

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 6, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT COSTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I congratulate the Premier on his 69th birthday and assure him that he has the personal regard of all members on this side and, undoubtedly, of all members on his. True, I am a year ahead of him; nevertheless, I bear him no ill will on that account. I wish him all the best for the future.

Yesterday the Premier replied to the member for Burnside concerning the salaries paid to certain Royal Commissioners. This matter was considered by the Party which I have the honour to lead temporarily, and the Party believes that this information should be given freely, without restriction. Therefore, will the Premier bring down tomorrow the information requested by the member for Burnside?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I accept the good wishes on my birthday, and assure the Leader and all other members that I appreciate the sentiments expressed. I am concerned about the matters to which the Leader referred; they have been discussed in Cabinet. I must consider the advantages to be derived from these investigations as well as the importance of the matters dealt with. I believe that the Royal Commissioner inquiring into the Licensing Act is a man of the highest reputation. He has tremendous responsibilities, for the problems confronting him are far-reaching, especially as they concern a social problem. Regarding the Royal Commission on State Transport Services, many confidential matters arise, and therefore I do not think the exact sums involved should be disclosed to the public. I would feel in duty bound to refer the matter back to Cabinet before I could alter the reply I gave yesterday. The people conducting these inquiries have a big job to do, and I should not like to have to compare the importance or value of one investigation with the value of another. The inquiry held into trotting was a social question, but everyone seemed to be happy about that because it was conducted by Mr. Wells, Q.C. However, it was not possible to have these other inquiries conducted in the same way. I ask the House to accept my explanation on this matter. I am prepared to

discuss the matter further with Cabinet so that I may obtain Cabinet's view on whether my decision should be altered.

Mrs. STEELE: Last week, in reply to a series of questions that I placed on notice, the Premier gave the House details of the sums involved in conducting the various Royal Commissions and committees of inquiry. Yesterday, the Premier refused to give the rates at which the Chairmen, members, and officers of these Commissions and committees are being paid, except, as he said, confidentially to members of the Opposition and at the request of the Leader of the Opposition. The figures given last week have been received with some scepticism, and the answer given yesterday to my question regarding rates obviously confirms the Government's reluctance to disclose the true figures. As Parliament is entitled to this information, I ask the Premier on what basis were the figures given last week estimated.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not prepared to go beyond what I have already indicated to the House. At this stage, if there is going to be anything of value associated with this matter—

Mrs. Steele: What's there to hide?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Information was given by the people concerned in the Commissions. Are you calling Mr. Sangster a liar?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Well, that is what she's doing.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That's the inference.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The inference is that the Commissioners concerned are liars. It's disgraceful.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Shannon: This is spending of public money.

The SPEAKER: I will name members if they do not observe the requirements of the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was perturbed by the replies given by the Premier to my Leader and to the member for Burnside, and particularly perturbed by the interjection from the Attorney-General when the Premier was—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why don't you ask your question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —answering the last question. It perturbed me greatly.

The SPEAKER: Leave has now been refused. I must ask the honourable member to ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister is as discourteous as that I must ask my question.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Discourteous! You are insulting the Commissioners. You have been told you can have it privately, and you know that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General shall have respect for the Chair.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham will address his question without comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether there is any precedent for refusing information of this nature, information which involves, on the answer that he gave last week, over \$150,000? Is there any precedent of which he knows and on which he is relying to refuse to give this detailed information to the House?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In the first instance, I am not an authority on this aspect. I have already indicated my thoughts in connection with the personnel concerned. They have a job to do, and if I can offer any protection to them as they fulfil their obligations, I intend to do so. Although I am prepared to ask Cabinet to consider the matter further, I am not prepared at this stage to go beyond what I have already intimated.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is not a question of obtaining information for comparative purposes: although tribunals and commissions have been set up to solve matters for the Government, the Government is apparently ashamed to admit what they are costing.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not true.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Government afraid to admit it? If it is not, why will it not give us the information?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We have told you what they are costing.

The SPEAKER: I think I shall have to rule that that question has been answered.

MID-YEAR INTAKE.

Mr. RYAN: I believe that the present policy of the Education Department concerning mid-year entry into infants schools is that a child must be over five years of age on the day of the new intake, namely, the first Monday after the fourth Saturday in June. This causes confusion to parents, who have to look up the calendar from one year to the next to find whether children are eligible to start at infants schools in the mid-year intake. I suggest that all children born before July 1 should be eligible and that all those born in the second half of the year

should have to wait until the beginning of the following year. As I have had complaints from numerous parents on this subject, would the Minister of Education consider altering this policy by making a firm date for the intake into infants schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will examine the honourable member's suggestion, and if it can be worked satisfactorily from an administrative and a parental point of view, I should be pleased to consider it favourably.

