

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 5, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

BUDGET DEFICIT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As the financial year ended last Thursday, can the Treasurer give to the House a statement of last year's Budget deficit, and can he say what remedial action the Government intends to take?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A press report was published (I think last Saturday) indicating that our overall deficit was about \$8,000,000. I indicated that ample opportunity to discuss the financial position relating to Loan and Revenue items would arise as soon as the necessary measures were introduced in Parliament. I intend to introduce that legislation as soon as possible, particularly that concerning the Loan programme. Further, I expect that during one evening before the show adjournment I shall be able to introduce the Budget.

Mr. McANANEY: Because of the large deficit, can the Treasurer say whence money has been borrowed to meet this deficit? Alternatively, if it has not been borrowed, what funds have been used to finance the deficit?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not carry the answer to these questions in my head, but I assure the honourable member, as I have already intimated to the House, that a complete list will be given to the House when it is available, so that members will have ample opportunity to discuss this matter.

ADOPTION LAWS.

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago, on reading a press article dealing with adoption laws in other States, I found that, for example, adoptions in Queensland were handled exclusively by the State, whereas in New South Wales (and I believe in Victoria) they were handled both by the State and by private individuals. Can the Attorney-General explain this State's position regarding adoptions, whether any move will be made to unify adoption laws throughout the Commonwealth, and whether the South Australian Government intends to take early action along these lines?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has discussed a uniform Adoption Bill for some time, and a draft Bill has been prepared which will bring

South Australia into line with the other States in the recognition of adoption procedures and in laying down certain features of adoption inquiries by the court. We intend to retain some of the features of the South Australian system in making adoption orders which we think advantageous and which they do not have in some of the other States. However, it is intended that no adoption will take place in South Australia without a full report to the court by the Social Welfare Department. Although original arrangements may be proposed through a church social welfare agency, the eventual inquiry and report to the court will have to be undertaken by the Social Welfare Department, so that we are able to see that adoptions take place in such a way that difficulties or tensions are not likely to arise thereafter. In fact, I have the draft Bill with me today, and I expect it will be introduced later this session.

GILBERTON FLATS.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week about the Government's intention with regard to the proposal to build a large block of flats at Gilberton in my district?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The trust purchased an area of land in 1964 at Park Terrace, Gilberton for the purpose of erecting two-storey or three-storey flats. At that time much of the area was covered with sub-standard houses and the project as a piece of redevelopment was brought to the notice of the trust by the then Mayor of Walkerville, Mr. Lance Milne. Some of the houses have been demolished, while others will be demolished immediately prior to the use of this site. To assist with the redevelopment, the Walkerville council agreed when the trust purchased the land to pay part of the land cost when the area was substantially covered with flats. The trust is not able to build these dwellings as part of its 1966-67 programme, but during this financial year suitable designs will be completed and it is hoped that the buildings can be erected in 1967-68.

UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently my attention was drawn to business people advertising in the local press enticing people to buy machines on which to work at home and stating that goods made could be sold immediately and would return handsome profits to the people concerned. As the facts stated in the advertisements are completely untrue, many people have

been fleeced of their savings in this way. In the *Advertiser* of July 4 appeared a letter to the Editor dealing with certain cases of people misled by these advertisements. As this practice seems to be general and is not in the best interests of the people, can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation on the matter or whether anything else can be done about those inserting these advertisements in the press?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Several members have raised this complaint with me; the member for Mitcham wrote to me concerning people of this kind. In one case wire mesh machines were involved, and we investigated to see whether an offence had been committed. Other machines have been peddled in the same way. We were not able to find that any criminal offence had been committed, for those people are operating just within the law, and it would be a considerable burden for the purchasers in these cases to bring civil actions. It is hoped that some facets of the unfair trade practices code to be presented to the House later this session will, if not completely prevent, at any rate considerably hamper the activities of vendors of goods of this kind. The provisions relating to door-to-door sales and to misleading advertisements are likely to make it very much more difficult for these operators to continue their depredations on the public.

STURT GORGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I should ask the following question of the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Lands, who I understand is away this week. During this present session of Parliament and over the last few months of the latter part of last session (and even before that), I asked questions about the acquisition of Sturt Gorge as a reserve. The week before last I asked the Minister of Lands whether the Government was interested in purchasing the property from the owners of the gorge at any price at all, there having been negotiations at a certain price that had broken down. I have not had an answer from the Minister on that, but over the weekend I was contacted by a member of the family that owns the gorge and have now received a letter which, in part, reads:

We shall be pleased if you will ascertain from the Minister of Lands whether the Commissioners of Wild Life Reserves have come to a favourable decision in regard to the above area (that is, the Sturt Gorge) being preserved as a national reserve. We have received a genuine offer to purchase from a land speculator and developer, and must give a decision

in this regard by the end of this week, our intention being to accept if the Government is still not interested in preserving the area as a reserve for future generations.

In view of the urgency of the matter, which is obvious from this letter, I telephoned the Minister's office yesterday and explained the matter to his Secretary, and I hope that the Premier knows something of these developments. Can he say whether the Government will, as a matter of urgency (if it has not already done so), consider whether it is prepared to make any offer at all for the purchase of the Sturt Gorge to preserve it for the future?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not sure in my own mind what is the land in question.

Mr. Millhouse: The Sturt Gorge.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member has had a proposal about some other land.

Mr. Millhouse: This is the land below the Sturt dam.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no knowledge of this land at the moment but I have knowledge of another section of land in which the honourable member was interested.

Mr. Millhouse: That is up in the National Park, and is a different one.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: All I can say at this stage is that I do not know the land under discussion. I shall certainly have inquiries made about what the land comprises, but I shall also want to know whether the Government will be involved in any cost in this matter.

ELECTROCUTION.

Mr. HUDSON: On Saturday at Marino a horse was electrocuted when it trod on a live cable that was lying on the ground, concealed by grass, and the girl who was leading the horse narrowly escaped either death or very serious injury. Some doubt appears to exist regarding whether or not proper precautions were taken in relation to this matter. Will the Premier ask the South Australian Gas Company what precautions were taken by the men working in this area, and will he ask the Electricity Trust how quickly it was informed that attention was needed for this cable, and how quickly its men reached the scene and carried out the necessary repairs?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall inquire about the facts of this case.

TRACTOR-TESTING STATION.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: At a recent meeting of the Agricultural Council a decision was made about the future of the Werribee tractor-testing

station. Has the Minister of Agriculture any comment?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: At the last Agricultural Council meeting in Sydney in February, it was decided to discontinue the tractor-testing property at Werribee (Victoria). The Standing Committee of the Agricultural Council brought down an extensive report recommending to the council that this be done, because the station was not fulfilling its expected function. The Victorian Minister strongly supported the retention of this research station, but he was the only one who did. Many comments have since been made about the wisdom of this decision, and I am confident that it will be discussed at the Agricultural Council meeting in Perth next week.

ALFORD SCHOOL.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my last week's question about the purchase of a schoolhouse for the head teacher at Alford?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The privately owned solid construction residence at Alford to which the honourable member refers has been inspected by the Public Buildings Department, and has been reported on as suitable for a teacher's residence. Yesterday Cabinet approved of negotiations being entered into by the Education Department with the owner with a view to possible purchase.

SMALL CRAFT.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the committee appointed to investigate and make a survey of small craft has submitted its report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The committee set within the Harbors Board provisions has made an extensive survey of the charges that should be made and of what craft should be included. It has submitted a report which I took to Cabinet yesterday. For the honourable member's benefit, it inquired whether all sea-going facilities should be considered, and finally decided that if this were done it would reduce the survey fee by about 10c a foot, as a lower fee would mean a deficit on the survey. Thinking it unwise to make a decision, Cabinet referred the matter back to me so that I could discuss the findings of the committee with interested persons. I intend to do this and, after having ascertained the views of the people concerned, I will again refer the matter to Cabinet for a decision.

PETROL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The question that I address to the Premier deals with a difficulty that has recently arisen as a result of the oil companies' deciding to change over to a higher-octane petrol. I have been told that the Prices Commissioner recommended an increase of 1c a gallon, .7c to the oil companies and .3c to the reseller. Will the Premier make available a copy of the Prices Commissioner's recommendation? Alternatively, will he confirm the correctness or otherwise of the figures given to me?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Before answering the question and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity of extending best wishes and many happy returns on behalf of this Parliament to the Leader of the Opposition on the occasion of his 70th birthday.

I am prepared to discuss with the Leader of the Opposition the matters he has raised, but I ask that any information given be treated as confidential. I hope to have such information available tomorrow.

WEST BEACH AIRPORT.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Recently a report from the Minister of Civil Aviation indicated that the Commonwealth Government was considering providing a temporary structure to serve as a passenger terminal at West Beach Airport. Will the Premier raise this matter with the Commonwealth Government to ensure that any terminal provided will be permanent, not temporary?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The answer is "Yes". I am prepared to take this matter up with the Right Honourable the Prime Minister at top level because I consider that South Australia is lagging, to some extent, in airport facilities. The ever-increasing numbers of people travelling by air demand greater recognition from the Commonwealth Government in this regard.

The SPEAKER: As the honourable the Leader of the Opposition is about to ask a question, I should like to identify myself with the congratulatory remarks made by the Premier on the occasion of the Leader's 70th birthday—three score years and ten, and nearly half of them spent in this Chamber, rich in service to the State and, I believe, to the satisfaction of himself. The Leader has the good wishes of every member of the House and, as far as I am able to speak for the House as Speaker, I convey those birthday greetings to him. The hon the Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: May I thank you, Sir, the Premier, and honourable members on both sides of the House for their kind remarks which, I assure you, are very much appreciated.

When the Premier is making representations to the Prime Minister concerning West Beach airport, will he point out that the present buildings were never designed at all as an air terminal but were makeshift buildings eventually to be used for administrative purposes, which are not even in a proper position in relation to the runways? Will he also point out that the permanent buildings could be established without additional cost and certainly without the inconvenience to the public that must occur if the buildings at present occupied are to be altered? I am informed that a permanent and proper building could be built without much additional expense (if any) to the expense involved in altering the present structure.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I appreciate that information and assure the Leader that it will all be included in the letter that I send to the Prime Minister.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of June 21 regarding the transport of handicapped children from near country areas to enable them to attend special schools in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member asked about handicapped children travelling by panel van from Roseworthy, Gawler and Elizabeth to attend special schools in the metropolitan area. In answering the points raised by the honourable member, I point out that an occupation centre has recently been established at Elizabeth and the conditions which now apply are: no children from the areas mentioned attend occupation centres in Adelaide, as there is a centre in Elizabeth; one child attends Kensington Sheltered Workshop; one child attends Marryatville Brain Damaged Class; three children attend Wakefield Street Clinic Special School; and 16 hard-of-hearing children attend the oral school (12) and North Adelaide Speech and Hearing Centre (four).

There is little possibility of a sheltered workshop, brain damaged class or special clinic being established at Elizabeth at this stage. It is unlikely that a school will be established at Elizabeth by this department for the 12 children attending the oral school as they are

of pre-school age. The four older hard-of-hearing children attending North Adelaide are not enough to warrant the establishment of a hard-of-hearing centre at Elizabeth at present. With reference to the unsatisfactory bus, I have received a report indicating that this vehicle was inspected and accepted by departmental officers when first used. However, on receipt of this complaint, another inspection was arranged at the Government Garage which disclosed that although the vehicle was safe, the operator had recently installed some loose seating to accommodate additional children. This does not conform with departmental requirements and the vehicle has now been replaced. Buses used for the transport of handicapped children are examined regularly by our departmental bus examiners, and the temporary seating would have been discovered in the course of these regular inspections.

MODBURY HOSPITAL.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Government having purchased an 18-acre site (bounded by Smart and Reservoir Roads at Modbury) for a Government hospital to serve the Tea Tree Gully and Modbury district, I understood that a planning committee was to be formed to prepare a master plan for the hospital. Can the Premier representing the Chief Secretary say what progress has been made in this regard?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: True, a planning committee was appointed to investigate the hospital's design, as well as other matters, and certain plans are already being prepared. Although nothing has been completed at this stage, I assure the honourable member that the Government is making some progress in the hospital's initial planning.

PINE.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to the question I asked last week, concerning pine used at a new hotel in my district?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Because of the honourable member's concern in this matter, I asked the Conservator of Forests to give me a report, which is as follows:

I have made inquiries as far as it was possible to do so into the matter raised by Mr. Rodda. As I understand it, the timber was supplied by a private producer in the South-East and portion of the supply was definitely faulty. I understand, however, that no extra cost was incurred by the hotel owner, and that the builder has been promised compensation by the producer. The final result was quite satisfactory. It was certainly unfortunate that such an occurrence should have happened in a speciality installation.

HORTICULTURAL ADVISER.

Mr. CURREN: Since the resident horticultural adviser at Berri passed away, the appointment has been filled temporarily. As growers in the Berri area desire that a permanent appointment be made, will the Minister of Agriculture have this matter investigated?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, I shall take up this matter with the department and the Public Service Commissioner to ascertain whether appointing a permanent officer can be expedited. We were upset to hear that the former adviser in the district (Mr. Cooper) passed away: he was an excellent officer in the department and was responsible for very good public relations with the people in the upper river area. The gentleman temporarily replacing him is also an excellent officer, and I shall try to ascertain the present situation.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: For some time now it has been suggested that the standardization of the railway line between Port Pirie and Adelaide should be diverted *via* Crystal Brook and Merriton, at which point it would link up with the existing railway line. About 12 months ago discussions on the matter had reached a fairly advanced stage, but recently little has been said about it. The people, and particularly the council of Crystal Brook are disturbed about this, and cannot obtain any information on what is happening. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport whether the alternative route *via* Crystal Brook and Merriton has been abandoned? If it has not, can an opportunity be given to the Crystal Brook council to submit a case in favour of this route?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up the matter with my colleague and obtain the information sought by the honourable member.

KAROONDA SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the date for the commencement of work on the Karoonda Area School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director of the Public Buildings Department informs me that on March 22, 1966, the Public Works Committee recommended the construction of a new secondary school building at Karoonda Area School at an estimated cost of \$330,000. This work is included in the current schools programme for 1966-67. Working drawings are being prepared and present planning is such that tenders will be called to enable a contract to be let in about mid-1967. The Public Buildings Department has worked in conjunction

with the Education Department on the schools programme, but the Education Department arranges its own school programme, and of this the Public Buildings Department has not been advised up to the present.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. HUDSON: I notice from the list of Justices of the Peace already appointed in my district that many more are available in one or two suburbs than any of the local residents would expect. However, one still receives complaints about the lack of justices available in these areas and about the inability to find out who are the justices. Will the Attorney-General see whether, with the co-operation of the Postmaster-General's Department, a list of justices can be made available in each local post office as well as a list at each local police station? I am sure that if this became standard practice and it was generally known that by going to the police station or to the post office a full list of justices could be obtained, this problem would be largely overcome.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly take up with the Postmaster-General's Department the possibility of doing what the honourable member suggests. Lists will be prepared for each area after consultation with honourable members. I am grateful that several members have already pointed out errors in the lists at the Attorney-General's Department, which exist as a result of returns made by police officers who, unfortunately, have missed some people whose names should have been changed on the list. As soon as the lists appear to be as accurate as we can make them they will be circulated to police stations. I will approach the Postmaster-General's Department to see whether it will make lists available at post offices to provide the service the honourable member suggests.

NUMBER PLATES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises out of the answer the Premier gave to me on Thursday last regarding the change to the *alpha numero* system of licence plates for motor vehicles. Reflectorized number plates have been generally recognized in many parts of the world as a significant safety factor for motor vehicles on the road. I understand a meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council will be held next week at which the Minister of Transport will be South Australia's representative. I also understand that various members of this Government (as had members of the previous Government have

looked at reflectorized number plates. I believe that at the A.T.A.C. meeting two States at least will submit recommendations for the adoption of reflectorized number plates. As the changeover to the *alpha numero* system of number plates at the end of the year would also provide a good opportunity to introduce the compulsory use of reflectorized plates, can the Premier say whether the Government has considered this matter and, if it has, whether the South Australian Minister of Transport intends to support the proposal at the A.T.A.C. meeting and whether the Government intends to introduce reflectorized number plates when the change to the *alpha numero* system is made later this year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A representation concerning reflectorized number plates was made to Cabinet about 12 months ago. We were told that these number plates would be made of a firmer type of metal than is presently used. As the matter was submitted to Cabinet, it would have meant that no competition could take place in this field. Also, there would have been an added cost to the public. In view of all the circumstances, the Government was not prepared to make a favourable recommendation at that time. The question of the *alpha numero* plates is to be discussed in Cabinet again when a further report is received from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. However, in no circumstances will the Minister or any of his representatives at this conference be instructed to support the proposals indicated by the honourable member.

PORT PIRIE DEPOT.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked regarding the proposed construction by the Engineering and Water Supply Department of a departmental depot at Port Pirie?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that provision has been made on the 1966-67 Loan Estimates for the construction of this departmental depot.

EUDUNDA RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On January 27 I asked the Premier whether the Railways Department planned to improve the loading facilities at the Eudunda railway station, and I reminded him last week that I had received no reply to that question. Has he now a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague informs me that the main output of the factory in question is bulk fuel tanks for

farmers and service stations, and these items are consigned to various destinations throughout the State. During a recent period of about three weeks the Railways Department railed 30 of these tanks from Eudunda. Inquiries made of the firm indicate that there is little difficulty in handling the factory's production on the outward movements, because only a small percentage requires crane handling; in fact, most of the items are loaded by hand. Consequently, the provision of a mobile crane at Eudunda is not justified.

PASKEVILLE-KULPARA ROAD.

Mr. HUGHES: For some weeks now I have noticed that survey pegs line the side of the road between Paskeville and Kulpara, and it would appear that they are there in preparation for the reforming and widening of this road, which work I have advocated for some years. Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Roads for a report on what the department intends to do on this section and when it is intended that the work will begin?

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

ELECTRICITY FOR IRRIGATION.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding electricity charges to primary producers using irrigation pumps?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A report from the Electricity Trust states that the trust's tariffs do not differentiate between summer and winter consumption of electricity. For consumption at day rates, a high usage in any one month will result in a lower average price, and this applies to all consumers, including industry. A great deal of water pumping is done at the night rate, and this is the same irrespective of the total consumption in any month.

