over-simplifying this issue, but the pattern would no doubt be the same when applied to the financial needs of the State. I have no doubt that the Treasurer at this time is having his fair share of concern at deciding what are first things and what to put first. I am also equally sure that, given reasonable seasons, every one of the phases mentioned in paragraph 6 will soon add great lustre to his Treasury.

Mr. Nankivell: He is trying to find something to plough out, not back.

Mr. RODDA: Not that I am suggesting he should get over-enthusiastic about increasing taxes or like charges in these fields; on the contrary, I suggest he give full and conducive encouragement to their expansion. Again reflecting on last session, I think every member of this House was pleased to see the two great rural portfolios, Lands and Agriculture, divided and becoming separate entities with the passing of the necessary legislation for a ninth Minister. I said last year that I thought there should be 10 Ministers: I see no reason to alter that view. I do not think we would have much trouble in finding a candidate to go on to the Treasury benches, although I do not know whether we could squeeze him in on the front bench as there are some broad beams over there and plenty of "togetherness". We might have to extend the front bench. In this important field of agriculture, with good husbandry and paying due heed to the latest findings of our backroom boys, the man on the land can with some encouragement make a real contribution to the State coffers and indeed to what is covered by this important paragraph 6 of the Speech.

Mr. Heaslip: He always has.

Mr. RODDA: I say he can do more with some help. I emphasize this to the Minister of Agriculture, who is the No. 1 farmer of the State; indeed, he is a king size farmer Giles. I say this with full V.I.P. emphasis.

Let us take this sunny South-East, where by repute it rains for nine months of the year and drips off the trees for the other three. I would not take that description too literally, but we do enjoy a good rainfall. We, of course, require good spring rains to ensure bulk pastures, an adequate seed set and attached to a characteristic non-evaporative winter the sub-soil becomes well and truly saturated. This set of conditions, simply, is the basic requirement to grow an adequate pasture. I cannot emphasize too strongly to the Minister and to the House that the best and cheapest form of fodder for any grazing animal is good pasture—and I mean good pasture, not just annual rubbishy short-term grasses that foist their undesirable presence on our countryside. We are all too familiar with these great yellow fields we see in the springtime, signifying the smothering insect-loaded takeover by the dandelion (or cape weed, as it is called in some parts of the South-East). This clearly is an indication to every producer that our pastures are not what they could be. With the advent of the small seed industry and the great progress that has been made in the development of pasture grasses and equally important legumes to suit every soil type, there is no reason at all why every arable acre in the pastured areas of this State should not be stepped up productively. This could be done at least twofold, and with some initiative, observation and scientific application the results could be fantastic.

Mr. Heaslip: With a 40-hour week?

Mr. RODDA: No. The 40-hour week is not considered in the line I am talking about. We must not lose sight of the fact that we have to have an adequate fertilizer programme, and in that regard I am pleased that the Government is looking at phosphate deposits in this State.

Mr. Hughes: The honourable member would not work many more hours than 40.

Mr. RODDA: I am not given to boasting; I think actions speak louder than words.

Mr. Hughes: That is right.

Mr. RODDA: The natural gas industry, with its by-products, can be a wonderful asset to our agricultural industries. I think I said last year that the area south of Keith had about 4,500,000 sheep and 250,000 cattle.

There is still much land capable of being developed, and indeed each year many thousands of acres of new land is being brought under production. This sounds all very well but, of course, it is not the complete story, and despite what we say about the high rainfall there come times when we incur the wrath of the Gods and we have poor Springs and sparse Autumns even in this widely acclaimed garden of the south, and there is a need to lay up and prepare for the days when the paddocks are bare. In terms of better feeding, we look at one animal and apply the standard overall, and a sheep, of course, requires 3 lb. of dry matter a day; and this would apply to the goats the honourable member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) spoke about the other day. A beast (that is, a medium cow) would require 50 lb. to 70 lb. of dry matter a day throughout the year.

To put it in simple terms, the sheep population of 4,500,000 may need 7,000 tons of fodder a day and the cattle population of 250,000 may need about 7,500 tons a day. High-quality pasture will supply a heavily stocked animal population in a good season, but to keep up the average we must prepare for the day that is not so good when we have these bare fields. Also, of course, too much emphasis cannot be laid on the need to conserve fodder. Silage and baled hay from quality pasture and grain crops are valuable components in the stock management programme and, of course, more important are the high protein fodders in the form of grain or processed food in the form of nuts, and it is this form of animal husbandry that gets results. Grain with a protein range of 10 per cent to 14 per cent, and the nuts with a rating of 18 per cent, are mediums that really keep stock in first-class condition and such that they will be efficient producers of wool, milk, beef, or whatever is the phase of production engaged in.

Two aspects of this high-rainfall country need to be mentioned. In the autumn when the fields are poor and there is a shortage of pasture, the conserved fodder makes up the leeway. There also comes a time when there appears to be plenty of pasture with an early break, a succulent pasture, yet we see the stock suffering because of inadequate nourishment. This stresses quite strongly the practice of feeding

animals well, and I repeat that a sheep requires 3 lb. of dry matter daily and a beast 70 lb. of dry matter daily. The sheep or beast has to go out and gather this food from a pasture that is full of succulents competing with a large quantity of water. Just think of the poor cow that is trying to extract 70 lb. of dry matter in about 300 gallons of water! This is something the Agriculture Department cannot stress too strongly to the man on the land. There is no doubt about the quality of the officers of that department and, if they can get the message over to the man on the land in the high-rainfall areas, this productivity can be stepped up two-fold. With a vigorous programme, the results can be staggering, because in all the higher-rainfall areas of the State productivity can be increased beyond all imagination.

Paragraph 6 of the Speech refers to land settlement, irrigation and forestry. All these are worthy of their place in the State's economy, and I commend the Government for attending to these things. I hope it will be able to give them full impetus. The Speech also refers to mining. The member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) drew attention to what is going on in Western Australia, and if such things can be done there they can be done in this State. We all know what is going on at Whyalla, where a fortnight ago I was privileged to see the steel mill. When one sees what is being done there, one feels proud to be a South Australian. We have many untouched resources in this State, and it behoves all of us as members of this Parliament to get in and make this country go. It is a feature of Parliament that we criticize, but on the bread-and-butter issues there is a real job of work to be done. I am sure that if we evaluate the necessity for others to look to the productive angle we can make South Australia a better place in which to live.

In conclusion, may I say that I consider it a privilege to be a member of this House and, as a new member, I am particularly pleased to be able to take part in this debate. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. LANGLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, June 30, at 2 p.m.