HIGHBURY SCHOOL SITES.

Mrs. BYRNE: At present, some primary school children living in the Highbury area attend either Campbelltown or Payneham Primary Schools. Can the Minister of Education say whether his department is aware of this position, whether it has any sites in the area for future primary schools, and whether there are immediate plans to erect schools on the sites?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is known by the Education Department that some primary children living in the Highbury area (about 40) attend either Campbelltown or Payneham schools. The schools which serve the area at present are:

- (a) Hope Valley Primary School.
- (b) Dernancourt Primary School, Parsons Road.
- (c) Modbury South Primary School (Pompoota Road): at present this school is housed in the southern wing of the Modbury High School, but the primary school building is under construction.

The departmentally owned primary school sites in the area are:

- (a) Corner Lyons Road and Lower North Road.
- (b) Near the southern end of Payne Street, and near bend at eastern end of Beckman Avenue.

The department has no immediate plans to erect schools on either of the sites held, nor will a recommendation be made in this connection until the primary school enrolment potential warrants such a step. However, the position is being watched closely.

BRIGHTON HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: As work on the Brighton Boys Technical High School has been proceeding for some months now, can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made, when the buildings are likely to be completed and, finally, when the school will be ready for occupation?

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

GOMERSAL WATER SCHEME.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Early this year (and, I believe, late last year) approval was given to make certain small extensions to the pipeline in the Gomersal district (near Tanunda) to serve some primary producers in that area. However, as I understand from several local people that work has not yet commenced on that project, can the Minister of Works ascertain when those extension works may be commenced, and will he bring down a report as soon as possible?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to accede to the honourable member's request.

TELEVISION PROGRAMME.

Mr. CASEY: Australians have generally been given the opportunity freely to view television programmes, including documentaries, but I was particularly interested in a recently televised documentary on Andamooka. As Andamooka is in the district of the Minister of Education, has the Minister seen that documentary and, if he has, will he comment on it? I must confess that I was horrified at the way the programme was presented and, in fairness, I think matters at Andamooka should be placed in their true perspective.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I saw the documentary (which was part of a *Four Corners* programme) last Sunday, and was disappointed with it, for I considered it an ill-balanced presentation of the affairs of both opal fields. It was interesting to observe that none of the officials from either of the progress associations of the two fields was interviewed in this documentary. Those associations are the bodies with which the Government deals on any matter affecting the opal fields. The views expressed by miners interviewed were not, in my opinion, representative of the views of either progress association. It was asserted that the Government had done nothing for either opal field whereas, in fact, the present Government has gone out of its way to ensure that police are stationed at both fields in accordance with requests from the field. The previous Government spent a large sum carting water to Coober Pedy and also contributed towards the cost of a small hospital there. The present Government has provided for a new hospital at Andamooka, but none of these facts was mentioned in the documentary. I consider that the situation at both opal fields was completely misrepresented by the documentary.

TOD RIVER MAIN.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Works any information on the re-laying of the Tod trunk main?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member was good enough to indicate that he intended to ask a question on this and other matters, I have obtained the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

The original Tod River trunk main has been replaced during recent years with new mild steel concrete lined pipes 33in. and 30in. diameter from the Tod River reservoir to a location near Tooligie. In February next it is expected that this replacement work will connect with the steel above ground main at Tooligie, the laying of which was completed from Tooligie to near Warramboos with new steel pipes in 1950. This section of the Tod trunk main is in "as new" condition and, with the replacement during recent years, will provide a high class main of new steel concrete lined pipes from the Tod River reservoir to near Warramboos.

Future urgent work programmed is for a continuation of the replacement of the badly corroded Tod trunk main at the rate of 10 miles per year in the section between Warramboos and Minnipa and a contract for 30 miles of 24in. diameter pipes for this purpose has been let. Completion of this proposed 3-year programme in 1969 will, with the exception of 11 miles of 27in. pipes, result in replacement of the Tod trunk main from the Tod River reservoir to Minnipa after which further replacement must continue beyond Minnipa as an urgent undertaking.

EMERGENCY GANGS.