HOUGHTON SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on June 29 regarding the new residence being constructed for the Houghton Primary School headmaster?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The South Australian Housing Trust states that at the present rate of progress the residence should be completed about July 15. However, the house will not be ready for occupation until an inspection has been carried out by the Public Buildings Department and any minor work completed.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report to the effect that the new Public Relations Officer in the Premier's Department has begun his duties. Can the Premier say whether that office has been created in Executive Council or whether it is only a temporary office? Secondly, without debating the advisability of having a Public Relations Officer, it would be appreciated if the Premier would say whether or not the officer who has been appointed has been closely associated in the past with the preparation of Labor Party propaganda in State election campaigns.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There are occasions on which I become a little embarrassed through having to say something in my own defence, and this is just such an occasion. During a discussion I had with the Public Service Commissioner I pointed out that because of the increasing volume of work in the Premier's Department I felt that I could not continue at the same pace as I had been going at, and he admitted to me that he did not know how I had managed to keep up the pace that I had kept up. It was then that I suggested the need for a Public Relations Officer attached to the Premier's Department. Although this is the first time this subject has been referred to in the House, I did mention it last Thursday at a businessmen's luncheon. From time to time, much criticism has been levelled at the Government concerning the alleged lack of decentralization and of new industry, a matter that is controlled by my department. I point out that there will be no attempt by this Government to alter our policy on immigration or to curtail it in any way. My Government can hardly agree with the policy recently announced in Britain because, if we continue to have an immigration policy, we must advertise the opportunities for investment in this country, whether they be in this State or in other States. Publicity will be given through the showing of a coloured documentary film, and in addition we will do anything we can that will help us to compete on a reasonable basis with other States of the Commonwealth. The appointment of the Public Relations Officer is considered to be temporary at present. If, in the future, there is further improvement and the Government is satisfied that the work performed by this officer is satisfactory and there is still a need for him, we will consider the question of again approaching the Public Service Commissioner through

the normal channels. At present, the appointment has been approved by the Public Service Board, and the Public Service Commissioner has told me this. Concerning the latter part of the question, the officer has not been associated with the public relations work of my Party, at least for the past two years, that I know of. I am not prepared to enter into any discussion about personalities unless I am compelled to do so, as I was on another occasion to which I shall not refer today. God knows we had enough of that last year. From the point of view of selection and approval this has been "top brass" as far as the Public Service Commissioner is concerned.

Mr. McANANEY: Because of the Premier's statement that the duties of Minister in charge of industrial development are excessive for him, and of the appointment in other States of a successful Minister of Development, can the Premier say whether Cabinet has considered the appointment of a Minister of Development for this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No: at present, the Government has full confidence in the Ministers it has appointed.

Mr. HALL: For many years the Tourist Bureau has circulated coloured films to other States and other countries publicizing South Australia to prospective migrants and industrialists. Does the Premier intend to relieve the Tourist Bureau of this function and to reserve it for his own staff?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Tourist Bureau has been mostly responsible for tourism and for informing people wishing to come to this State what is available through the Housing Trust. Although I do not deny the value of any work that has been going on, there will be a complete revision for the purpose of co-ordinating all information in order to improve the position. South Australia will be examined as a State, not on the basis of individual groups.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier has not quite answered my question, although he has said that the Public Relations Officer has not been engaged in public relations work for about two years. Will he say whether this officer prepared Labor Party propaganda prior to the last State elections?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The answer is "No". He did not take any part in the last campaign in 1965, when we were very successful: we did not need him.

ELWOMPLE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NANKIVELL: At present the Elwomple water scheme consists of a pump at Elwomple and two water storage tanks on the Dukes Highway connected with the pumping station between Moorlands and Coomandook. These tanks are known as "McIntosh's Monument". Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether it is intended to include any of these works in the extensions of the Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme, or to temporarily connect this scheme in lieu of pumping from the present supply, which is a T-shaped branch in the ground?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I thank the honourable member for the clear definition of the tanks, etc. He appreciates that I shall have to obtain a report, which I will do and inform him of the result.

ROADS PROGRAMME.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I read with interest in this morning's newspaper the announcement by the Hon. Stanley C. Bevan (Minister of Roads) of the roads programme for the forthcoming year, totalling the large figure of \$33,000,000. From time to time members on both sides of this House, and when on opposite sides, have urged that Parliament be allowed to scrutinize and debate the roads programme. Can the Premier say whether this year the Government intends to give the House the opportunity to scrutinize the proposed roads programme and to debate it?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe that we can claim that the Highways Department is an authority on building roads and bridges, and that it is to be commended for the outstanding work it has done. As a result of that work (and I believe the work has been done in the interests of the State) the answer is "No".

TROTTING.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say what progress has been made by the committee appointed to inquire into trotting?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have received a report from the Chairman of that committee, and I have read many pages of it. Without reflecting on anyone, I consider that a certain amount of free speaking and personalities are involved. Members of the committee have signed a letter addressed to the Chairman in appreciation of the most patient way in which he gave ample opportunity for the presenting of evidence. Members of the committee commend Mr. Andrew Wells, Q.C., in no

uncertain terms. Several suggested amendments are being examined. At present I have been unable to obtain a summary of the proceedings and report of this committee, and I doubt whether honourable members would be interested in much of the present comprehensive report. Consequently, I am trying to condense the report and have sheets duplicated to show the suggested amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act before they are introduced. Members of the committee considered that it had done a satisfactory job and were in sympathy with the way the inquiry was conducted. I give full marks to the committee, and particularly to the Chairman (Mr. Wells, Q.C.).

BOOK ALLOWANCES.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to several questions I asked recently regarding book allowances payable to Matriculation and Leaving Honours students?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Education Department Regulations provide that a student will receive \$20 for the first year of study in a matriculation year and \$10 for a repeat year, provided he is undertaking a full normal course of study (not less than five subjects) in respect of the year for which a book allowance is claimed. The particular students referred to by the honourable member would not be undertaking the full course and therefore would not be eligible for the \$20 allowance. However, the regulations provide that if a student is not undertaking a full course of study, the proportion of the allowance payable is determined by the Director. A reasonable proportion of the allowance payable in this case would be in the ratio of the number of matriculation subjects taken to the number of students in a normal full course (not fewer than five). For example, if a student is studying three Matriculation subjects, the amount payable as book allowance would be three-fifths of \$20, that is, \$12.

TEACHERS' SALARIES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of June 30 regarding the basis of payment to woodwork and sewing teachers in primary schools, whether by the month or by the term?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Teachers of primary woodwork classes are full-time teachers on an annual salary and receive payment by cheque at fortnightly intervals. Teachers of sewing are employed on an hourly basis according to the needs of individual schools. At the

end of each term the head teacher of a school where a part-time teacher of sewing has been appointed furnishes a return which indicates the number of hours of instruction given. Payment is made by cheque early in the ensuing term.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As the second term is almost half-way through, will the Minister see whether these cheques for sewing teachers have already been issued?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

INNER SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. COUMBE: Last year the Attorney-General indicated to the House in connection with inner suburban development that he had circularized the metropolitan councils concerned requesting that they make submissions to him. I understand that such submissions were to be in hand by the beginning of April this year. Will the Attorney-General say, first, whether the submissions have been made by the relevant councils; secondly, whether they have all been received; and thirdly, whether he has received co-operation from the councils concerned? Can he indicate what, if any, action he intends to recommend in this regard?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have received detailed submissions on proposals for the first lot of clearance areas from two inner suburban councils, namely St. Peters and Kensington-Norwood. I had the latter document before me when the honourable member rose to ask his question. These have only just come to hand: I received the St. Peters proposal a little over a week ago, and the Kensington-Norwood proposal last week. The Walkerville council had indicated to me that its only proposal for redevelopment concerned the area to which the honourable member referred in an earlier question this afternoon. I have not had any proposals from the Adelaide City Council, which has yet to concert its plans for redevelopment. Although that council advertised for planning staff last year, I believe it was unable to get the staff it was looking for. I have not had proposals from the Unley City Council. I do not expect to receive submissions from the Burnside council as its area closer to the city has not as yet reached the redevelopment stage.

The only proposals so far received from the Hindmarsh council have been those associated with the Maslen plan, but much information has been collected concerning Hindmarsh and a detailed survey of certain of the areas is being undertaken in conjunction with Housing

Trust officers. Some preliminary information regarding clearance areas there is already to hand. I have not as yet had submissions from councils in the western suburban area, although those councils have appointed a consultant.

When these plans are to hand they will be examined in the first place by the Town Planning Office so that we may prepare preliminary submissions on the possibilities of redevelopment and obtain advice on costing programmes. I have been to other States to inspect the redevelopment activities of Government interests and to examine the costs of their major redevelopment schemes. However, we shall not be able to take further steps other than the preliminary ones until a planning and development authority has been constituted. In fact, the authority would concern itself with one major aspect of the work, the redevelopment proposals in conjunction with local government. We must complete the preliminary surveys, however, and they appear to be proceeding. As I have said, I have received some submissions and I hope to receive others during this financial year. In the meantime work is proceeding and a start has been made by the officers of the Town Planning Office.

STATE AID.

Mr. Coumbe, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the policy of the Government on State aid to independent schools changed since March 1, 1966?

2. If so, when was it changed and what now is the policy?

3. If not, is it proposed to reconsider the policy during the month of July?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. No.

2. See reply to No. 1.

3. No.

LEASEHOLD LAND.

Mr. RODDA (on notice): What is the Government's policy with regard to the refusal to transfer leasehold land to registered proprietary companies?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government's policy is not to allow the transfer or subleasing of leasehold land to registered proprietary companies. It has been deemed necessary to adopt this policy in order adequately to administer the provisions of the Crown Lands Act.

GOVERNMENT COSTS.

Mrs. STEELE (on notice): Can the Premier give details of the rates of pay of the Chairman, members and officers of:

- (a) the Royal Commission on the Licensing Act?
- (b) the Royal Commission on State Transport Services?
- (c) the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal?
- (d) the Local Government Act Revision Committee?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The answer as to (a), (b), (c) and (d) is "appropriate amounts for the work done". The specific amounts will be revealed to the Opposition confidentially if the Leader of the Opposition wishes.

PASTORAL FEES.

Mr. McANANEY (on notice):

1. Are the fees substantially increased recently by regulations under the Crown Lands Act, the Pastoral Act, and the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, required to cover administration costs?

2. If not, what proportion of the fees will go into general revenue?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reply to questions Nos. 1 and 2 is "Yes".

POLICE REGULATIONS.

Mr. Coumbe, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it proposed to amend the regulations under the Police Regulation Act to provide for increased annual recreation leave for members of the Police Force?

2. If so, for what period of leave is it proposed to provide?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Regulation 87 (1) of the regulations under the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1963, was amended on June 24, 1965, to take effect as from July 1, 1965, to increase annual leave for members of the Police Force from 28 days to 35 days. This amendment was gazetted on page 1591 of the *Government Gazette*, 1965. I know of no further proposed amendment to this regulation.

EGGS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice):

1. What is the present retail price of eggs to the consumer in this State?

2. What is the return per dozen to producers from the sale of export eggs, if any, at the present time?

3. What was the average retail price per dozen of eggs to the consumer, for the financial year 1965-66?

4. What was the average return to the producer, per dozen, from export eggs in the same period?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The replies are:

1. The Retail Storekeepers' Association states that the recommended maximum retail price of eggs is as follows: large hen (24oz.), 67 cents; standard hen (21oz.), 59 cents; small hen (18oz.), 50 cents; ungraded, 55 cents; to which may be added a delivery charge of 1c a dozen where applicable. In many stores a charge is also made by the retailer for eggs prepacked in one-dozen cartons.

2. The South Australian Egg Board has no surplus for export at the present time.

3. The board controls only the wholesale prices of eggs. The average wholesale price was, for sales by the grading agents of the board of all grades of eggs to June 18, 1966, 50.45c a dozen, to which would be added the recommended retail margins.

4. The board has not packed eggs in shell for export during the year ended June 30, 1966. It is estimated that the return to the board for the sale of eggs packed as export whole egg pulp will be 9.737c a dozen for 24oz. grade, to which is added a C.E.M.A. reimbursement of about 42.87c a dozen, making a total of 52.607c a dozen. A handling charge of 6c a dozen is deducted by the board, giving a net return to the producer of 46.607c a dozen.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 20. Page 232.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): At this stage I consider it appropriate to record my appreciation and that of other members on this side of the House to Sir Thomas Playford. Everyone in this House, and practically throughout the State, knows about Sir Thomas's wonderful record, and no-one would begrudge the high praise that he merits. As we shall have many opportunities later to express our thoughts about Sir Thomas, I do not intend to speak long about his qualities today. However, I pay a tribute to him for his integrity which is so completely unquestionable and which is so important in a successful public man. Sir Thomas has been an inspiration to the whole State. Despite his great intelligence

he has always had a modest and humble approach to human problems, and no citizen who has ever had occasion to contact Sir Thomas has ever met with the suggestion of arrogance or lack of personal sympathy on his part.

Sir Thomas's common sense, courage, persistence and tremendous stamina have been the qualities that have made him an outstanding leader. In addition, Sir Thomas has an unlimited capacity for hard work from which has flowed the study and mastery of his subject. From that, in turn, has flowed the tremendous confidence, self-reliance, and readiness to bear responsibility that he has always shown. They are not qualities common to everybody, but Sir Thomas has had them in abundance. We on this side of the House (and, I am sure, other members of the House), all wish Sir Thomas well in the future. Finally, we should not like it to be forgotten that Lady Playford has been such a tremendous help to Sir Thomas during his long period of responsibility.

Mr. Hughes: Hear, Hear!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although the point I am about to mention does not occur in the sequence that I intended (it has developed since last Thursday), I should like to refer to the appointment of a public relations officer in the Premier's Department. By questioning him today, I have been able to elicit from the Premier a little information about this office. It is not at the moment a permanent office; as I understood the Premier, he said that it was a temporary office and that later consideration would be given to making it permanent. The Public Service Commissioner does not need to call for applications to fill a temporary office as he does to fill a permanent office. Therefore, rapid appointments can conceivably be made, and a rapid appointment was made in this case. Cabinet apparently decided to establish this office last week. A temporary officer has been appointed and, as far as Parliament goes, that is the *fait accompli*. Parliament has had no opportunity to discuss the matter, and the Opposition has had no opportunity hitherto to record its views. The Government will hear our views in future debates because we want to know much more about the appointment than we know at present.

We heartily oppose the establishment of any type of public relations office that could lead to advertisement for a political party. Whether or not that happens is not the point: until question time today we had been given

no information about the matter. We on this side will do the best we can to see that this office is not used for political propaganda. It was stated that one function of this officer would be the production of visual aid material to help the Agent-General in his quest for more migrants, industry and investment, and to promote decentralization within the State. The term "promote decentralization within the State" could mean anything, and unless there is careful control there could be considerable misuse of this office. The Premier said that the man appointed had been in public relations work for about two years. However, I understand he has been closely associated with the type of advertisement used by the Australian Labor Party at elections. If that is so, I believe more information should be given than the Premier has given today. The Opposition is touchy on this subject and will remain touchy until it is completely satisfied that there is no political tie-up in this appointment, irrespective of whether or not the appointment is advisable. My information is that this officer is anything but disinterested in the political affairs of the State. I hope the Premier will make a wider statement on this appointment later. If he does not, the House will hear much more about it. Last week the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) criticized the press, and said a meeting conducted by the Hon. Mr. Calwell at Australia Hall, which he had attended, had been incorrectly reported.

Mr. Freebairn: The press said he went to sleep.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: An extract from the *Australian* (which was not the target of the honourable member's criticism) states:

The police statisticians started it all off. "The police inform us that 3,000 people are listening to this address out in the street," boomed Arthur. All 800 of us cheered wildly, shook hands with red-faced cops, and offered to whip in to buy the gendarmes an abacus. It made Clyde Cameron, M.H.R., scratch his head uncertainly. Gil Langley, M.P., in wicket-keeping position against the brick wall of the building and apparently asleep, stirred uneasily like a retriever having dreams.

Is that the report about which the honourable member was so worried?

Mr. Langley: I did not see it, but it is untruthful.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This newspaper report is untruthful, too?

Mr. Langley: I spoke about the report I saw.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It appears that two newspapers had untruthful reports.

Mr. Langley: I don't doubt that, either.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I referred to this report because the member for Unley received much publicity in his home newspaper last week.

Mr. Freebairn: Did you see that Mr. Calwell and Mr. Whitlam shook hands? That is unprecedented, surely.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Aborigines were referred to in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. The Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill was introduced last session and the incomplete debate on it ended abruptly in the early hours of the last day of that session. I understand the Bill is to be reintroduced this session. Undoubtedly, these problems are difficult to solve. As I said last session, I have certain sympathy for anyone setting out to solve these problems, and I pay a tribute to the former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and to the present Minister for their sincere attempts to solve the outstanding problems concerning Aborigines.

The Bill introduced last year was not satisfactory but the Bill to be introduced this session might be framed differently. A wider inquiry is undoubtedly needed before the legislation is introduced. Although from time to time Select Committees have inquired into the matter, no committee has done so for a long time. It is high time we had a Select Committee to inquire into the problems of the Aboriginal people. No-one can point to any person in this Parliament who has been totally right or totally wrong over this question, but we all should agree, if we have any understanding at all, that this is an extremely complex problem. Conditions vary so much from one part of the State to another that it is almost impossible to provide a formula to solve the problem.

Apparently we are to have a new Lands Trust Bill, and we are also to have a Bill to prevent discrimination in employment against persons on account of their colour or race. I am sure that the latter ideal is good, and the Bill will be supported as far as it goes. I say that because I doubt whether it will go far enough. I should like to know whether it will also prevent discrimination against Aborigines should they not be members of trade unions. This Bill should make sure that they are not discriminated against, and if it does not do that it will not be effective. I am interested to know about this, because the honourable member for Mitcham last session introduced a Bill which provided that. However, the Government voted against the Bill and it was lost, and unless the

Government changes its view on the honourable member's proposition I doubt whether it is likely to bring in a satisfactory Bill in regard to Aborigines. I believe the Government is quite likely to discriminate against them in the event of their not belonging to trade unions, and if it does that it will be most unfair. I shall be interested to see the result of this.

I have advocated the need for a Select Committee because conditions vary tremendously throughout the State. The North-West Reserve of 28,000 square miles, adjacent to reserves in Western Australia and the Northern Territory, contains Aboriginal people who move from one Government station to another across the borders. At times they are settled near one of the stations and are used to their children receiving education, and at other times they move away. On the other hand, we have stations such as Point Pearce, Point McLeay and Gerard in the river areas where totally different conditions exist. There is also a reserve at Port Augusta, a comparatively small one in area but with a large population, and there are other areas on Eyre Peninsula. A Select Committee should look at all these places and inquire into all of their problems. It should also look into the problems of the Aboriginal population in the metropolitan area, because it is conceivable that one-quarter or more of the total number of Aborigines or part-Aborigines live in this metropolitan area, and to my mind they should be given great encouragement. These people have actually become at least partly assimilated in the white population, and many of them are working in various kinds of employment.

I know that the expense involved in some reserves is worrying the Minister. Naturally, some of those reserves are expensive. Incidentally, the expense is largely connected with farming operations in some places. Point McLeay and Point Pearce (although I know much less about the latter place) have attached to them farms which are probably fairly expensive and which probably are not doing much good for anybody. I think we would all agree that these reserves are expensive. Nevertheless, something should remain in Point McLeay and in these other areas as a focal centre for the people who come from the area and want to revisit it. Whether or not the farm continues to be run as at present is relatively immaterial to the Aboriginal people themselves, but the existence of the station is much more important. As I was saying, virtually nothing that I know of is being

done for the Aboriginal people living in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That isn't true.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister may well be able to give me some information that I do not know about. Virtually nothing is being done for them except what is being done through the department in its own offices in Adelaide. If I am correct in my estimation that several thousand Aboriginal people live in the metropolitan area, surely something could be done to provide them with a focal centre for community life, such as is given them in other places in the country areas. If that could be done, they would then be on a better footing and rather more comparable with the people of European origin who have their own community centres. Many people from various countries of Europe have formed themselves into communities and have been able to purchase halls or clubrooms for themselves where they can gather and keep contact with each other. I think such a move would be advisable in the case of the Aboriginal people. I know that many of them want this, and I think the Government could well assist them in achieving that objective.

Before the Minister came in I was saying that we should not try to deal with the Lands Trust Bill without first having an investigation by a Select Committee, because too little is known about the effect of such a Bill and there is such a tremendous variation in the conditions of Aboriginal people. Also, their localities are so spread that the effect of owning land through this trust is unknown. The fact that there is a land trust in which people of Aboriginal origin have some interest may have a moral effect. They would not have individual titles but they would be interested in it. If they lived on a country reserve they would have a vote in its administration through the trust, but many in the metropolitan area would have no direct representation on the trust. This question would be a good subject for an inquiry by a Select Committee, as this would result in the people being informed of what was in the minds of administrators when setting up a land trust. I am not sure whether it should be a land trust or an Aboriginal trust, as perhaps a land trust would not cover fully the appropriate needs. The holding of land by a trust would be helpful in some instances, but in many cases the land now held at Aboriginal reserves should remain in the hands of the Government, and be the Government's responsibility and not that of any trust. I gave evidence before the committee inquiring into

small boats. I do not believe in regulations applying to water sports, as the registration of boats and licensing of drivers is unnecessary. It will hamper people who like to go about in small boats, and also those who have business, or part-business interests in them.

Mr. Ryan: How could you control it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I strongly believe in regulating the way boats are handled in certain waters. The Port River should have speed and other regulations, but it is unnecessary to make a person hold a licence to drive a boat or to register it.

Mr. Ryan: How could you control the regulations without registration?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The possession of a registration card does not affect the way a person handles his boat. If he misconducts the boat or causes danger he should be apprehended, as regulations now exist in many places. A person wanting a day on the water has first to hitch his boat to a car that is registered and insured. This person has a motor car driving licence, but when he gets to the water to put his boat in he would have to possess another set of documents, if these recommendations are accepted. That is entirely unnecessary. The number of accidents with boats in South Australia is not proportionately high when compared to the number in other States and those accidents would probably not have been prevented by licensing and other regulations. When a person puts to sea in St. Vincent Gulf he should carry an adequate number of life jackets, flares, and other safety equipment. He should have an effective anchor attached to a good stout rope, and a pair of oars. These are commonsense precautions and perhaps could be prescribed by regulation, but there is no need for a person to be registered to enforce those regulations.

The investigation of design and construction has been suggested for boat safety, but this is unnecessary and expensive. Some home-made boats are totally unsafe, but others are safe if used correctly, particularly the modern fibre-glass factory-made boats. They would pass any safety inspection, yet they are no safer than a tub if they are used incompetently or overloaded. Bad handling can cause loss of life in the best made boat. Inspections are not justified for small pleasure boats. On the other hand, we may regulate the conduct of people and the equipment they carry. Since I gave evidence before this committee, I have asked the Minister of Marine why the committee received no sitting fee, because I know it sits at night on many occasions.

I gave evidence in the evening, and the committee sat for several hours for which it received no reward. The Minister said that it was originally intended to have a committee but, by deputation, the Government was asked to enlarge the committee. The Minister said that if the committee were enlarged its members could not be paid.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: No. I asked them whether they would serve voluntarily.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: They said that they would and they are doing that, and they are applying themselves conscientiously to this inquiry.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I agree with that entirely.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This Government has a record number of inquiries proceeding, some of which are extremely expensive.

Mr. Ryan: And important!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: And long drawn out, so that they will not report for a long time.

Mr. Ryan: Name one?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Royal Commission on State Transport Services is one.

Mr. Ryan: That will depend on how long you take to get before it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am ready to debate the merits of whether an inquiry should or should not be held; in some cases an inquiry is fully justified, but in other cases I do not think it is. However, this Government has set up many committees of inquiry, most of the officers of which are being paid. Here, we have a small committee sitting and working well, but members are not being paid anything for their time. I do not care whether the officers were willing to serve voluntarily, or not. Members of Parliament would be willing to serve voluntarily; city and district councillors do, anyway, but that does not alter the fact that members of this committee should receive a sitting fee for their work. I hope the Minister will reconsider that matter. We know the State is not wealthy but, if acted on, that suggestion would not cost much.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It will be noted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I thank the Minister for that interjection. I have said a few things about the unsatisfactory aspects of this Government, and I have voiced protest about the way the State is being run in regard to various matters. That is not all the protest I can or will voice, but I say at

the same time that I have always received courtesy from the Ministers personally in my inquiries of them and, to that extent, I hope they will accept my expressions of goodwill. As this is an important day, because of Sir Thomas's announcement of his intention to resign as Leader of the Opposition, I repeat that I am pleased to have had the opportunity to record my appreciation of the way our Leader has conducted the affairs of the Opposition and, formerly, those of South Australia. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I, too, support the motion so ably moved by the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) and seconded by the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill). It gives me great pleasure to do so, solely because on this occasion I speak to the motion after 12 months of Labor Government in this State. I believe it has been beneficial to the State, irrespective of the comments and criticism of our opponents opposite. I should like to offer my condolences to the relatives of those people who have served this State in Parliament and who have passed away since we last had the opportunity to speak. The four former members concerned are the late Sir Frank Perry, the late Sir Richard Butler, the late Mr. E. J. Craigie, and the late Mr. A. V. Thompson. Although I was not fully conversant with the services rendered by the first three, I was indeed fully conversant with those rendered by the late Albert Thompson. I do not wish to express any preference, but I especially refer to the late Mr. Thompson, because he at one time represented the District of Port Adelaide which I now have the honour to represent.

When a former member of Parliament dies, I believe it is the custom to send a letter to his relatives. No doubt that letter is well received but ultimately locked away in a drawer, which is the last seen of it. However, I believe that in some State Parliaments and in the Commonwealth Parliament the demise of former members is remembered by the sending of a special brochure, similar to one I have seen emanating from the Senate. I once had the occasion to call on a person who wished to see me as the member of the district, and was proudly shown a memento that she had received from the Senate. A message of condolence was contained in a small leather-bound volume, recording the fact that that person's father had been, in this case, a representative in this Parliament and in the Commonwealth Senate. The lady concerned was proud of the fact that

she was able to produce this little leather-bound booklet as a message of condolence and to say, "My father served in the Parliament of the Commonwealth, and rendered a service." I believe this Parliament would do well to adopt that principle, and I believe that other States have adopted it, although I am not sure whether all of them have. We have heard from the Opposition that the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech on this occasion was "dull", "dreary", "despondent", "lacked imagination", "not progressive". However, I think we could well attribute all those terms to members opposite since they became the Opposition.

Mr. Hurst: It is gloomy and dull.

Mr. RYAN: It does not even shine. At least while we were in Opposition (and our Party was in Opposition for many years) we offered constructive criticism and not destructive criticism that we are receiving from the Opposition today. The Opposition's destructive criticism will eventually destroy it as a political Party.

Mr. Hurst: That has happened already, hasn't it?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, in the 12 months of Labor Government in this State. Why is it that, when the Lieutenant-Governor, or the Governor (as it was last year), refers to Bills to be introduced by the Government to implement Labor's policy, they are not acceptable? The only people to whom they are not acceptable are the Liberal Opposition members; they are acceptable to most of the people in this State. Indeed, most South Australians desire the implementation of Labor's policy as the Lieutenant-Governor outlined it on this occasion. One of the most important matters confronting this Government towards the end of its first 12 months in office was whether it would create unemployment, or run the State into debt by budgeting for a deficit. When in Opposition, we often criticized the Government of the day because it did not budget for a deficit to prevent unemployment. It is no good Opposition members saying that they had all the rosy years, because the employment position in South Australia was often not as good when they were in Government as it is now.

Mr. Hurst: What happened in 1961?

Mr. RYAN: That year the Government of the day took great pleasure in announcing that it was budgeting for a surplus. The Opposition criticized such a Budget and said that the State should budget for a deficit rather than create unemployment—and that is what

happened, and it happened on several occasions. This Government decided to budget for a deficit in its first year because we thought it was a better financial policy and better for the people of the State. We went ahead with the works programme and the result was a deficit. I believe the people of the State endorsed that policy because they did not want unemployment. They did not want to see the Government with \$20,000 in the bank while people were walking the streets out of work. That would be foolish policy for a Government and, indeed, for a private enterprise. No business undertaking would want to create a surplus for its shareholders at the end of the year by putting people out of work. After all, a Government represents shareholders, too—the people of the State. We are proud that we budgeted for a deficit on moral grounds and improved the employment position in South Australia.

Mr. Jennings: Don't forget we inherited a deficit.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and we are suffering from the fact that before the 1965 election the Liberal Government had a good idea that it would not be returned, and therefore commenced Government works which we inherited and which it would never have started had it thought it would be returned as a Government.

Mr. Hurst: You are saying there was some bad planning before we took office?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, but the previous Government thought it was good planning to pass on this burden to the new Government.

Mr. Hurst: And they are trying to blame us now!

Mr. RYAN: True, they are trying to blame us for carrying on something we inherited, something they started and something we could not repudiate. The member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) referred to public works. He served for some time as a Cabinet Minister and should have known what was going on, although we know that, under the system that operated when he was a member of Cabinet, Ministers were not taken into the confidence of the then Premier. The honourable member referred to the policy speech made by the Premier before the last election and stated:

As a matter of interest, the previous Government's building programme was endorsed repeatedly by the then Opposition, which subsequently stated that it would honour all the previous Government's commitments. However, the list of commitments that the present Government is not honouring has grown, and the list of those it is honouring seems to be shrinking. Earlier this session we were told

that the Kimba water scheme would not be proceeded with for the time being, and a delay has occurred on the Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme.

His next reference particularly concerns me. He stated:

The Kangaroo Island water scheme particularly interests me; people there had to contend with about 533 grains a gallon in the water during the last summer. I remember when that project was approved by the Cabinet of which I was a member, when the then Premier said, "We must go straight ahead with this project, and complete it."

That becomes the joke of the year because, on reference to Public Works Committee reports, I find that this scheme was recommended and submitted to and approved by Parliament in July, 1962. The present Government is accused by the member for Alexandra of retarding important Government works. This scheme was considered uneconomic by those charged with putting it into operation and a modified scheme was referred back to the Public Works Committee for its consideration on July 8, 1965, when this Government had been in office for three months after 32 years in Opposition. It was investigated by the Public Works Committee and, in view of its urgency, an interim report was made on August 3, 1965. The final report was brought down on September 23, 1965—only about 10 weeks after it had been referred to the committee. The money has been appropriated by the present Government for this scheme, which will be started this year and finished in 1968. The member for Alexandra accused us of retarding Government works, yet in this case the previous Government did not start the job in three years, whereas this Government put under way a modified scheme in three months.

Mr. Hurst: How long have you been concerned about the Jervois bridge?

Mr. RYAN: I have waited for ages. This Government has taken action and work will commence in about three weeks. I wish to compliment the Leader of the Opposition on attaining the age of 70 years. He has reached a stage where, instead of looking forward to each birthday and saying that he has reached a certain age, he would like to take one year off.

Mr. Quirke: He is not an orphan in that respect.

Mr. RYAN: We are all getting older each day but we would all like to say we are not getting older and would like to take years off.

Mr. Clark: Possibly we're not all getting wiser.

Mr. RYAN: True. The Liberal Government got very old over 32 years, and because its policy became stale there was a change of Government in this State. Members opposite did not grow up with the progress of this State but went backward, and the people realized that. The people are not as silly as some members opposite would like to believe. In fact, the people can think for themselves and they can vote, and at the last election they voted according to their idea of the ability of the respective Parties.

Mr. McKee: The attitude of members opposite to social legislation was very backward.

Mr. RYAN: According to the Opposition, if a Labor Government does something in its social programme it is bad and nasty. In fact, those members right through the last session used the word "crook". We never used that word when we were in Opposition: we said the Government of that time lacked imagination, but we never said it was crook, although we may have thought it.

In expressing my congratulations to the Leader on his 70th birthday, I point out that he has possibly started a civil war in his own Party. At present there is a popularity poll taking place in the House of Assembly, and if any member of the Opposition wants to know where he stands in that poll I will tell him. I think the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele), as far as Totalizator Agency Board betting is concerned, is about 1,000,000 to one. We heard a most inspiring speech this afternoon by somebody who says he wants the position of Leader and that he is going to try to achieve it. It is a sorry state of affairs when a political Party has to go to the press for the press to select its Leader, and that is what has happened. Of course, the press has been the greatest single contributor ever to the Liberal and Country League cause, and it has contributed to such a degree that now it determines the policy of the L.C.L. On this occasion it has selected the Leader of the Opposition irrespective of the wishes of the individual members of the Party. The popularity poll does not read too well. The member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), because of his outstanding speech the other day, has shortened from 1,000,000 to one to 900,000 to one. I think the honourable member has bought so many of the editions that said he was fifth in running for the leadership that he would never be able to read all of them if he lived for 1,000 years.

Mr. Jennings: My tip is the member for Eyre.

Mr. RYAN: I know that one member wants me to tell him where he stands. I refer to the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip). Well, I think my chances of becoming the Leader are better than his, and I am not even in his Party.

Mr. Clark: I bet they would like to have you, though.

Mr. RYAN: We have often heard criticism of the method of electing the officers of the Parliamentary Labor Party. We have heard the criticism that it does not have democracy, that everything is crook and not fair and above board. According to what I have read in the press recently, the L.C.L. is adopting the principle that has always been followed by the Labor Party in electing its officers. Well, if it was crook when we did it when we were in Opposition, how can it now be right for the Liberals to do it when they are in Opposition?

Mr. Hurst: What do their rules say?

Mr. RYAN: The rules do not exist. We have heard members of the Opposition read the rules of the Australian Labor Party, which are available to everybody, but can we buy a copy of the L.C.L. rules?

Mr. Rodda: We'll give you one.

Mr. RYAN: We have been fortunate enough to get a copy of the agenda of its annual conference, and I can tell all honourable members that most items on it are items we have had on our platform for years and years, which we are now implementing as policy, and for which the Opposition is criticizing us. Some of the L.C.L. branches have submitted matters for discussion in the hope that they will be carried as L.C.L. policy at this coming conference.

Mr. Hurst: What about one vote one value?

Mr. RYAN: That is in there, yet when we tried to provide for this we were criticized and told that it was neither practicable nor possible. It is enlightening to compare the policy of the two main political Parties; and, let us face it, there are only two main political Parties. When the Labor Party calls a public meeting, anyone can go to it. The "Light" that went out referred to the Labor Party public meeting at which the hall was packed and there were 800 people outside. It was the biggest political meeting ever held in this State.

Mr. Langley: And anyone could go.

Mr. RYAN: That is so. The member for Unley was accused of being asleep at that meeting, but I was sitting behind him and I know that he did not go to sleep. Members

opposite are thinking of another meeting. A public meeting by the Labor Party to enunciate policy is a true public meeting, for it is open to all. Compare that with a public meeting called by the L.C.L.! One such meeting was held on Friday, June 24, to enunciate Liberal policy.

Mr. Hudson: Was it a red ticket or a pale pink ticket that one had to have?

Mr. RYAN: The ticket I have here is an invitation to hear the Hon. Allen Fairhall (Commonwealth Minister for Defence) at the Adelaide Town Hall on Monday, June 27, at 1 p.m., and it states that entry is by ticket only. It is a red ticket. I always thought the L.C.L.'s colour was blue, and that anything other than blue was something foreign and something it hated. However, it was a red ticket, and it stated that one could get into this public meeting by invitation only. I received one myself. I have dozens of them now.

Mr. McKee: The member for Light is wearing a red tie.

Mr. RYAN: I am not criticizing the meetings that were held, for they were called to enunciate the policies and the attitudes of the two political Parties. All we have heard is criticism of the public meetings held by the Labor Party: no criticism has been heard of the public meetings to be attended by invitation only.

Mr. HEASLIP: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is the honourable member for Port Adelaide acting within Standing Orders by showing exhibits?

The SPEAKER: No, he is not. However, although he was exhibiting invitations he put them down before I had the chance to draw his attention to them.