Mr. LANGLEY: On June 23 the member for Barossa asked a question concerning a broken water main in her area. Apparently the break occurred outside working hours and repairs were not effected until the following morning. It is the practice of the Electricity Trust of South Australia to have stand-by gangs of workmen available outside working hours to carry out emergency repair work. As the Engineering and Water Supply Department is a public utility similar to the Electricity Trust, will the Minister of Works take up this matter with the officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and insist that similar stand-by gangs are available at all times?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am satisfied that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has done everything possible to ensure that effective repairs can be carried out when needed. The watermen are on service 24 hours a day for seven days a week, and a number of men are engaged on the understanding that they can be called out on short notice. To

keep these men employed 24 hours a day would be unwarranted and most expensive for the Government. I submit that the honourable member could not instance a case where prompt service, when required, has not been rendered. I am confident that prompt service will continue to be rendered under the existing arrangement, and therefore I do not intend to recommend any change.

TORRENS RIVER COMMITTEE.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a progress report on the investigational work being carried out by the Torrens River Committee?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I deeply appreciate the interest the honourable member has shown in this work. I believe the House is conscious of the fact that he has been a keen student of problems connected with this matter, and has been helpful and made many suggestions so that we now have a worthwhile committee. The work of the Torrens River Committee is proceeding steadily. The terms of reference have been extended to cover all of the river from the Torrens Gorge to the outlet, excluding that portion under the Adelaide City Council. Regular meetings are being held, and a joint inspection with local government authorities on the eastern extremity of the river has taken place. Investigations are proceeding into a variety of matters including legislation, land acquisition, hydraulics, and freeway location. Several of these matters will require some time to resolve completely; for example, the location of the freeway will not be known until the first half of 1967. However, the commencement of minor works in some localities need not be delayed until the whole scheme has been finalized.

TELEVISION EDUCATION.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On May 11, the report of the Advisory Committee on Educational Television Services was tabled in the Commonwealth Parliament by the Postmaster-General (Mr. Hulme). Speaking on the report, Mr. Hulme said that the Commonwealth Government had no need in the foreseeable future to conduct a separate network of television services. He also said that, as education was a matter for the States, he was about to communicate with the various State Governments. Can the Minister of Education say whether he has communicated with the Commonwealth Government and whether the Government has any plans for an educational television service here?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Communication with the Commonwealth Government has taken place on this matter. At present, however, the Government has no plans for commencing educational television in the schools, but every aspect of the matter will be discussed at a meeting of Education Ministers which I shall attend in Canberra tomorrow.

TROTTING.

Mr. RODDA: Yesterday I asked the Premier a question about the report of the committee appointed to inquire into trotting and, in his reply, he said that he considered that free speaking and certain personalities were involved. He was also reported in the *News* as having said that there was no need to report the findings of the committee to Parliament. As these investigations were conducted by a properly appointed committee, can the Premier say why the report is not available for members to peruse?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I did not intend that the report should not be made available to Parliament. I said that, because of the manner in which the committee had been appointed, there was no necessity to have its report laid on the table. Having read much of what is contained in the report, I believe much unnecessary printing would be required for it to be laid on the table. I doubt whether members would benefit from its tabling. As I assured the House that I would make certain information available before a Bill on the matter was introduced, I am trying to work out what is of value to members. I believe I now have some matters of value that I can submit to the House. I do not want to have the report printed as I believe the Government Printer has more than enough work to do. If the honourable member wishes to see a copy of the report he may see it.

WATERPROOF STORAGE.

Mr. McKEE: In a letter, the Port Pirie council has asked whether I can ascertain from the Government if consideration has been given to the provision of waterproof storage facilities, in the way of sheds, on the Port Pirie waterfront as part of the wharf rehabilitation programme. I believe that such facilities are desirable because the projected standard gauge will encourage shipping companies to off-load cargoes at Port Pirie for rail transport to other States. Will the Minister of Marine comment on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will take up the matter with the Harbors Board. However, I should point out to the honourable member that much money has been spent in Port

Pirie recently (far more than has been spent in many other parts of the State), and work is still being done in that area. Other areas have urgent needs, and we have only a certain sum available with which to provide facilities. Nevertheless, as I believe that the request is justified, I will take it up with the board to see what can be done.