Mr. RYAN: How thin skinned can some members get? The Opposition can refer to public meetings at which its policy is enunciated, but when a Labor member retaliates they cannot take it. I am not concerned at any Party having meetings to let the public know its policy on any matter. Every meeting held by the Labor Party to publicly announce its policy has been criticized by the Opposition, but Opposition members have not referred to what happened at their meetings.

Mr. Clark: Would yellow be the appropriate colour?

Mr. RYAN: That would be a good colour.

Mr. Rodda: It is a wonder you did not attend a transport meeting several months ago.

Mr. Hurst: In our district we explain to the people and make them understand. They are not told half truths.

Mr. RYAN: Opposition members said that the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech was despondent and lacked imagination. I have never seen political representation that lacked imagination as much as the present Opposition. The Opposition would not pass transport legislation as it required experts to inquire into the matter and report to Parliament. When the Government does what was considered to be necessary, it is again criticized for setting up committees to investigate important matters. The member for Burnside said that the transport inquiry would be too expensive and was not warranted. Opposition members have the opportunity to present their viewpoints to the committees dealing with these important matters.

Mr. Rodda: Because of your statement, I thought you might have gone out and told the public what your legislation meant.

Mr. RYAN: I am always prepared to do that at any time. I will come into the honourable member's district and amplify the Labor Party's policy, if he will invite me.

Mr. McAnaney: Members of your Party were invited to transport meetings but they would not come.

Mr. Hurst: Were you speaking of the member for Port Adelaide?

Mr. RYAN: Who invited me?

Mr. McAnaney: Labor members were invited.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Victoria challenged me and I accepted. No-one invited the member for Port Adelaide to any of these meetings.

Mr. Freebairn: The member for Mount Gambier went to the pictures.

Mr. Jennings: Why shouldn't he? He would get more entertainment there.

Mr. McKee: We don't have to please the Opposition.

Mr. RYAN: I notice that the member for Gouger has been noticeably quiet since the newspapers selected him to become Leader of the Opposition, with the member for Albert as second favourite.

Mr. Burdon: They're speechless.

Mr. RYAN: Apparently Opposition members do not know when they are to select a Leader. When the ex-Premier was in charge he thought it was sinister to hold a meeting of the Party. Several Opposition members have

criticized the statement made by the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, prior to March, 1965, when he said:

Additional funds will also be available on account of the normal growth in Government revenue and Loan funds. The current trend of growth in Government expenditure and receipts is 7 per cent per annum and there is no indication that this trend is likely to alter. Apparently these are wild statements made by Opposition members who have not done their homework. With regard to the Loan Council, in 1965-66 this State received \$86,467,000 from Revenue, and \$82,949,000 from the Loan Account. For this year the State received \$93,189,000 from revenue and \$88,430,000 from the Loan Account. The increase from revenue was 7½ per cent and that from the Loan Account was 6½ per cent, an average increase from the Commonwealth Government of 7½ per cent. Obviously Opposition criticism was not true or factual, because the increase in the first year of this Party's Government was 7½ per cent, so that the Premier was ½ per cent out in his estimate. Opposition members have criticized the Government for not introducing new industries to the same extent as the Opposition introduced them when it was in Government. If one could add the wealth and financial growth of new industries coming into this State during the regime of Sir Thomas Playford, one would find that the total was astronomical! In fact, I do not think I have ever known a politician that could dream up new industries as the present Leader of the Opposition could dream them up, when he was the Premier of this State. Every Wednesday evening we heard of at least one (sometimes two, sometimes more) new industry.

Mr. McKee: Where did they go?

Mr. RYAN: They never came here, and there was never any intention of their coming here. One Opposition member asked about a salt industry being established in the Speaker's district, but the Leader knew that that industry would never eventuate, because arrangements were already in hand to establish it in Western Australia. The Leader often referred to new industries that would be established in a certain part of my district, but I used to traverse the area practically every day—

Mr. McKee: Did he have you in for a while?

Mr. RYAN: Never! If anyone visits the area today he will see the true position.

Mr. Rodda: Did you have your dark glasses on?

Mr. RYAN: Any dark glasses being worn are being worn by members of the Opposition.

Mr. Curren: They've got a dark horse, too.

Mr. RYAN: No. I think the Leader has selected his successor, and that's that! When the people of this State selected the Labor Government 12 months ago, and when this Government was first called together in Parliament, we used to hear members of the Opposition speaking to private Bills seeking that certain legislation be proceeded with. Each one of those Bills was part of Labor's policy and placed on the Notice Paper in the hope that the new Government would be embarrassed. However, that embarrassment has boomeranged on the Opposition, because until last Thursday not one private member's motion from the Opposition appeared asking for the implementation of Labor's policy. The Opposition knows that, even though time was limited and that we had been in office only 12 months, we passed through this House a record number of Bills. We were able to implement the greatest portion of Labor's policy and its most beneficial measures to the people of this State.

We are not embarrassed by what we have done, and we are not embarrassed by our policy. Referring to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, we see that the Labor Government this year will again proceed with a heavy programme, in the hope that it may implement more of its policy for the benefit of the State. Over the last few days the *News* has referred to the wonderful era of progress in this State under Sir Thomas Playford's regime. I shall not say that no progress occurred in those 32 years, but it took a page and a half to show what progress Sir Thomas Playford and his Government had made over that time, whereas the Labor Party published a booklet entitled, *Twelve Months in office by a Labor Government*, which took about 20 pages to include the measures we have implemented as our policy.

Mr. McAnaney: Extravagant with words, as well as with money!

Mr. RYAN: We are not extravagant. In fact, the member for Stirling would rather budget for a surplus than a deficit, if the surplus meant the creation of unemployment. That is not this Government's policy, however.

Mr. McKee: It was the former Government's policy to keep this a low-wage State.

Mr. RYAN: Free firewood from friendly farmers! The wage structure should not be high, because the former Government said people could get free firewood from friendly farmers! I shall quote from the *Monthly Summary of Australian Conditions*, pub-

lished by the National Bank of Australasia only a few days ago. I do not think the member for Stirling would regard that bank as a contributor to the Labor Party in any shape or form. The honourable member said that a downward trend had occurred because a Labor Government was in office. This publication refers to South Australia's retail trade as at the end of May, 1966. I shall refer to particular passages in relation to which criticism of this Government's activities has come from the Opposition. The article states:

There was an improvement during April when turnovers were considered to be generally up to those recorded over the similar period of last year.

The member for Stirling said there was a recession. Everything was going bad—industry, employment and finance!

Mr. McAnaney: What about the 7 per cent increases you were talking about?

Mr. RYAN: Was the honourable member asleep when I referred to that? The 7 per cent was an increase in revenue expenditure in the 12 months we have been in office. It was a 7½ per cent increase this year, as compared with last year, and the figure from the Loan Account was 6½ per cent.

Mr. McAnaney: Don't you want progress?

Mr. RYAN: There has been progress, and there will be.

Mr. McAnaney: You were quoting the same figures.

Mr. RYAN: They say that jarrah is difficult to penetrate, but I shall read the statement again for the benefit of the honourable member:

There was an improvement during April when turnovers were considered to be generally up.

Does that mean "down"? The chairlift at Victor Harbour goes up and comes down, and perhaps the honourable member will come down with it one day. This next quote will be important to the member for Stirling, for it states:

It is reported that manufacturers have raised the price of a number of grocery lines appreciably over the last two or three months.

I am still reading from the report of the "friendly Labor Party bank". The publication continues:

The latest official figures from the Department of Labour and National Service show that unemployment dropped by 347 persons in this State during March, leaving a total of 6,471 registered unemployed, as against 3,420 for the same period last year.

They are the bank's figures, and not those of the member for Port Adelaide; yet the member for Stirling has the audacity to say the Labor Government has created a recession.

Mr. McAnaney: You just read out that unemployment has doubled.

Mr. RYAN: All I can suggest is that the member for Stirling read *Hansard* tomorrow for the facts and figures I have quoted.

Mr. McAnaney: I would sooner read the quarterly summaries.

Mr. RYAN: I know it is extremely difficult to get anything over to the member for Stirling. In view of Opposition statements that the State had suffered a downward trend, I asked for a report from the Department of Labour and National Service as to the true position. The report, dated June, 1966 states:

It should be remembered that this State continues to receive, on a population basis, a larger percentage of migrants coming into Australia than most other States. Although there has been some increase in the number of persons registered for employment there has also been a significant increase in the number of persons employed. In the year ended March 31 last the number of persons employed in all areas of civilian employment increased by 2.8 per cent, which was the same percentage increase as in one of the Eastern States and higher than in the other two.

That is the downward trend to which the financial wizards of the Opposition are referring. It cannot be substantiated by any authoritative source. On what facts do they base their allegation of a downward trend created by the Labor Government? I ask members opposite to do their homework and bring forward substantiated facts of which we can take notice. We will not take notice of the rubbish stated so far. The Government has two more years in which to implement its policy. If the Labor Government is returned at the next election it will not receive so much opposition from another place because its return will mean that the people want a continuation of Labor Government, and members of another place will have received a direct answer from the people.

Mr. Hall: What if Labor is not returned?

Mr. RYAN: The member for Gouger came into the House on the same day as I did; which of our prophesies has been correct? The member for Gouger knows the answer. At only one election in the last 35 years did the Liberal and Country League vote exceed the vote of the Labor Party, and at each election the Labor Party vote and its representation in this House increased. As other members

and I had predicted, Labor eventually came to govern.

Many policies implemented by the Government have been widely accepted. Even the Tory *Advertiser* could not criticize the implementation of Labor policy in the legislation it has brought into this Parliament. The very items of legislation that the Opposition set out to destroy have boomeranged on it. Let us consider the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill under which Opposition members said people would be penalized. Their opposition has now boomeranged because its alleged purpose has not been achieved, and we are back where we started. I do not wish to go through all the legislation introduced in the last 12 months.

Mr. Hudson: The *News* dealt with 32 years of the previous Government.

Mr. RYAN: I noticed that half of the things referred to in that supplement were not under the control of this State, and the greatest assistance in that period came from the Commonwealth Labor Government. When the Leader of the Opposition was Premier he often let it be known that he received greater assistance from the Commonwealth Labor Government than he ever received from the Commonwealth Liberal Government. He said that he would prefer to deal with a Commonwealth Labor Government than a Commonwealth Liberal Government at any time. Half of the advances alleged to have been made in this State in that period were the result of Commonwealth intervention and money, and had nothing to do with the Government of this State. An article in the *Advertiser* of June 30 states:

Referring to proposed extensions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Sir Lyell McEwin said it would be a shame to "destroy the look of our most modern and best hospital." (Proposals now before the Public Works Committee are for \$8,500,000 extensions, including a nine-floor wing of 185 beds and a new floor on top of the general wards.) Sir Lyell McEwin said the hospital was a most attractive building and its features would be destroyed if the proposed building was to be a mere repetition of the existing buildings.

"I am sorry that advantage has not been taken to obtain another opinion because that would satisfy me and all the many other people who are not in a position to speak on the subject," he said. "They regret that there should be any intrusion on the open area at the hospital." This area was never intended to be the site for a new building, Sir Lyell McEwin said.

Although Sir Lyell McEwin was Chief Secretary for many years, he was apparently not

prepared to avail himself of information available on this matter. His was a wild statement and I could go as far as to say that he was talking out of the back of his neck. These extensions were referred to the Public Works Committee for consideration and the committee inquired of the original designers of the hospital. The plans and specifications of the original building were handed over to the Public Buildings Department. I have found out that the department believes that even had the designers of the original building contemplated these extensions they could not have constructed the building more suitably for their provision. Sir Lyell McEwin was playing politics, for these extensions will provide better and cheaper hospitalization. An outside opinion was sought, and the Public Buildings Department proceeded on that opinion, yet this criticism by the Opposition was headlined in the Tory *Advertiser*. That was done because it was something that was implemented by a Labor Government, and anything so implemented will get headlines in the *Advertiser*.

Mr. McKee: We are not setting out to please the Opposition.

Mr. RYAN: No, we are here to benefit the State as a whole, to represent all the people of South Australia, not just one section that contributes to the L.C.L.'s cause. I now refer to one matter mentioned in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. This matter was not referred to last year because, as members of the Opposition know, it is not possible for a Party that has been in Opposition for 32 years to implement the whole of its policy in one year. I have often heard it said in this Chamber that the Liberal Party believes in competition. However, Opposition members do not believe in competition if the State competes with private enterprise. If we wished to socialize an industry, the Opposition would say that such action was not fair and not warranted. But what did the then Government do when it started the uranium field? That was said to be run for the State on behalf of the State, and that was good, according to the Government at that time.

Mr. Langley: What about the Electricity Trust?

Mr. RYAN: I have referred to that before. We would not have had the trust today had it not been for the support of the Labor Party on that occasion, yet members of the Opposition would probably be the first to complain if it was ever suggested that the trust be handed back to private enterprise.

Mr. Jennings: But the Minister for Rhodesia proposed it!

Mr. RYAN: This is a State Parliament dealing with State affairs. I do not profess to know what goes on in Rhodesia because I am not an expert on that subject, and a person who has never been there cannot be an expert on it.

Mr. Rodda: You are setting yourself up as a philosopher now.

Mr. RYAN: No, as the Labor member for Port Adelaide. I do not want to be a philosopher or an expert on a place to which I have never been and about which I know nothing.

Mr. Hughes: It was Leigh Creek that made the Electricity Trust, wasn't it?

Mr. RYAN: Certainly it was.

Mr. Hughes: And remember that in today's press a Liberal member referred to Mr. Chifley as one of the greatest politicians of all time.

Mr. RYAN: I think we all agree with that. The amazing thing is that a Labor politician is never a great public man or a great politician until after he dies: during his lifetime, according to the Liberals, he is probably the worst politician. Why does this have to happen after he dies?

Mr. Hall: Never mind, you will be here with us for some time.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and as a Government member, too. Whether or not the member for Gouger succeeds, at the request of the press, in becoming the Leader of the Opposition, he will not be here for very long unless he changes from Gouger to Gumeracha. He knows that the writing is on the wall. If ever a member got a terrific shake when the voting figures were announced at the last election it was the member for Gouger, and he is looking for ways and means to shift somewhere else. The same applies to the member for Alexandra. I told the former Minister of Education to his face that he would not be a member of this Parliament after the 1965 election, a fact which members can ascertain by reading *Hansard*, and I make the same statement regarding the member for Gouger after the next election.

Mr. Hughes: But he will be the Leader of the Opposition then.

Mr. RYAN: At any rate, it will be interesting to see what happens. I speak on behalf of the Government which I represent and of which I am proud to be a member. The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech referred to the setting up of a State insurance office, and from the moment it was mentioned we heard criticism from the Opposition, which says

that it does not believe in competition if it is competition between Government and private enterprise. That will be the cry again when the Bill is introduced. Members of the Opposition should do a little homework on this question and discover the benefit that such offices have been to the other States. If we can set up a State insurance office it will be a great asset to this State and it will not in any way affect our grants or reimbursements from the Commonwealth.

Sometimes, members opposite pick pieces out of a quotation or a publication to justify their argument that certain things should not be implemented because they are not paying propositions. We heard such remarks from the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), who has had his ego really upset. The honourable member knew he was not in the running for the leadership of the Party, so he did everything possible to gain the pre-selection for Boothby in the Commonwealth Parliament, and he thought he was a certainty. According to members opposite, everything they do is fair and everything the Labor Party does is unfair. Well, all I can say is that the way the Liberal Party is carrying on today it can never improve, because it can never be scrupulously fair.

Mr. Hall: Tell us about the passenger terminal you were recommending the other day?

Mr. RYAN: If the member for Gouger becomes the Leader of the Opposition I can see the Labor Party being in Government for many years. I wish now to refer to an article that was reprinted in the *Australian Financial Review* of May 31, 1966. This article was written by a special insurance writer, who would know much more about the insurance business than members do. As this is a long article, I shall not read it all.

Mr. Hughes: Give the lot and then there can be no argument.

Mr. RYAN: This report is headed "United Kingdom capital restrictions stress insurance outflow", and was written by a special insurance writer, who refers to the transfer back of insurance premiums. It states:

Surpluses above this group limit are then directed for cession to the principal office treaty re-insurers. Premiums in respect of these surpluses are transmitted to the overseas head office. . . .

This is important. I stand to be corrected if I am wrong, but I doubt whether there is one wholly Australian-owned insurance company in Australia today, except State insurance offices.

Mr. Millhouse: There are some. You just don't know anything about it.

Mr. RYAN: The member should not misinterpret what I have said, that there was not one "wholly" Australian-owned company in Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: We can all hear you saying that.

Mr. RYAN: I do not want to refer to what happened in the change-over to decimal currency, when one insurance company made millions of cents although the insured got nothing out of it.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the South Australian Insurance Company?

Mr. RYAN: That is not wholly Australian-owned. Let the honourable member look up the list of shareholders. I said I doubted whether there was one wholly Australian-owned insurance company in this State. I think that is a true statement. The member for Mitcham referred to the liability that a State insurance office would be to South Australia. He took one small section from an Auditor-General's Report or a Parliamentary report and said, "This is factual." Apparently, he does not want to go on and look at a report that shows the benefit that can be derived from the setting up of such an office.

I now refer to the report of the New South Wales Auditor-General for the year ended June 30, 1965 (the latest available) on the Government Insurance Office in that State. This report was not cited by the member for Mitcham: he merely took out a small portion and said, "This is bad", a term similar to that used by Opposition members last session when they said "This is crook. Don't go on with this or we will oppose it, because we do not believe in Government competition with free enterprise."

I do not think anyone can say that the Auditor-General would not present a factual statement, and in his report on the New South Wales Government Insurance Office to which I have referred he sets out the results for 1964 and 1965. In 1964, the surplus for the worker's compensation department was \$1,421,174 and in 1965 it was \$1,535,486. The surplus in the fire department in 1964 was \$1,433,550 and in 1965 it was \$1,570,592. In 1964 the surplus in the marine department was \$32,896 and in 1965 it was \$41,416.

I now wish to refer to the general accident department. This is the type of insurance that is the concern of most motorists in this State today, when they are being robbed by insurance companies that require

increased premiums but are not giving proper service. That department, which handles third party motor vehicle insurance, had a surplus in 1964 of \$100,066 and in 1965 the surplus was \$35,352. This is the item that the member for Mitcham took out of the context when he said, "The Government Insurance Office is no good. It is a losing proposition, and we should not proceed with an insurance office in this State."