POINT PEARCE.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs a reply to my recent question concerning rentals at the Point Pearce reserve?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are 53 houses on Point Pearce reserve rented by Aborigines. Rent is now owed by 26 tenants in residence, and four previous tenants at present owe rent but do not now occupy houses. The existing total debt at June 30 was \$1,092.80; at the end of May the debt was \$1,112.36; and the debt at the end of April was \$1,184.72. The highest current individual debt is \$130.90. We have periodical reviews of the tenants at Point Pearce who are in arrears with rent. I may say that on taking office I had a review made of the rents of houses at Point Pearce by Mr. O'Reilly of the Housing Trust, and the rents recommended were in no case lower than those already proposed. I went to Point Pearce and explained to a meeting of the residents that they were being charged rent at the current rate fixed by the Housing Trust under the Housing Improvement Act for substandard houses in the general community, and that they were therefore required to pay the rent for their premises from the earliest date on which these rents had been fixed. The council at Point Pearce undertook to endeavour to see that the rents were brought up to date. In some cases the rents have not been met, and warning notices have been issued and in due course summonses have been issued to recover the rent. I have explained to the residents at Point Pearce that if they do not pay rent for the dwellings there it deprives the department of necessary moneys for expenditure on Aborigines elsewhere in the State who are in a very much less privileged position than the residents of Point Pearce. However, generally speaking we have had co-operation from the residents at Point Pearce in the payment of rent. Those who have been difficult about payment have been dealt with the same as any other people who have refused to pay rent to the Government would be dealt with. The matters have been forwarded to the Crown Solicitor for collection.

WATERWAYS COMMITTEE.

Mr. CURREN: Last year a committee, known as the Waterways and Recreation Areas Investigation Committee, was set up to make inquiries and to visit certain areas. In the absence of the Minister of Lands, can the Minister of Agriculture say how far the committee's investigation has proceeded and when the Upper Murray area will be inspected by this committee?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I had the privilege of setting up this committee when I was Minister of Lands, but now, of course, I no longer control that department. I will take up the question with my colleague on his return from a conference in another State, and try to ascertain the present position.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works further knowledge of when the report will be available from the committee investigating the possible use of effluent from the Bolivar sewage works?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to be able to report to the honourable member that I have been advised that conclusions have been reached. That report has been signed by the various members of the committee, and I hope it will come into my hands early next week. If it does I shall have it tabled and printed, as I believe from what I have been told it is a very enlightening and valuable report, particularly for the people in the honourable member's district.

APPLES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister of Agriculture call for a report from the Chief Horticulturist regarding inspection of apples for export during the forthcoming season? For many years the system in operation in South Australia was that the fruit for export was inspected at the packing sheds, where officers of the Agriculture Department are able to see accurately the grade of fruit; in fact, they can see every apple that goes over the grader if they so desire. However, last week, halfway through the season, these officers were withdrawn, and the only inspection that was made took place on the wharves. This, if I may say so, was a much more haphazard inspection than could be achieved by the officers in the packing sheds. Will the Minister see that the report is particularly directed to the possibility of re-establishing the inspection at the packing sheds, so that the sheds will be able to have

the advice of the inspector on the requirements of the department before fruit is actually placed in containers and submitted for export, with the very great cost that arises to the primary producer if the fruit is rejected? I think a submission by the department on that matter would tend to overcome certain difficulties which we have had this year, when, unfortunately, we have defaulted on our sales of fruit overseas and on filling our ships because of the problem that has arisen. As next year will be a very heavy fruit year, in ordinary circumstances, I think a large export is essential if we are to get the advantage of the fruit crop and, incidentally, the oversea credits that will arise from it.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will get a full report for the Leader and for other members interested in the apple and pear industry. However, I believe I can assure the Leader that the shed inspectors will be reinstated next year, although this is subject to our being able to get the right type of inspector. The inspectors were withdrawn this year because it was an unusual season. I will let the Leader have a full report as soon as possible.

MARINO QUARRY.

Mr. HUDSON: Some months ago I took a deputation of local residents from Marino to the Minister of Mines in relation to the dust problem created at the Linwood quarry at Marino. At that time, and in later correspondence, we were informed of proposed preventive measures to be adopted by that quarry. Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain from the Minister of Mines a report on the progress of those measures?

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

OPAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Right at the end of last session (but not in the House) and thereafter, I made representations to the Chief Secretary with regard to the bringing of opal under the Gold Buyers Act. My question has some reference to an answer by the Minister of Education, a short time ago, to a question by a Government member. On April 13 I wrote to the Chief Secretary a further letter quoting from a letter sent to me by a buyer. The main point made by him in his letter is one which, incidentally, appeared in a *Four Corners* programme the other night, and is that sales of opal to other States will

not be caught by the provisions of South Australian legislation. Having made that point, the writer states:

I have no doubt that, in their own good time those in authority will do something to improve the situation, but in the meantime South Australian buyers have been and will be victimized from March 1 until such time as Parliament has time to ratify an Act which will be in accordance with present-day mining and disposal of opal.