For other insurance, the surplus in 1964 was \$779,002 and, in 1965, \$859,008. For the information of Opposition members, in 1964 the overall surplus of the State Insurance office in New South Wales was \$3,766,688, and in 1965 it increased to \$4,041,854. This does not interfere with the matter of reimbursement from the Commonwealth. If we could get the same type of business, we would only be taking from private enterprise what was being transferred overseas, as shown in the article in the report I have mentioned, and that money is a dead loss as far as this State is concerned.

I shall go further, because some Opposition members may say, "You quote from reports for one State. What about other States?" The member for Mitcham ought to have referred to the position in more than one State. I now refer to the Victorian Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1965. In that State they have two offices of insurance. The following table shows the net profit made by the accident insurance office in each of the last five years:

| | |
|------------------|-------------|
| 1960-61 | \$1,187,602 |
| 1961-62 | \$1,053,552 |
| 1962-63 | \$1,733,474 |
| 1963-64 | \$1,102,570 |
| 1964-65 | \$1,311,144 |

Up to the present this year it has made a profit of over \$1,000,000.

Mr. Nankivell: How much was transferred to revenue?

Mr. RYAN: At June, 30, 1965, the assets were \$20,062,618. The general reserves were \$6,000,000 and building improvement reserves were \$30,000. The appropriation account stood at \$1,311,144. It is a poor losing proposition!

Mr. Heaslip: That money was only appropriated to that account, not paid out.

Mr. Nankivell: It was not paid to the State.

Mr. RYAN: I thought I had all the reports here, but I have only the Auditor-General's Report. This is what the member for Mitcham says is crook. The other insurance office in Victoria is the State Motor Car Insurance Office, and the latest figures I could

obtain for that office show that at June 30, 1964, \$4,726,200 had been invested. That is bad business, a risk! According to the Tasmanian Auditor-General's Report for 1965 (and this is in the State whose progress does not compare with that of South Australia) since the establishment of the insurance office in 1920, total net profits paid to the consolidated revenue fund were \$1,511,878; appropriation for reserve general account amounted to \$779,130 and for the building fund \$78,032, while unallocated profits for 1964-65 were \$2,573,570. For Queensland, which may be compared with South Australia in many respects, the Auditor-General's Report for 1965 states that for 1964-65 the life assurance fund stood at \$68,999,464, while premiums received for the workers' compensation fund were \$15,668,106, excluding the sum for mining diseases.

The overall surplus of this office for 1965 was \$5,466,454. The Queensland State Government Insurance Office figures are divided into various sections but do not interfere with the overall figures I have quoted. The financial wizards of the Opposition say that these offices do not pay. Why should they pay in every other State and be a means of contributing to State revenue, and yet that not apply to South Australia?

A better argument is needed to oppose the legislation outlined by the Lieutenant-Governor with regard to a State insurance office. For the Queensland State Government Insurance Office, as at June 30, 1964, total funds and provisions were \$114,735,960 compared with \$125,903,424, an increase in one year of \$11,167,464, and yet this is not a paying proposition! It is a field of revenue that this State should have entered years ago, and would have except for the dominating policy of the Liberal Government dictated by private industry, which prevented this. In Western Australia, which recently started an upward trend of financial, physical, and material progress, for 1963-64, the General Revenue Account net surplus transferred to general reserve was \$135,224, while in 1964-65 this had increased to \$251,590.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The Liberals tried their best to smash it there but dare not because of public support.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. In the States where this principle was applied by a Labor Government, a change to a Liberal Government has not resulted in the abolishing of State insurance offices. This is one of the greatest sources of revenue for any State, and it does

not interfere with Commonwealth Government reimbursements. South Australia has been backward in this matter, as it has in other matters where private enterprise has impeded the implementation of legislation.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Nearly all councils in Western Australia insure through the Government insurance office.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and that principle applies in most other States. Why has South Australia always been the last State to do anything? For the last 32 years it has been under Liberal domination, and in many matters we have been a Cinderella State. The Labor Government, in power by the will of the people, is accused of introducing a socialistic programme, but Opposition members will have to change their thinking. The people have said they want something, and the only way they can get it is through a Labor Government. The Governor does not draw up the Governor's Speech: it contains the policy of the Government of the day, and the Ministers decide what shall be contained in this Speech. I warn Opposition members that although we had a heavy session last year the coming session will be heavier. It must be if we are to overcome the lag in legislation that should have been introduced in the past. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion, and will have much pleasure in supporting the Government's legislation this session. The people of the State want something, and we will give it to them by implementing the Labor Party's policy as enunciated in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) made a speech that was at times almost hysterical, a speech in which he condemned the Opposition for not being constructive. But the honourable member, following those words, destructively criticized individuals as well as the Opposition. He condemns the Opposition, but then he does the thing for which he condemns the Opposition. I cannot agree that the Opposition has been merely destructively critical of what the Government has done. The Opposition will not subscribe to many of the Bills and policies in which the Government believes: we would not be a good Opposition if we did. Then he said that his Party was proud of the deficit and said that the Liberal and Country League was out to destroy itself as a political Party. On that point, the L.C.L. Party is here not for its own sake but for the good of South Australia and its people. If it destroys itself in trying

to save South Australia and its people, it will at least have tried to do what it is here for—to represent the people of South Australia and to try to foster progress into the State.

Usually his Excellency's Speech is a forecast of the Government's intention for the next 12 months, of its policy and the projects it will embark on. I have always looked forward to these Speeches and got from them something to benefit the State and its people, but this year, unfortunately, I derived no pleasure from reading this negative Speech. I know that His Excellency read it but did not prepare it. The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) did not say it was a fine speech but the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) said it was. He also said:

It is most essential to have some measure of control over prices, for the continuance of this legislation has always been a deterrent to the unscrupulous people who unduly raise prices.

I will say more about that later. He continued:

It is necessary once again to introduce legislation to prescribe land tax rates, following the quinquennial assessment that has just been announced. Taking it all round, the Speech by His Excellency was a fine one.

The member for Chaffey seems to think it is a fine one but I got no pleasure from it. He pointed out to the House what he considered were the principal Bills mentioned in the Speech. He said:

The principal new measures to be introduced are a Bill to set up a lottery controlled by the Government, as a result of the referendum held last year; a Bill to establish Totalizator Agency Board betting in South Australia, as a result of the opinion expressed in this House last session; and the proposal to establish a State Government Insurance Office.

If those are the principal Bills to be introduced over the next 12 months, then I fear for the future of South Australia and its people. There is nothing in them that will give our people more employment or lead to increased production in this State. If that is a "fine speech", then it is different from what I believe a fine speech to be.

Mr. Rodda: Your fears are well founded.

Mr. HEASLIP: I hope they are not: I hope the future of South Australia is assured.

Mr. Hurst: Have you ever been wrong previously?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes; I have been wrong and am prepared to admit that I am often wrong. Nobody is right all the time. I hope I am wrong on this occasion and that the State

will progress under this type of legislation—lotteries, T.A.B. and Government insurance—because those are the principal Bills, according to the member for Chaffey, to be introduced this session. I can see no progress resulting from them but I can see much danger if that is the type of legislation that the Government will introduce over the next 12 months. I refer now to the Premier's policy speech made before the last election. I note that paragraph 42 of the Speech deals with budgeting and revenue. This is what the Premier said about finance in his policy speech:

So soon as I mention anything concerning finance, I am always asked "Where will you get the money?" Let me remind you that the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, M.P., as Treasurer, carried on with a deficit of almost £2,250,000 for the first six months of the present financial year and the affairs of the State went on without any fuss.

Mr. Hall: That is an admission that we were going all right.

Mr. HEASLIP: If we can balance a Budget at the end of 12 months, that is what counts. We can be down the drain halfway through the year; it is what happens at the end of 12 months that really matters. The present Premier went on to say:

Ours is not a policy for extravagance; it is one for accuracy in budgeting.

Mr. Quirke: One can have an accurate Budget even though one is down the drain.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, if one budgets for it; but, if one does not budget for it, it is not accurate budgeting. The Government got something different from what it budgeted for.

Mr. Hurst: What would be a reasonable allowable margin of error?

Mr. HEASLIP: I will answer you that question in a few minutes' time. Paragraph 42 of the Speech states:

In September last my Treasurer presented a Budget of Revenue and Expenditure estimating a deficit on current operations of \$3,082,000 . . . the estimated net deficit at the end of this financial year, given the revenues intended to be raised, was \$1,859,000.

That was 14 months ago and, if reasonable budgeting had occurred, one would have expected the deficit to be near the mark. However, 14 months later we find that \$8,000,000 is the figure—not merely double the deficit budgeted for, but almost treble! If a person conducting a business under those conditions called that accurate budgeting, he would not last long. Indeed, it is the exact opposite of what the Premier said when he stated:

Ours is not a policy for extravagance; it is one for accuracy in building.

How can one budget for a deficit of \$1,800,000 and end up with a deficit of \$8,000,000? What has happened to the money? His Excellency's Speech stated:

The very dry season has had adverse effects throughout this State; it has reduced the earnings of the Railways and Harbors Board Departments and has increased the costs of supplying water.

The Leader of the Opposition quite properly refuted that statement, because it is not correct. We have not experienced a dry season. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) also tried to show that the dry season was partly the reason for the deficit and said he had obtained his figures from somebody else. He quoted some figures in relation to wheat deliveries to the Australian Wheat Board, calling them production figures, but they are not quite correct, for a difference of 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 bushels occurs in each case. He apparently obtained the wrong figures. One member, after quoting those figures, asked, "How much is that above the average of the State for the last 20 years?" and the member for Frome replied that he could not say. The honourable member was trying to say that the 36,100,000 bushels reaped in South Australia last year was below the average and that, because of that fact, it was partly the reason for the deficit that had occurred.

Mr. Casey: I didn't say it was below the average; I said it was below the production of the year before, and of the year before that.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but the honourable member quoted figures for previous years and said that the figures for those two years were below the others. Further, he said that in 1961-62 South Australia produced a total of 30,712,000 bushels, in 1962-63, 34,993,000 bushels, in 1963-64, about 51,000,000 bushels, in 1964-65, about 49,000,000 bushels. In concluding that statement, he said that because of adverse seasonal conditions (referring to 1965-66) the crop was poor, but I point out that it was not a poor crop.

Mr. Casey: I said it was down on the two previous years.

Mr. HEASLIP: It was a poor crop because of adverse seasonal conditions. The crop reaped last year was nearly 4,000,000 bushels above the average for the last 20 years, so it cannot be called a poor crop. The last five years have been good years, during which the total production has been well above average, the average for those years being 36,800,000 bushels. Last year 36,100,000 bushels was

reaped, approximating the average for the last five years.

Mr. Hughes: How would that compare with the acreage?

Mr. HEASLIP: The acreage has not altered much, although it is gradually increasing; the average acreage for each of the four years previous to the last year was 2,220,000, 2,800,000, 2,500,000, and 2,200,000. During this "poor" season there was a record number of sheep in South Australia—over 17,250,000.

Mr. McAnaney: What about wool production?

Mr. HEASLIP: That naturally follows. Further, cattle in South Australia last year totalled 697,000, 694,000 the previous year, and 678,000 in the year before that. There would probably be a record number of pigs, too.

Mr. Rodda: What about fowls?

Mr. HEASLIP: They are going up! The member for Frome and the Premier tried to establish that the so-called poor season was partly the reason for the deficit but, frankly, one could not help smiling when the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) blamed the weather for the lack of employment in the building industry. The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech dismisses primary production in 28 words, and yet primary industry is mainly responsible for the State's finances.

Mr. Casey: Not only the State's but also the nation's; two-thirds of our gross national product is made up from primary production.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course it is, but why dismiss it in 28 words?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you think things would be much better for primary production if it were said in 60 words?

Mr. HEASLIP: If the Government realized the importance of primary production it would give more information about it because it is of major importance to South Australia. The smallest paragraph in the Speech states, "A Bill to amend the Evidence Act will be laid before you." That gives no information—nor do the 28 words devoted to primary production.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: But you know all about primary production; you don't need to be told.

Mr. HEASLIP: I wish I did. What would be the use of the Agriculture Department if everybody knew about primary production?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The department is doing well.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, it is helping us tremendously.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: We have a good Minister now.

Mr. HEASLIP: I should not like to see this department cease to function. Why have the department if we know all about agriculture?

Mr. Clark: How many words are there?

Mr. HEASLIP: Primary production is dealt with in 28 words.

Mr. Clark: In the Book of Genesis the whole world was created in less.

Mr. HEASLIP: We are not talking about the Bible now.

Mr. Clark: I am.

Mr. HEASLIP: The paragraph referring to primary production states:

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

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Brevity is the soul of wit.

Mr. Nankivell: It's not funny.

Mr. HEASLIP: Nothing in the Speech should be funny because the welfare of the State depends on what is contained in it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: On the 28 words?

Mr. HEASLIP: On all that is contained in the Speech. Primary production is dismissed in 28 words, and is partly blamed for the State's \$8,000,000 deficit and for unemployment in the building industry. Part of paragraph 42 states:

... while the general slowing down in the Australian economy has reduced a number of major Government revenues.

The Leader gave some excellent and factual figures in regard to that. The unemployment figure for South Australia in March, 1965, was .8 per cent; only Victoria had a smaller percentage unemployed. In 1965, the Australian figure for unemployment was 1.2 per cent. Only 14 months later, in May, 1966, the South Australian unemployment figure had jumped from .8 per cent to 1.5 per cent. From having the second lowest unemployment figure in the Commonwealth, South Australia's figure had risen to the second highest. This rise is peculiar to South Australia.

Mr. Hurst: Too much attention to primary production!

Mr. HEASLIP: The overall Commonwealth unemployment figure remained at 1.2 per cent. Why has this happened?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Doesn't employment affect the spending of money?

Mr. HEASLIP: Possibly, but it is no good spending money unwisely. South Australia has a deficit of \$8,000,000 and yet three times as many people are unemployed as were unemployed about 12 months ago. Has this money

been spent wisely and, if it has, why have we so much unemployment? Quite frankly, I fear for South Australia's future. South Australia's deficit this year must mean that less is available to spend next year. However, the Government intends to spend millions of dollars on a State insurance scheme.

Mr. Casey: I should hate to live in Victoria. Do you know its deficit?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know the position there, but I know that its employment figure is the second highest in Australia and that South Australia has the second lowest figure.

Mr. Casey: They have a multi-million dollar deficit this year.

Mr. HEASLIP: Then I am sorry for them. Is it good policy to spend millions of dollars on bricks and mortar in building a new insurance office? Wouldn't it be better to spend that money on something productive that would provide employment? I believe that would be the right thing to do. I always thought the Labor Party believed in full employment but in this case it is spending millions of dollars on an insurance company and leaving the unemployment figure as it is, which is too high. Last Thursday we heard that a salt works projected for this State was now to be established in Western Australia. At Elizabeth recently, 150 men were put out of work and Diecasters transferred its operations to Victoria. Why is this sort of thing happening?

Mr. Casey: We lost the salt works because of the previous Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: The previous Government really tried.

Mr. Casey: But it did not succeed.

Mr. HEASLIP: True, but this industry has gone only in the last 12 months.

Mr. Casey: It went long before that; it went in the life of the previous Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: This new industry would have been good for South Australia but it would have employed only about 17 men. Those running industries are losing confidence in South Australia. For the sake of unification, South Australia is building up its costs to such an extent that we cannot compete.

Mr. Hughes: Tell the House the real reason why Diecasters left.

Mr. HEASLIP: I cannot say: only the company management would know. The Premier, too, may know the real reason, but I do not. However, I know that we have lost that industry.

Mr. Casey: The salt industry was lost by the previous Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know about that, but I know that Diecasters went in the last 12 months. It is interesting to read the reports in the newspaper regarding the position in the other States, and in that respect I refer, first, to a report of a Labor Premier from Tasmania. That report states:

Tasmania, Australia's smallest State in size, population and resources, is on the brink of its biggest boom in history. In the next few years, upwards of \$150,000,000 is going to be poured into the State's primary (it comes first there) and secondary industries—and the Government can take a lot of the credit.

I believe it can, too. I think any Government that can do that sort of thing can take a great deal of credit. A report from Sydney states:

The New South Wales Chief Secretary and Minister of Labour and Industry said a few weeks ago that he was "not altogether happy" with the rate of development of New South Wales compared with other States.

The position in New South Wales is not as good as the position in Tasmania. The report from Brisbane states:

Serious damage done to rural production in Queensland by the drought last year undoubtedly will be reflected in the State's earnings this year. But income from all other avenues of production is expected to reach record heights. New South Wales shared in that drought with Queensland. The report from Western Australia (which State, incidentally, is going ahead faster than any of the others), states:

Stimulated by iron ore developments in the north of the State and almost over-full employment, Western Australia is enjoying a period of exceptional prosperity. Indeed, conditions are so buoyant at present that there is a danger that the community will suffer seriously from local inflation.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You don't think that is right, do you?

Mr. HEASLIP: Well, there is a definite shortage of labour in Western Australia, and I know that some people are going there from the Eastern States, by-passing South Australia; and, in view of our unemployment, we cannot blame them for doing so.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Do you want total employment or under-employment? You are having a bob each way.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not; all I said was that it could cause inflation.

Mr. Hurst: Where do you get your employment figures for Western Australia?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not have them here with me.

Mr. Hurst: You are making them up as you go along?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not. Anybody who has read the employment figures for Australia

will substantiate what I am saying: that Western Australia is making more progress than any other State in the Commonwealth. South Australia had that distinction some time ago, but it does not have it today. At one time we were absorbing, I think, 24 per cent of the migrants, but we are not doing so today. The present position frightens me: I do not like what is happening. As I said before, the present Government in this State changed a \$1,000,000 surplus of a year ago to a deficit of \$8,000,000.

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

Mr. HEASLIP: Before the dinner adjournment I referred to the deterioration in State finances. I think the Government ought to look into this matter before providing buildings for an insurance office. Although we have had the second best employment figures in the Commonwealth, we now have the second worst. I am concerned about that and I think the Government is, too. I cannot supply the answer but I think the Government will do its best to overcome this real difficulty. Government is the biggest business in the State and difficulty arises if money is spent without adequate thought being given to how it is being expended. I think the Government has spent without realizing the consequences, and it now has a deficit of \$8,000,000.

Mr. Ryan: You would rather have unemployment.

Mr. HEASLIP: That money should have been spent in giving employment to the unemployed. We have not a sufficient number of voices to direct the Government, but it is not so silly that it will not try to overcome the difficulties in this State regarding unemployment.

Mr. Shannon: Did you read in the *News* that a union organizer in the building trade is telling people not to come here unless they have jobs?

Mr. HEASLIP: I shall refer to that matter now that it has been raised.

Mr. McKee: Have you copies of the newspapers of about 1960 and 1961?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is reported in today's *News* that an official of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners in South Australia has sent a warning to migrants on the shortage of jobs here. The Government must do something about this.

Mr. McKee: The young British people will not come here now, because the Liberal Government in Canberra will conscript them to fight in an undeclared war if they do.

Mr. HEASLIP: That is not a State issue but, if the honourable member wishes, I shall debate it with him, because I have firm views on the matter and support the Commonwealth Government. I am talking about migration to South Australia. The member for Port Pirie is a Government backbencher and can do something about the position. The newspaper report to which I have referred goes on to say that Mr. V. J. Martin, secretary of the society, said today that he had sent the warning recently to the London equivalent of the society and that building trade union officials today agreed that the employment situation in South Australia's building industry was not improving. That is the report, despite what the member for Port Pirie says about it. We are not absorbing enough migrants in South Australia. We shall not be able to do that unless we have full employment here. We are not bringing to South Australia as many migrants now as we were bringing about 18 months ago.

Mr. McKee: Do you know that that is happening in other States as well?

Mr. HEASLIP: The intake of migrants is not as good as it has been, and such matters are important to the State and to the people. Are we here to look after South Australia and our people or to promote a particular political Party? It seems to me that many back-bench Government members are here for political purposes. However, I am elected by the people of my district and am interested in the good of South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: And of the Liberal and Country League?

Mr. McKee: Since the Labor Party has become the Government of this State, conditions have been so good that we cannot prevent people from coming here. Migration has doubled because there is a Labor Government in power. They come from a low wage State to a high wage State to reap the benefits of the prosperity under a Labor Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: As many migrants are coming to Australia today as were coming here a year or two ago, but not as many are coming to South Australia as came previously.

Mr. Ryan: They are.

Mr. HEASLIP: They are by-passing South Australia and going to Western Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: Give us some proof!

Mr. HEASLIP: There is employment in Western Australia, but there is unemployment in South Australia. I am not moralizing or submitting figures out of the air. I am giving the facts.

Mr. McKee: You are writing your State down.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am trying to build it up, and that is why I am here. I am interested in the people and State of South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: What is your authority for those figures?

Mr. HEASLIP: They can be obtained anywhere.

Mr. Ryan: Let us have them so that they can be included in *Hansard*.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not have them with me at present.

Mr. Ryan: They are not true!

Mr. Broomhill: Where did you get them?

Mr. HEASLIP: I shall read what has been published about the position in Western Australia.

Mr. Ryan: Liberal and Country League propaganda!

Mr. HEASLIP: No, it is not. This is what was stated in a newspaper:

Stimulated by iron ore development in the north of the State and almost over-full employment, Western Australia is enjoying a period of exceptional prosperity in that conditions are so buoyant at present there is a danger of inflation.

Mr. Ryan: What has that got to do with migrants coming to South Australia?

Mr. HEASLIP: They are by-passing South Australia and going to Western Australia.

Mr. Ryan: What is your authority?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Boilermakers from Whyalla have gone to Western Australia and come back to Whyalla because they could not get work in Western Australia.

Mr. HEASLIP: Today Whyalla is a city that is offering employment. It is growing, but there would not be a Whyalla if it had not been for the Playford Government.

Mr. Ryan: What about the development of Rocky River?

Mr. McKee: His Government would not put a silo at Appila!

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not getting on to that subject. That was one of the things promised but repudiated by the present Government. Because the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech had nothing productive in it and nothing to help South Australia go forward, I refer to the present Premier's policy speech, which stated:

So also will any proposal to increase the Ministry to provide for six Ministers in the House of Assembly and three in the Legislative Council until such time as there is a substantial increase in the number of members in the House of Assembly, but if Sir Thomas desired to establish the office of Premier this can and should be done by regulation.

The then Leader of the Opposition opposed the appointment of a ninth Minister in his policy speech.

Mr. Ryan: Only until the representation was increased, and didn't he try to do that?

Mr. McAnaney: And now he admits he wants another one.

Mr. HEASLIP: He said he would oppose the extra Minister's appointment until there were more members of this House. However, we supported him when he introduced legislation for the extra Minister.

Mr. Ryan: What about the increased numbers?

Mr. HEASLIP: The Premier said he would not have an extra Minister until we had more members of Parliament. Obviously he made a mistake but we helped to rectify that by agreeing to the appointment of a ninth Minister. South Australia is better off for it and that is why we wanted it. The Labor Party was wrong and should admit it. The people of South Australia, whom we represent, are better off, particularly the primary producers. The next paragraph of the Premier's policy speech is interesting if one remembers that it was made 16 months ago, as it stated:

The Labor Party has always been opposed to executive control and our reasoning in this matter is that we must give greater opportunities for the voice of the people to be heard in Parliament rather than to be subjected to executive control by an extra Minister without a substantial increase in the number of members.

He was emphatic about it because he believed it, but again he was wrong. He has the extra Minister without any increase in the number of members. No-one on this side agrees with Executive control, and the Labor Party also opposed it. However, now it agrees with it because we have never had more Executive control in this State than we have now.

Mr. Ryan: The ninth Minister was appointed not by the Executive but by legislation.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Port Adelaide is not with us. I had finished with that point. We knew it was right but the Labor Party thought it was wrong. However, when it came to power it wanted the extra Minister, and we supported this move.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The Government knew but would not admit it.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course. The Government was wrong, and if it is honest it should admit that.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think the Government has ever been right since it has been in power?

Mr. HEASLIP: I shall not be drawn on that. I know that the Labor Party opposed Executive control. So did we, and we still do, but there is more Executive control today than ever.

Mr. Ryan: How do you account for the fact that Parliament met more last year than ever before?

Mr. HEASLIP: I don't know, but we have a better Opposition.

Mr. Ryan: Judging by the present speaker it must be weaker.

Mr. HEASLIP: No-one can dispute these facts, and it has all happened in the last 12 months. This is a promise made by the present Government:

Labor's proposals provide for a general hospital at Tea Tree Gully of 500 beds and a teaching hospital for the south-western districts of 800 beds. This must be at or near the university area at Bedford Park and to provide for sufficient doctors this teaching hospital must be erected without delay.

That was 16 months ago. Has anyone heard of the Tea Tree Gully hospital or the Bedford Park hospital? They are not even on the drawing boards after 16 months. Have these ever come before the Public Works Committee? Have we heard anything about them? No—they are dead. These promises were made in the policy speech 18 months ago. Why have we not heard anything about them?

I come now to mental health. The policy speech states:

Labor will immediately speed up the rehousing of mental hospital patients in modern buildings adequate for their needs.

Before the previous Government went out of power a report came from the Public Works Committee about Strathmont and mentally retarded people, and immediately afterwards there came another report about Elanora. When will they be built?

Mrs. Steele: The Government has missed the bus for Commonwealth assistance.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, of course. We had an offer from the Commonwealth Government to subsidize these schemes, but the Government has missed the bus. We are not getting that Commonwealth assistance now.

Mrs. Steele: It is the people who are suffering because of that.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. This was to be, not in 18 months' time but immediately, just as the new hospitals at Tea Tree Gully and Bedford Park were to be built immediately the present Government came into power. Has it honoured its promises?

Mr. Quirke: Has it got the land?

Mr. HEASLIP: The land was bought by the previous Government, but this Government has not carried on with the work.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much noise. I do not propose to allow the debate to continue in this strain. If the honourable member will address the Chair I will try to give him the best protection I can.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know whether or not I was out of order but I was trying to address you, Sir. I do not think I have named anybody opposite in particular. I have been addressing you, Sir, as much as I could. I admit I have been in difficulties.

The SPEAKER: I did not say the honourable member was out of order. I said that there was too much noise generally, that I did not propose to allow the debate to continue like this and that if the honourable member would address the Chair I would give him as much protection as I could.

Mr. HEASLIP: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I shall get on faster now. A little further on in this policy speech, on which the Government was elected, we come to service pay:

Service payment retrospective to January 1, 1965, will be made with provision that our service payments will be in addition to any amount at present being received, with a proviso that they will be in agreement with the decisions of our Industrial Advisory Committee.

I do not know what "our Industrial Advisory Committee" means.

Mr. Jennings: It has been mentioned many times, so you should know by now.

Mr. HEASLIP: I know, but who they are and what they are does not matter. What concerns me is that this back service pay was paid by the present Government. We now have an \$8,000,000 deficit. What we shall do in the future for money I do not know. We cannot do without it. The money spent on back service pay (which, I suggest, would be not less than \$2,000,000 and could be as much as \$4,000,000) has bought votes for Government members. There is no doubt about that: it is political.

Mr. Jennings: But there has not been an election since.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but what about the unemployed people in South Australia today? Would that \$2,000,000 or \$4,000,000 not have been better used in providing employment for the unemployed in South Australia? If the Government's interests are in the people of South Australia and the advancement of South Australia, would it not have been better to pay for something that would produce and

employ and bring returns in future revenue instead of buying votes? That is what has happened. I am not prepared to buy votes. I believe in the future of South Australia. I want to see South Australia go forward, not backwards.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: With service pay, what is the difference between the pay received by people in Government service and that received by people in private enterprise?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know whether the Minister realizes the implications of this. The Government has seen fit to give back service pay to its employees. Do not the Minister and the Government realize the repercussions of that on private enterprise and that strikes are taking place today because non-Government employees have not got back service pay while Government employees have?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: But what is the difference between the two; what are the different rates?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is a matter not of difference but of dealing with one section of the community and excluding another section. Shall we have a happy community with that sort of thing happening?

Mr. Hurst: Do you believe in balancing the rates?

Mr. HEASLIP: I believe in the people of South Australia. I believe in their welfare and progress. That is what I have been elected to Parliament for. I am not interested in one section or another of the community. I am here elected by the people of my electoral district to represent them all, not one section or another. I emphasize that I believe in the advancement and the people of South Australia. I have said it previously and will say it again: it is the policy speech that got the Government into power. Bank amalgamation was referred to in the policy speech.

Mr. Coumbe: What has happened to that?

Mr. HEASLIP: That is what I want to know.

Mr. Coumbe: It is a little airy-fairy, is it not?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. Then, if the Government had had its way, increased succession duties would now be with us and, generally speaking, we would become small people with the Government running the show. We would be peasant farmers and nothing else. But we have not heard much about succession duties. I do not know whether we shall hear more about them. I fancy we shall, but I question the

wisdom of the Government's bringing them up again. However, that is a job for the Government.

Mr. Curren: Have you read my comments on His Excellency's Speech?

Mr. HEASLIP: I could find nothing in the Speech worth mentioning, except Bills relating to a totalizer agency board, trotting and lotteries, which were its principal contents. That legislation may have been referred to by the member for Chaffey, but His Excellency's Speech, in fact, contains nothing else. As a result, I have to refer to the Premier's policy speech, following which the present Government came into power. In dealing with general and public works, the Premier said:

The point I am more concerned to make known to the people of this State is that any public works recommended by the Government which are estimated to cost \$200,000 or more must be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. Any that are already recommended will be proceeded with under the administration and we have the assurance of the industrial organizations—

and I do not blame those organizations in any way—

that wherever it is possible to speed up the completion of these works and any others that may be recommended, they will do their utmost to assist.

What has happened to the terminal for Giles Point? What about a silo at Appila? The Government unconstitutionally denied Appila that silo, despite its promise to honour any recommendation made by the Public Works Committee. The Giles Point terminal was recommended before this Government came into office, but where is it today?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It's going ahead.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is not; it has not been started, and we know from replies to questions we have asked in the House that it will not be installed until 1971.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Perhaps you can tell us what happened to the electrification of railways that was promised in 1952?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am going forwards, not backwards. The Giles Point terminal may or may not be erected in 1971, but if anybody deserves a terminal, people in that locality deserve one. However, they are the primary producers blamed for the \$8,000,000 deficit, who warrant only 28 words in His Excellency's Speech.

Mr. Shannon: In 1968, a Liberal Government will bring that project two years forward to 1969!

Mr. HEASLIP: A public relations officer is appointed who, from information I obtained

this afternoon, will show films, etc. From my own experience I can say that the only way to sell a commodity is to present it and not merely to show a film. What has happened to a passenger terminal at Outer Harbour? I for one am not proud of our entrance to South Australia.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You had 30 years to improve it.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not going back 30 years. The Public Works Committee recommended this scheme and the present Government started it.

Mr. Shannon: It's a stop-go job.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, more stop than go. A cafeteria has been erected at Outer Harbour, but the terminal itself has not been commenced, and passengers entering this State can have nothing but a dismal outlook.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: A memorial to the Playford Government!

Mr. HEASLIP: What about the other memorials?

Mr. Clark: Don't go back into the past, though.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not intend to. If we are to attract people to South Australia, let us dress up the front window.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: What do you want first; a terminal at Giles Point or at Outer Harbour?

Mr. HEASLIP: Both, and a silo for Appila, too.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: What would you cut out to commence those projects?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know, but the fact is that an \$8,000,000 deficit has occurred this year. I have mentioned one way it may have been spent; I know of no other ways. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is the most important department in South Australia for its water reticulation projects that are the lifeblood of South Australia. However, its expenditure is decreased more severely than that of any other department.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: When did your Government spend more than \$38,500,000 in one year?

Mr. HEASLIP: I think the Minister will agree that its programme was horribly hampered when it had to delay much of its water reticulation programme. Nothing more has happened about the Elanora and Strathmont Hospitals, although mental health was to be one of this Government's first considerations. I am sure that a women prisoners' hospital that was recommended by the Public Works Committee will not eventuate for some years, despite the

present Government's condemning the present conditions under which women prisoners were now living. What about the recommendation on the Kimba water scheme?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: After consideration by the Public Works Committee, that recommendation lay in the Minister's office for approval until I received the portfolio.

Mr. HEASLIP: What has the present Government done to rectify the position? If anybody deserves water, the Kimba people deserve it. Kangaroo Island has not always been important but now people there are producing and they deserve the benefits of further development. However, what has happened to the Middle River scheme? It is at a dead stop.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Don't talk rot!

Mr. HEASLIP: I should like the Minister to tell me the position.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You wouldn't understand if I did tell you; you are writing the State down all the time.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am trying to make the Government realize the importance of the State.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You haven't been doing your job; you know tenders have been let.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am glad to hear that, because I did not think they had. I know that the scheme was recommended a long time ago, and people on Kangaroo Island will be glad to hear that action will be taken. The Harbors Board building at Port Adelaide, one of the first projects the present Government embarked on, is still being considered.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That has been referred to the Public Works Committee for a report and rightly so, and you know it.

Mr. HEASLIP: As far as I know, the committee made a recommendation, which was approved, the work was almost started and then something happened; it was stillborn. Work on the Keith main has stopped completely.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It has not stopped completely.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand there are a few cooks there and that the pipes are being carted from there to somewhere else.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You said that work had stopped completely. If you can't tell the truth why don't you keep quiet.

Mr. HEASLIP: Well, I will say it has been 99 per cent stopped. Without water the country cannot be developed. This is one way to spend money and get a return.

Mr. Curren: This has become important in the last 18 months!

Mr. HEASLIP: It has always been important.

Mr. Curren: Then why didn't you do something about it the 30-odd years you were in power?

Mr. HEASLIP: In South Australia more people are supplied with water than is the case in any other State, because of the Playford Government. The member for Chaffey had something to say about price control. He said that it was necessary to keep prices down.

Mr. Curren: I said it was necessary to control unscrupulous people. I suggest you quote me correctly.

Mr. HEASLIP: I will do that. The honourable member said:

It is most essential to have some measure of control over prices, for the continuance of this legislation has always been a deterrent to the unscrupulous people who unduly raise prices.

In view of that statement, I wonder why the Premier, who is the Minister in charge of prices, is trying to get an increase in the price of petrol. The Leader asked a question about this matter. Of the increase in the price of petrol, .7c will go to the big petrol companies and .3c to the retailers, but the entire increase will be paid by the consuming public. I cannot understand that. I thought that Labor policy was to keep down the price to consumers, but here we have the Premier giving most of the price increase to the oil companies and the rest to the retailers with the public having to pay the lot. That is what it means, yet the member for Chaffey says that price control is to prevent these "unscrupulous people" from doing these things.

Mr. Quirke: What about the man who wants to sell cheap petrol; are they opposed to him, too?

Mr. HEASLIP: I know about the Prices Act. When we were in power we fixed a maximum price, never a minimum price; now the Premier is going to fix a minimum price. He is saying, in effect, that somebody is selling cheaply to the public and he will not allow it. Which is Labor Party policy: that stated by the member for Chaffey or that stated by the Premier?

Mr. Langley: It is the one in the book.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is not mentioned in the 1965 book on which the Government was elected. I advocated price control when it was first introduced, about 17 years ago. Although he had to talk hard, the then Premier convinced me that it was right. Since then I have favoured price control to look after the small business man, not the big business man.

Mr. Casey: During the term of office of the previous Government, the Prices Commissioner

always announced petrol price rises whereas the Premier always announced petrol price reductions.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Premier announced them because he was the Minister in charge of prices, and he knew all about the matter. The Attorney-General has sent out a circular about justices of the peace, and I think all members have read it. I do not agree with the quota of one justice for small country towns. I do not know why 100 people who are remote from the city should have to travel 15 or 20 miles to see a justice of the peace, because it would not cost the Government anything to appoint two justices to all these little towns.

Mr. McKee: But you have never believed in decentralization.

Mr. HEASLIP: What I am advocating is decentralization in its true sense.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I simply asked for suggestions for quotas if you disagreed with them.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but the original suggestion was for one justice.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The original suggestion was based upon what my predecessor had done.