I have not had from the Chief Secretary an acknowledgment of my letter. I noticed in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech a reference to legislation on this topic, but no hint as to its content was given or when the Bill was likely to be introduced. Can the Premier say, if the Attorney-General has finished prompting him, what the Government's intentions are on this matter and, in particular, the type of legislation that it intends to introduce and when, because of the urgency of the matter to opal buyers, the Bill will be introduced?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: With all deference to the honourable member, every question on every matter that comes into this House is urgent: it is so urgent that it has to be proceeded with forthwith. I shall bring down a report next week.

HOUSE FOUNDATIONS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that a prominent Adelaide soils engineer, Mr. Philip Fargher, has evolved a new grillage-raft foundation footing for house-building that can be used on Adelaide's troublesome biscay clay soils, and that it is more easily and quickly poured and achieves substantial economies compared with deep-beam foundations needed to support houses on the same shifting soils. I believe this method has been tested at Athelstone under practical conditions, and so far, the houses have shown complete resistance to wall cracking. Results seem to be much better than those obtained by the conventional methods, and effect considerable economies, particularly where deep foundations are required. Because of these results, will the Premier inquire into this type of foundation, particularly as to its application on troublesome types of soil, to see whether it is a method that can be employed by the Housing Trust in order to save money in building houses?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take the matter up with the General Manager of the Housing Trust and obtain a report.

POTATOES.

Mr. BURDON: Comments were made in this morning's *Advertiser* about the high rejection rate of potatoes, and that this was causing concern to potato growers, particularly early this year, as the market value of potatoes is low compared with that of last year. Because of the statements published in the newspaper, has the Minister of Agriculture any comment?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I noticed what was published in this morning's newspaper. I know, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot refer to a debate in another place, but the statement in the newspaper was a report on part of a debate there. Last year about 84 tons was rejected, and about 33 tons was rejected this year. The statement in the newspaper by a member of another place arises from alleged complaints received by him, but no-one has complained to me as Minister. I saw an article in the *Chronicle* about this, in which growers had something to say but would not state their names because they feared victimization. If any of these people had approached me they need not have feared victimization because I would have protected them, although they would not have needed protection because no victimization would have resulted from an approach to the department. I am surprised that these people have not approached me and explained their problems. I consider there is no problem as alleged in the newspaper article. The honourable member said that this year production was heavy, and I have received the following statement from the Chairman of the Potato Board:

At its meeting last Friday, July 1, the Potato Board declared a final payment of \$18.50 a ton for all potatoes marketed in the May pool. This completed a payment of \$38.50 a ton for all No. 1 grade marketed through the board for that period. This compared favourably with grower returns in the Eastern States. During the same period, growers in Ballarat netted up to \$26 a ton for their best lines. The retail price in Adelaide of 3.5c a lb. for unwashed potatoes and 4.5c a lb. for washed pre-packed potatoes was generally lower than retail prices in Melbourne in spite of the substantially higher returns to growers in South Australia.

Honourable members may realize that the South Australian producer and consumer are better off compared with their counterparts in the Eastern States, and I believe that some things have been said without much thought. Only last week I received a petition from growers seeking a poll to determine the fate of the Potato Board. Allegations were levelled on this occasion not against the board but against departmental officers. Growers are entitled

every third year to apply for a poll to determine the board's fate. That matter is being expedited; the signatures on the petition have already been checked, and the document complies with the Act. Further, I have already asked my colleague the Attorney-General to ascertain from the returning officer the possibility of conducting an early poll which, of course, will determine the fate of the board. The outcome of a poll will naturally indicate whether growers generally are satisfied with the board, or not. I point out, though, that if the board is rejected, it will be pointless to seek any other means of stabilization at this stage.

SCIENTOLOGY.

Mrs. STEELE: I have received a letter from a constituent of mine drawing attention to the evils of Scientology. These are enumerated in great detail, most of them being the result of personal experiences of my correspondent. He expresses the fear that having been banned from Victoria as a result of legislation introduced by the Liberal Government in that State, the remnants of the Victorian Executive Association intends (as my constituent says) to stabilize Scientology in Australia from Adelaide, and later return to Victoria. The final paragraph of the letter states:

If you wish to prevent such continuing—referring, of course, to Scientology— and spreading over the well intentioned but gullible, weak, anxious or desperate members of the public who need protection for their own sake then you will do everything possible to have the evidence of the Victorian Board of Inquiry into Scientology accepted, with additions, and introduce legislation accordingly to ban the professional practice of Scientology throughout Australia.