Mr. HEASLIP: I know that is not so, because there was no quota until the present Attorney-General took charge. This is a new formula under which no justices of the peace have been appointed, except perhaps in exceptional circumstances, for the last six months.

Mr. Curren: It took the Attorney 18 months to sort out the existing mess.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not sure that the Attorney does not agree, on second thoughts, that these little remote country towns are entitled to the same representation as are the people in the bigger towns. I think the people in those little towns are entitled to have the same facilities as have the people in the bigger towns, provided the cost is not too high, and in this respect I point out that one extra justice would not cost the taxpayer one penny.

Mr. McKee: What about a big industry at Crystal Brook?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not concerned about that: I am concerned about the little towns remote from Crystal Brook, where people would have to travel 30 or 40 miles in some instances to get a second justice of the peace. If the Attorney-General would raise his quota from one to two in these remote areas he would save those people the inconvenience of having to travel those long distances. I hope the Attorney will have another look at this matter.

Mr. McKee: You make a decision for the Attorney-General.

Mr. HEASLIP: I turn now to another topic. I think everyone who has read the newspapers will know that we have had great difficulty in getting a doctor to assist the doctor at Orroroo who is now looking after both the Quorn and Hawker hospitals.

Mr. Casey: I think you will find that the Orroroo doctor now has help.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think the Orroroo doctor has any help at present. A Registrar from the Royal Adelaide Hospital was there for three or four weeks, I think, but he has now returned to Adelaide and I understand that it will be several weeks before any other relief is afforded.

Mr. Casey: The doctor from Orroroo told me last Saturday that he now has a private practitioner from New South Wales helping him.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am glad to hear that. I know that the doctor there has been in great trouble, as have been the people up there, because of this lack of assistance. I pay tribute to the Minister of Health for what he has done and for what he is trying to do. He has now come up with a proposal to set up a cadet system, and I hope that that system will operate.

Mr. McKee: The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) has been advocating doctors for Orroroo and other parts.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course he has, because he is interested in the people up there.

Mr. McKee: I think he is the man who has brought this about.

Mr. HEASLIP: If the member for Frome did all this in my district, perhaps he should take it over. Perhaps the member for Port Pirie would like me to read some of the correspondence I have had with the doctor at Orroroo; it would take me a long time to do that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! I think the honourable member for Rocky River is trying to address the Chair, but his remarks are not audible to the Chair.

Mr. Jennings: You are not missing much, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Mr. HEASLIP: The history of this matter goes back a long way. Mr. Acting Speaker, I believe that the people of Orroroo, Quorn and Hawker are entitled to as nearly as possible the same attention as are the people in the metropolitan area. Following communications between the doctor at Orroroo, Sir Lyell McEwin (one of the Legislative Council members for the Northern District), the member for

Frome and I, the Minister of Health has now put forward a proposition which, if it is carried into effect, should be of great help not only to Orroroo, Quorn and Hawker, but to the South-East, the West Coast and the whole of South Australia.

Mr. Clark: Is that praise for the Minister?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is the Minister's idea.

Mr. Clark: You are giving a word of praise to him?

Mr. HEASLIP: Definitely; it is the Minister who has come up with the idea, not this chap from New South Wales, about whom I know nothing. The present Minister of Health has suggested this cadet system whereby students who perhaps have not enough money to pay their way through their training can bond themselves to go out into the country for two years after they finish their course or after they get through. These young doctors can go to these places where doctors are badly needed. We would have enough doctors for the country areas if they were prepared to go there, but they are not so prepared. Port Augusta has five doctors, and I maintain that those doctors should look after Quorn, which is only 25 miles away and is connected with Port Augusta by a bitumen road. Those Port Augusta doctors will not do this, yet they expect the Orroroo doctor to travel 70 miles across to Quorn and do their work. I now wish to say something about the discovery of gas at Gidgealpa.

Mr. Clark: You're just the right bloke to do that!

Mr. HEASLIP: Gidgealpa is 500 miles from Adelaide and it is no good bringing gas here unless it can be brought at an economic price so that we can compete with existing fuels. It is also necessary that we be able to compete with the Eastern States. Who is going to do that for us?

Mr. McKee: I hope you have a good, sensible suggestion.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have a suggestion but no-one has heard it yet. Today is Sir Thomas Playford's birthday. Although he is 70 years old, his ability and mental faculties are as good as they were 30 years ago. He has made a wonderful job of managing this State for about 27 years as Premier.

Mr. McKee: I didn't know you were an aspirant for the leadership.

Mr. HEASLIP: During his term as Premier South Australia advanced more than it had ever advanced before and at a much greater rate than it has been advancing recently. He is a man of capabilities and, if he comes to the back benches, his ability will be wasted. If the

Government wants Gidgealpa to be successful and if it wants a good man for the job, Sir Thomas is the man.

Mr. Hurst: You're not suggesting that he go and put a pipeline down, are you?

Mr. HEASLIP: I suggest that, if the Government is wise, it will put Sir Thomas in charge of the project. It if does that, the people of South Australia will benefit from his control just as they benefited from his Premiership for 27 years.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): Before dealing with His Excellency's Speech, I should like to say that the member for Unley wanted to know whether I was going to reply to the member who has just resumed his seat. The only comment I could make on the hour and three quarters for which he spoke is that for the first hour he wrote down the previous Government and did nothing but sing a swan song.

I take this opportunity of sincerely congratulating the Leader, Sir Thomas Playford, on attaining his 70th birthday and of wishing him many happy returns. Even though he may be taking a backward step so far as occupying the back benches is concerned, I am sure his advice will be sought, none the less. I also thank the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) and the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) for their kind remarks regarding my health.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion so ably moved by the member for Chaffey and seconded by the member for West Torrens. I sincerely congratulate the member for Chaffey on the excellent contribution he made in moving the motion. It is obvious that he has a deep and justifiable pride in the area he represents in particular, and for the whole of the River towns in general. His knowledge of the citrus and grapegrowing industry, which is an important industry, is outstanding. He has given the benefit of his knowledge to the people he represents. His fighting spirit has been evident when he has asked questions of the various Ministers in this House and, if he was not satisfied with their replies, he persisted with further questions until he really got what he was after.

Despite what the member for Light has said, the advice of Reg Curren is sought in the River towns, because the problems of the people in those towns are the problems of the member. His constituents can rely on him to do his best for them, and I do not think the people of any district could ask for more than that.

I compliment the member for West Torrens who seconded the motion. The way he delivered his speech augers well for his future contributions in this House. His knowledge of industrial matters and the requirements of the building trade marks him as one who will make his presence felt in the future. He is a young man with a great future.

Mr. Curren: The baby of the House!

Mr. HUGHES: I am not sure whether he is the baby of the House but, if he is, he is a good baby and we are proud to have him on this side.

I, like previous speakers, extend my sincere condolences to the families of the former members who passed away during the year. I knew the late Sir Richard Butler and Mr. Craigie only by sight. The late Sir Frank Perry was one who in his quiet but effective way contributed much to this State, particularly in the industrial field. The late Albert Thompson was a big man in stature and inside that stature there was a big heart. He was a man who gave his whole life to relieving the burden and sufferings of his fellow men. There would not be another man in this State who has given more to assist people on lower incomes than the late Albert Thompson.

I was pleased to read in the press that His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan were to return to South Australia soon. It was with regret that I learned of the illness of Sir Edric on his return to England. However, I understand his health has improved and that he, with Lady Bastyan, is returning to this State to carry on as Her Majesty's representative, a position which he has filled with distinction in a way that has drawn the ties of Australia and the Mother country closer together.

I join the people of this State in expressing appreciation to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor (Sir Mellis Napier) for his services to the State. The way he delivered the Speech on the opening of Parliament this session was outstanding for a man of his age. On Wednesday last, the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) delivered one of his good speeches dealing with social credit, a subject about which he knows much. I always listen with interest when the honourable member speaks on social credit, because he makes it sound so easy to finance the country. I have never professed to be a financial wizard, therefore I could not give an opinion whether it would work or not.

Mr. Jennings: You have heard the same speech about 30 times.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and each time the honourable member delivers it I find it interesting because of the points he makes. Although he has not converted the House, I know that members take much notice of what he puts forward on social credit. However, I did, by interjection, ask the honourable member whether, during his term as Minister, he had suggested to his Ministerial colleagues that they adopt this way of financing the State, and he replied "No". I should have thought that if this were a better way to finance the State, that wily old bird, the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Thomas Playford), would have adopted it years ago. No doubt Sir Thomas and his financial advisers examined, from time to time, the proposals outlined by the member for Burra. Apparently, this way of creating finance is not workable otherwise Sir Thomas, as Treasurer, would have adopted it.

Mr. Quirke: If you understood it you would know that it was workable.

Mr. HUGHES: I said earlier that I was not a financial wizard, and I do not understand it. I give credit to the Leader of the Opposition who was Treasurer for many years and who had the best financial advisers in the State, but he did not adopt it. Perhaps he did not understand it.

Mr. Quirke: You have read and heard about how other people have worked it and what they have achieved with it?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes I have. A man living at Wallaroo spoke to me frequently on this subject and he was firmly convinced that this method of financing the country was possible. However, I could never understand why a man like Sir Thomas Playford, who held the Treasury benches for so long and who had expert financial advice available to him, did not finance the country in this way. If he and his advisers could not see fit to adopt it, how can I understand it?

Mr. Quirke: Fair enough, but there has to be a wish and a will.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The will wasn't strong enough.

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently not.

Mr. Quirke: We're not strong enough, anyway.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member means that we are not strong enough as a State?

Mr. Quirke: We are strong enough as a State, but there is no wish or will to do it.

Mr. HUGHES: You mean there is no wish by our Leaders to adopt the idea?

Mr. Quirke: When it was spoken about, the Leaders became afraid, and when that happens people become afraid.

Mr. HUGHES: This is the first time that I have heard of Sir Thomas being afraid of anything.

Mr. Quirke: You are afraid of the union of the Savings and State Banks because you do not understand it.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not afraid of that.

Mr. Quirke: You don't understand it, and I have never heard one member of the Labor Party explain it.

Mr. HUGHES: I explained initially that I was not a financial wizard and that I did not intend to give an opinion.

Mr. Quirke: You are in duty bound to understand what you put out in a policy speech.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly, and we all understand that well.

Mr. Quirke: No you don't.

Mr. HUGHES: In spite of what the honourable member says, this Government does understand its financial affairs.

Mr. Nankivell: The platform of the Australian Labor Party states:

The elimination of public borrowing and the utilization of national credit.

Mr. HUGHES: I have voiced my opinion on finance and credit, and I shall leave it at that. When the member for Albert is ready to deliver his nation-rocking speech perhaps he will be able to see something in the honourable member for Burra's ideas on social credit that I cannot see. Paragraph 5 of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech states:

The Premier's Department has actively pursued the Government's policy for the attraction of new industries to the State and the expansion of existing enterprises. The recent decision of Chrysler (Aust.) Ltd. to erect a multi-million dollar plant near Port Stanvac and inquiries from other sources are evidence of the success of this policy and of the confidence which industrial and commercial interests have in the prosperity of the State.

I regret that an Opposition member apparently has been misinformed about this department, because last week he gave notice that he intended to move:

That in the opinion of this House the work of the Premier's Department in attracting new industries to this State has been ineffective, and that as a matter of urgency, and with a view to providing more energetic and vigorous promotion of industrial expansion and the exploitation of the natural resources of the State, a Department of Development, to be the sole responsibility of a Minister, be set up without delay.

If the Premier's Department had not done any more during its short existence than the details contained in His Excellency's Speech, that alone would more than justify its appointment.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot debate that motion.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not intend to develop a debate on those lines.

Mr. Quirke: You may have had ideas about it.

Mr. HUGHES: I may have had ideas, but I cannot develop them. I wanted to refer to the Premier's Department.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That department has helped three industries in my district.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly, and I, as Chairman of the Industries Development Committee could refer to others. I shall not do that because this is not the place to do it at present.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The Case brothers would not be at Murray Bridge without the assistance of that department.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. To successfully negotiate for a multi-million dollar plant to be erected within the State is no mean effort. Other industries have been established, as honourable members know. There are other industries such as Federated Industries, which is established at Elizabeth and is doing well as regards its work force. In fact, it intends to more than double that work force within the next 12 months. So I see no reason why the sort of motion to which I have referred should be placed on the Notice Paper. Also, there appeared in yesterday's daily paper the following heading "Plan for S.A. Metal Mills". Had this announcement been made whilst the Playford Government was in office, it would undoubtedly have made headlines on the front page.

Mr. Nankivell: Why isn't it there now?

Mr. HUGHES: I think the honourable member can answer that without my telling him. This announcement appeared only on page 10, occupying about 18 lines. Yet, had it been announced when the Playford Government was in power, it would have been in black headlines across the right or left side of the front page of the *Advertiser*.

Mr. Nankivell: Don't be so jealous!!

Mr. HUGHES: I am not jealous; I am only pointing it out to the honourable member. I am disappointed with the press.

Mr. Nankivell: You should have appointed a public relations man before.

Mr. HUGHES: That is all right; I may have something to say about him later. That is my point. I am comparing the publicity

given to the previous Government with that given to the present Government.

Mr. Coumbe: I do not know. You got plenty of publicity from the opening of the Krunchi Krisps factory.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. Quirke: You are damning the press.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not damning any press. I am pointing out that I sometimes fail, as a layman, to understand these things.

Mr. Coumbe: You don't encourage the press to give you publicity the way you blast them.

Mr. HUGHES: One thing I like is being honest. That is why I brought this before members tonight. I feel that an injustice is being done to the people who are prepared to spend money in the country.

Mr. Quirke: Perhaps the press is taking heed of what you are now saying.

Mr. HUGHES: I certainly hope the press pays heed to what is said this session. I am not concerned about the Government in power but I feel that people who are prepared to spend \$2,750,000 in the State deserve a little more publicity than they got on this occasion. When I looked at the newspaper, at first I could not find this announcement.

Mr. Quirke: It was not on the back page?

Mr. HUGHES: No. It would look pretty grim if it was there. The announcement was as follows:

Plan for S.A. Metal Mills.—Texas Instruments Aust. Ltd. was considering erection of two metal processing mills costing about \$2½m. at Elizabeth, the company's managing director (Mr. D. Powers) announced at the week-end. He said it was hoped that the first mill would be built early next year and the other in 18 months. The announcement followed the return to Adelaide of the firm's metallurgical division manager (Mr. W. Miles) after a tour of the United States and the Far East.

I still say that people prepared to come and spend \$2,750,000 on one factory deserve a little more encouragement in the advertising of their plant.

Mr. Ferguson: Is this a new industry or an extension?

Mr. HUGHES: It is an entirely new industry, not one prepared by the previous Government.

Mr. Coumbe: It is an extension of the Texas company.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know the Texas company but I understand this is a product new to this State.

Mr. Coumbe: Texas Instruments Australia Limited, at present at Elizabeth.

Mr. Broomhill: It's a new industry.

Mr. HUGHES: It is showing confidence in the Government and the people of this State by being prepared to spend this additional sum in South Australia.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The Chrysler people opened a plant at Tonsley Park, and they are satisfied with it.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, I shall refer to that soon. It appears to me that unjust statements are made, not only in this House but also outside, intended to lower the morale of the people and stampede them into thinking that there is a depression just around the corner. That is what it sounded like when the member for Rocky River was speaking. The depth to which some individuals and organizations will stoop in the game of politics is despicable.

Mr. Ferguson: They're hard words.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and I mean them.

Mr. Nankivell: You are usually a very tolerant person.

Mr. HUGHES: I want to be honest and truthful. If these people I have mentioned had the welfare of the people and the prosperity of the State at heart and were prepared to assist the Government of the day, they would be honest in their intentions and their criticism would be constructive. But no! Now that a Labor Government is in office this section of people wants to play politics at the expense of the worker.

Mr. Quirke: Before you go on, tell us who is "the worker".

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member knows who the worker is. Honourable members opposite can say they are all workers when it suits them.

Mr. Quirke: But who is "the worker"?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member knows who he is without my answering. It is such a silly question to ask. I mean the person on the lower income.

Mr. Quirke: Are you a worker?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, of course. I work as many hours as the honourable member does.

Mr. Quirke: You're a worker and so is everybody.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, but the members of the Opposition do not always put themselves down as workers when they have to sign forms stating their occupation.

Mr. Quirke: I'm a hard worker.

Mr. HUGHES: Make no mistake about this. Members opposite can have their own opinions about who is a worker, but I say in all sincerity that this is done at the expense of the worker.

Mr. Quirke: But who is "the worker"?

Mr. HUGHES: The wage earner.

Mr. McAnaney: Are you one?

Mr. HUGHES: Does the honourable member call himself a wage earner when he states a profession under his signature?

Mrs. Steele: Do you?

Mr. HUGHES: No, even though I may work many more hours in looking after my constituents than members opposite work. I was concerned to read in the *Advertiser* of May 13 that the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures was endeavouring to incite public opinion against the present Government and the worker by charging the Government with being responsible, because of its actions, for slowing down the expansion of secondary industry in South Australia, and stating that the present Government could not claim credit for any new industry being established since it took office. It also charged the South Australian worker with being responsible for a record number of strikes in 1965. I wonder whether the chamber was charging any member of the Opposition when it referred to those strikes. Of course it was not.

Mr. Coumbe: It was referring to you.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member may be a member of the chamber, although I do not think he is.

Mr. Coumbe: It was thinking of you.

Mr. Quirke: The member for Wallaroo must realize that as soon as a Labor Government comes into office the worker proceeds to kick it to pieces.

Mr. HUGHES: I, not the member for Burra, am making this speech. In the statement that I intend to quote to the House, honourable members will note that after the executive of the Chamber of Commerce had done its best to destroy public confidence in South Australia the President tried to justify its actions by stating that the executive had stressed the necessity for the State Government to keep strongly before it the need to promote among South Australian people a vigorous feeling of confidence and security. I shall quote the whole of the statement appearing in the *Advertiser*, as well as the whole of the reply given by the Acting Premier, so that honourable members will be able to decide whether the chamber's statement has been adequately answered. The *Advertiser* article stated:

"Slowing" for secondary industries. Concern at the slowing down in the expansion of secondary industry in South Australia was expressed by the executive of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures yesterday. In a statement issued after its meeting yesterday the executive said a number of factors

contributed to this state of affairs. They included: The announcement by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Callaghan) that the flow of developmental capital from the United Kingdom to Australia would be restricted, on a "voluntary" basis, for at least three years. This would mean that South Australia would receive an even smaller share than previously.

Rising Costs: The increasing costs and the trend of legislation being introduced into the South Australian Parliament. These had had a depressing effect upon the confidence of South Australian industrialists in their home State, and on industrialists in other States. There had been a severe increase in the rate of State land tax, as enacted by the South Australian Parliament in the 1965 session, and of about 60 per cent in the assessment of unimproved land values, to which the land tax rate in future years would be applied.

The worsening of industrial relations, shown by the record number of strikes in South Australia in 1965, as reported this week by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics.

The executive's statement added that, bearing in mind that South Australia was at a disadvantage compared with the Eastern States in the location of manufacturing industries, it was of the opinion that the South Australian Government, and all sectors of the community, should carefully reconsider the Government's actions—and proposed actions—in the light of their effect upon the attraction of new industries to South Australia. Since the Labor Government had taken office in South Australia no new industries had been established here, other than those whose coming to South Australia had already been practically arranged, the statement added. The executive considered that an increasing value of export trade in the products of secondary industry must be continued if the gap created by any entry of the United Kingdom to the European Common Market was to be offset.

Publication: The statement added that the chamber's president (Mr. F. R. Curtis) had informed the Executive that he had this week received from the Commonwealth Department of Trade and Industry a publication entitled *A Directory of Overseas Investment in Australian Manufacturing Industry*. This publication had highlighted the fact that the greater percentage of overseas undertakings established in Australia were located in the larger States of New South Wales and Victoria. Mr. Curtis had suggested that this was because overseas companies normally based their manufacturing operations close to their major markets.

The executive had stressed the necessity for the State Government to keep strongly before it the need to promote among South Australian people a vigorous feeling of confidence and security. It considered that any shaking of this would tend to make South Australian manufacturers poor ambassadors for their State in their dealings with interstate colleagues—even, perhaps, to the extent of causing these same South Australian manufacturers to think that their own companies would be better off in another State.

The statement continued that the opinion had been expressed at the executive meeting that any Government should husband the resources within its control in the full knowledge that those resources belonged to the community. The South Australian Government had a mandate to preserve the strength of South Australia and this would require long-term thinking and not the gaining of a quick political advantage, or the imposition of oppressive costs to overcome an immediate shortage in the Government's funds. In particular, the executive felt that a return to the fixing of wages and employment conditions through the machinery of arbitration was an essential to a progressive and expansionist outlook.

That statement left no doubt in my mind that the chamber had built up within its own organization opposition to a Labor Government and, if there is any slowing down in this State, as the chamber claims, the organization as a whole must, because of its confused thinking, accept its share of the blame. Since that statement (which, by the way, was not correct) appeared, retail business slackened in certain fields (a fact made known to the honourable the Speaker and me by a North Terrace businessman only last week). I maintain that that occurred because of the statement that appeared in the press under the name of the Chamber of Manufactures. On the day following the statement made by the chamber, a statement was made by the Acting Premier (Hon. A. J. Shard) which very effectively refuted the claims made against the Government and the worker. The *Advertiser* of May 14 reported as follows:

The Acting Premier (Mr. Shard) described the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures as "an apostle of doubt" yesterday when he replied to the chamber's claim that industrial expansion in South Australia was slowing. A statement from the executive of the chamber, published in *The Advertiser* yesterday, gave as its reasons for the slackening of secondary industry expansion the announcement of a restriction on development capital from the U.K. to Australia increasing costs and the trend of legislation being introduced in South Australia; and the worsening of industrial relations during 1965. Mr. Shard said yesterday that it was apparent the Chamber of Manufactures had not gone deeply into the matter.

Employment figures in South Australia indicated that there was no slowing in expansion. Commenting on the chamber's references to deterioration in industrial relations, he said that only 79 man-days for each million civilian employees had been lost through industrial disputes in 1965. This compared with 199 under the Playford Government in the previous year. "This was a marked reduction, the State's percentage of man-days lost through industrial disputes falling from 7 per cent under the Liberal and Country League Government to 3 per cent since the last election," Mr. Shard said.

"The reference to the Department of Trade and Industry's publication *Directory of Overseas Development in Australia* also highlighted the dominance of overseas ownership in the Eastern States. "While the South Australian Government welcomes, and is actively encouraging overseas firms establishing in this State, it does not encourage the straight-out take-over of existing industries when the overseas firm does not contribute at all to the development of the State and the introduction of new ideas and techniques. "This practice has been happening in the Eastern States."

Mr. Shard said South Australia's continued expansion was underlined by the number of recent announcements, including the Chrysler statement that it was setting up its engine-manufacturing plant in this State because it was cheaper to produce an engine here than elsewhere.

This was not a new industry which had been arranged by the Playford Government. Far from circumstances dictating an air of gloom in South Australia, indications were that the State would continue to experience strong growth. Only the Chamber of Manufactures seemed to have taken the role of an apostle of doubt. The chamber's statement concerning land tax was quite misleading, Mr. Shard said.

The only increases in land tax last year under the Labor Government were on properties with an unimproved value of \$10,000—the wealthiest properties in the State. It had been necessary to make these increases because the previous Government had, for 30 years, completely neglected the need to acquire open space and recreational areas in the metropolitan area. Metropolitan councils had unanimously indicated their unwillingness to "rate their ratepayers" for this purpose and all had requested the Government to raise the money. It would have been quite contrary to the Government's mandate not to have provided the money "essential for the future of our children in this city."

Mr. Quirke: The assessment on Murray River blocks has increased by 120 per cent.

Mr. HUGHES: I know that it has been a big increase.

Mr. Quirke: In a depressed district.

Mr. HUGHES: The same thing applies in the subdivision of Bute in my district.

Mr. Quirke: I am not blaming you, but the assessment has increased.

Mr. HUGHES: These things will have to be considered by Parliament.

Mr. Quirke: It has gone up by 120 per cent.

Mr. HUGHES: If that can be offset by the rate I do not think any great harm will be done, but I cannot say this will be so.

Mr. Quirke: The effect of the increased assessment depends on the rate, doesn't it?

Mr. HUGHES: That is true. Many assessments have been increased in my district. Some people claim the increase was 100 per

cent. They are not complaining about this increased assessment, but they are concerned about what the rate will be.

Mr. Quirke: And the exemptions.

Mr. HUGHES: That matter will be determined by Parliament. Despite the fact that Mr. Shard came up with a counter to the various claims made by the chamber, the damage caused by its statement has resulted in the tightening of purse strings. If the chamber was sincere in its approach to industrial stoppages, why did it refuse to accept a properly appointed arbitrator when it was acting for four fertilizer companies in the fertilizer and chemical dispute earlier this year? I have not heard any response by members opposite to that statement.

Mr. Quirke: Say it again.

Mr. HUGHES: I will not repeat it, because members opposite heard what I said the first time and did not respond. The action taken by the chamber on that occasion not only penalized South Australian industry but seriously retarded the State's primary producers. I am most concerned about those people as well as about those on lower incomes.

Mr. Quirke: As long as you indoctrinate your colleagues.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not responsible for the thinking of my colleagues. I try to get them to follow my line of thought sometimes, but I am not responsible if they do not do so. I am seriously concerned (as I believe are all members on this side) about any costs that may go against primary producers.

Mr. Quirke: I think you are dragging the chain a bit.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not dragging the chain. If honourable members look at my previous speeches they will find that I have always supported the primary producer. The member for Burra is an honest man, and I think he will admit that I have done so. I always try to support all sections of the community but sometimes it is difficult to make a decision. The chamber was so confused in its thinking that it fostered the very thing it claimed it was trying to prevent and in so doing completely overlooked primary producers who, despite what some honourable members say in this House, are still the backbone of this country. Some members maintained that we had an excellent year last year, but if they asked some of the people in my district whether they had an excellent year they would be told that their crops were below normal.

Mr. Quirke: They were down in some districts.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I am glad the honourable member made that statement.

Mr. McAnaney: We only objected to your claiming there was a drought.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not claim that.

Mr. McAnaney: The Premier did.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not claiming that it was an entire drought: all I am saying is that drought conditions existed in certain parts of the State. Even in areas around Bute and in the District Council of Kadina, where we have some of the best land on the Peninsula, many farmers will tell you that their crops were down last year from what they normally are.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the record number of sheep and the amount of wool?

Mr. HUGHES: I maintain that we have to be careful that we do not over-stock, because if we get a few drought years somebody will have to pay for it.

Mr. McAnaney: You have just been telling us that we have had one.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not tell honourable members that there was a drought last year. What other people have said is not my concern.

Mr. McAnaney: We are only quoting statistics.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member can quote all the statistics he likes, but that will not make the farmer who did not get a good crop a happy one. If the honourable member has farmers in his community who had a small crop last year, he should be concerned about their welfare. I am concerned about my people when they have a small crop, because their expenses are no less.

Mr. McAnaney: They are going up since you have been in power.

Mr. Quirke: Old Jupiter Pluvius doesn't take any notice of Parliamentarians.

Mr. HUGHES: Paragraph 6 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech *inter alia* states:

My Government will continue to pursue policies to make full use of the potential of the State in agriculture.

The Government was criticized by the member for Rocky River on the number of words applied to this important industry; I think he said 28 words were used, but I did not count them. I come from a primary producing area, and I do not see anything wrong with the statement. The people in my district do not see anything wrong with it, provided the Government continues to pursue policies that will assist them. While certain parts of the State have had good rains, other grain-growing areas have not been so fortunate. However, despite the lean rainfall in these areas the crops are looking very healthy. It is hoped

that a good soaking rain will fall before the longer days and dry winds set in. In my own District some producers are still feeding baled hay to stock to supplement feed, and I presume that some honourable members opposite who are primary producers are doing the same.

I sincerely hope that it will not be necessary for the Prices Commissioner to grant an increase in the price of superphosphate as suggested recently because of the proposed increase in cost of phosphate rock and sulphur. If and when an approach is made to the Prices Commissioner for an increase, the fertilizer industry will certainly have some questions to answer in order to support its claim, in view of the takeover bids for one of the fertilizer companies. I consider that they will certainly have to come up with some pretty good material to justify an increase. In the first instance the worker was blamed for the suggested increase. One honourable member of this House, in a statement to the press made outside the House, endeavoured to focus attention upon the fertilizer workers' service payments by stating that an increase in bread prices throughout Australia was inevitable and that it could take effect before the end of the year. He went on to say that the increase would be caused by a predicted increase in the cost of superphosphate following service payment agreements. No mention was made in that statement of the takeover bids, but in recent weeks the same member has been very vocal in letting the public know about the nine-to-two takeover. I maintain that back when the strike was on was the time when that nine-to-two takeover bid should have been aired by the honourable member.

I have found in my association with them that the majority of primary producers are fair-minded people, and I consider that a large percentage of them would not begrudge the fertilizer workers this service payment. A letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser* of May 4, 1966, supports my contention in that regard. I take it that the person who wrote the letter was a primary producer; otherwise, he would not have phrased it in the way he did. The letter states:

The fertilizer industry workers are back at work. One wonders just to whom our gratitude is due. No doubt the fertilizer companies will claim credit, and the workers are reasonably satisfied with their position. But no sooner is it announced that a return to work has been negotiated than we are told that superphosphate prices are to be increased to meet the service payment increase. This must be resisted by all primary producer organizations, individual

farmers, and graziers. There can be no justification for this increase, as recently ridiculous prices were offered by several large companies in takeover bids for one of the fertilizer companies, surely not to take over an industry which is not in a very secure financial position. I do not begrudge the industry workers their increase. I know only too well just how much hard work is involved in handling superphosphate, and the dust and smells are indeed trying, to say the least.

As I say, I think that that letter is from a primary producer and that he really understands the work of the fertilizer industry.

If the fertilizer companies apply to the Prices Commissioner for an increase in the price of superphosphate, the primary producers can rest assured that every part of the industry will be thoroughly examined by the Commissioner to ascertain whether the industry can absorb the increased cost of phosphate rock and sulphur. I sincerely hope the costs can be absorbed. Otherwise, primary producer organizations should explore other avenues whereby the increased cost can be met. Paragraph 7 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech states:

In view of the importance of natural gas supplies the Premier, the Minister of Mines, the Director and Deputy Director of Mines have just returned from an extensive overseas tour studying the piping and use of this product. The new discovery of natural gas at Moomba near Gidgealpa adds to the known reserves and has confirmed the belief that further supplies exist in that region.

When the Premier had satisfied himself that the prospects of having natural gas piped from Gidgealpa to Adelaide and of providing laterals to main industrial centres were feasible, arrangements were made for him, the Minister of Mines and the Director and Deputy Director of Mines to travel extensively overseas to study the piping and use of this product. They have recently returned with valuable information, which will enable the Government to have first-hand knowledge of how to establish this proposed undertaking. It appears that the first problem to be solved is the financing of this huge project, which I understand from reports that have been made by the Premier will require an initial sum of \$30,000,000 for the first two years and an additional \$10,000,000 during the following five years.

Naturally, after the pipeline was producing and returns were coming from it, any finance for further extensions would be available from returns from the line. I consider that this State can expect an exciting future when this line is complete. It is essential that the finance to build the pipeline come from within

Australia at the lowest possible interest rate, to enable the sale of gas to encourage industrialists to set up in this State. The money to do this should come from the Commonwealth Government.

A planned \$40 million plant to manufacture the nitrogen fertilizer anhydrous ammonia at Brisbane, using natural gas from the Roma field, almost certainly will be the first of a number of such plants for Australia. Members may remember that last week, in explaining a question to the Premier, I informed him that an American syndicate, represented by Mississippi businessman Mr. W. P. Bridges, had purchased about 1,000 acres for \$120,000 for urea production near Wallaroo.

In a letter to the Kadina Council a representative of an Adelaide company representing Mr. Bridges said:

Providing the South Australian Government can take advantage of vast resources of natural gas, we have every hope that this project for urea production will come to fruition and prove an asset to your district.

Local government bodies at Wallaroo and Kadina have assured Mr. Bridges that they will do everything in their power to help establish a urea-producing plant in the area. The Chairman of the District Council of Kadina, Mr. A. A. Haynes, told me last week that the land near Wallaroo could be used for industrial purposes without being affected by zoning restrictions. Any State or Commonwealth regulations would have to be complied with, but the council was not aware of any such regulations, nor was I.

I understand that the actual process of producing anhydrous ammonia from natural gas involves little risk. But the syndicate has bought 1,000 acres near Wallaroo to provide what they regard as a safety margin. Mr. Kaeshagen of Kadina has reported that Australians have, as yet, little conception of what natural gas can mean to a country. Victorians perhaps, can say in a vague fashion that they expect cheaper gas domestically when the State's off-shore field flows into Melbourne homes, but to the primary producer the development of Australian natural gas resources could lead to a substantial expansion in the use of nitrogen fertilizers, particularly anhydrous ammonia.

In America, the home of natural gas, production by mid-1965 was running at about 9,000,000 tons a year, and one trade group estimated that this would be doubled by mid-1968. The importance of natural gas in this massive expansion lies in the fact that it is the source material for about 85 per cent

of ammonia production. Australia could benefit, too, by the American experience in plant design. Early American ammonia plants required as much as 50,000 cubic feet of gas for a ton of ammonia; the latest plants use 35,000 to 40,000 cubic feet, I understand.

About 90 per cent of Australia's fertilizer for many years has been in the form of super-phosphate. Nitrogen played a minor role. In 1964 about 3,000,000 tons of fertilizers were used by various nitrogen fertilizers produced or imported amounted to only 277,000 tons. It is only in the last two or three years that anhydrous ammonia, the liquid gas form of nitrogen, has made its appearance. Regarding the method of using it, it is held and transported under pressure as a liquid. Anhydrous ammonia (82 per cent nitrogen) spreads through the soil as a gas as soon as it is released behind the tines of special applicators.

Progress has already been made in developing systems for application and distribution in New South Wales and Western Australia and the service is now beginning to extend to portions of other States. Availability of the new form of nitrogen fertilizer already has prompted agriculturists to forecast a rise in nitrogen application. Development of natural gas resources could provide extra impetus. An industry such as that proposed for my district could be advantageous to the State and, at the same time, could contribute much to decentralization. Paragraph 10 of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech states:

My Government continues to pursue an active and progressive policy in connection with educational services.

Last August the matter of an adult education centre for Wallaroo was brought before the Minister of Education by a deputation. Since then, I was invited by the Principal and Council of the Yorke Peninsula Adult Education Centre to visit the woodwork centre at Wallaroo. I was shocked to find that the classes were conducted in a very old lean-to shed. Upon inquiring since, I found the shed was originally one of the first buildings erected in Wallaroo, and was used initially as a stable. The walls have deteriorated with dampness up to a height of

about 5ft., and the lighting is antiquated, having old extension cords connected to provide lights for the students. I realized immediately the reason for the low number of students attending these classes. Few people, desirous of learning this trade, would go to such a hovel for instruction, and it is a reflection on the previous Government for allowing this position to continue for so long. I understand that a few years ago much equipment was allocated to this centre but, when the building was inspected in preparation for its installation, the equipment was diverted elsewhere. This is another of those legacies inherited from the previous Government, to which the member for Rocky River referred.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What has the Government done in the last 18 months?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member should be ashamed to ask that question. This Government has been trying to catch up with the back lag of the previous Government. The honourable member can laugh as much as he likes, but he should make no mistake about that. The member for Rocky River referred to item after item, and wrote down the previous Government, saying what had not been done.

Mr. Heaslip: What did the previous Government do at Gawler?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It took 50 years to do it.

Mr. Clark: It took me 60 pages of *Hansard* to do it.

Mr. HUGHES: I am confident that the Minister of Education and his department will rectify this anomalous situation. I wanted to inform the House of the submissions in support of improved adult education facilities at Wallaroo. These submissions have been made to the Minister of Education, but I wanted to bring them to the notice of members to show how the previous Government had neglected certain country areas in which they professed to be interested. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 6, at 2 p.m.