Is the Attorney-General able to make a statement on this matter and to say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation this session to ban the practice of Scientology in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No decision has been taken by the Government to introduce legislation to ban Scientology. The action taken by the Government is that, as far as any additional registrations of business names or companies using the name of Scientology or associated names are concerned, those registrations will not be accepted by the Companies Office. As far as the existing practice of Scientology in South Australia is concerned, I have received a certain number of complaints, as has the Chief Secretary. I have had very many letters, on the contrary, from people who are not "weak", "gullible", or "desperate" individuals, and who believe that they should

be given the right to continue with practices which, it seems to me, are their private business. Some discussion has taken place with recognized bodies of representative psychologists in South Australia about the possibility of registering and licensing the practice of psychology in South Australia on the basis of payment for work done. However, so far, no Bill has been prepared. When it is prepared it will be discussed with the responsible authorities. The Government thought that we ought not rush into legislation of the kind which has been introduced in Victoria and which has created a number of considerable problems for quite the legitimate exercise of psychological assistance in that State. I frequently receive letters concerned with this subject, and only recently an application was made to the Registrar of Companies for the registration in South Australia of the Church of Scientology of California as a foreign company. On examination of the relevant documents, it was quite apparent that under the Companies Act in South Australia this was not a proper body to be registered as a foreign company; it was completely contrary to policy on any grounds, entirely apart from Scientology, that it should be registered, so I refused agreement to register it. However, I received the original letter sent to the applicant in South Australia informing the applicant of the refusal. It was sent in an envelope with the words "off policy" scrawled across it. I do not know whether honourable members have read the report of the inquiry in Victoria and gathered the meaning of these particular words, but I gather that I am, as a result, not *persona grata* with the persons concerned, putting it mildly. However, the matter is being watched in South Australia. The Government believes it should not intervene in practices that seem to be satisfying to reasonable individuals in the community but, at the same time, in due course we should take some action in relation to protecting the community from unqualified work in the psychological field for payment of fee.

PHOSPHATE ROCK.

Mr. HALL: The normal supplies of phosphate rock from the island of Nauru to Australian phosphate producers have a limited life, I understand, of about 25 years. I also understand from newspaper reports that the Mines Department is endeavouring to search for local phosphate supplies. In view of the limited life of the supply of deposits to South Australian producers, and of the importance of phosphate to South Australia's agricultural industry, will the Minister representing the

Minister of Mines obtain from his colleague any available information concerning the search at present being made by the Mines Department and any possible prospects of success in this regard?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PAYMENTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I desire to refer to a matter I previously raised with the Minister of Education concerning certain payments made in connection with income tax to certain teachers. I have a copy of the *South Australian Institute of Teachers News*, from which I wish to quote, in order to frame my question. The publication states:

In 1965 there was an inordinate delay and the correct salary was not paid retrospectively until after the end of the financial year.

Will the Minister say whether that statement is correct and whether it was an "inordinate delay", because I understood from him that it was a normal delay and that the matter was receiving attention. Will the Minister make available to the House the information contained on Form 3 dealing with details of the excess warrant required?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As promised, I have prepared a reply for the Leader. The actual delay was rather more than half during the period in which I have been Minister, as the teachers in question completed their qualifications in 1964, were appointed from January, 1965, and took up teaching duty from the beginning of February, 1965. I was sworn in on March 10, 1965. These payments were delayed until July, 1965. The delay, as I have pointed out, arose out of an administrative procedure inherited from the previous Administration, and I have taken measures to avoid a repetition. As the Leader has suggested, the delay arose from delays in classification of newly appointed teachers. The retrospective payment was therefore not in the same category as retrospective payments that might arise as a result of wage and salary awards. There is no suggestion that action taken in this case, in which the delay was administrative, should be extended to wage and salary payments arising from retrospective increases in awards. Regarding the latter part of the Leader's question, I will try to make the information available.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When the Minister obtains the other information with regard to the Form 3 payment, will he also ascertain the date on which these payments were made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

CITRUS INDUSTRY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question, directed to the Minister of Agriculture, concerns the Citrus Organization Committee set up under the provisions of the Citrus Industry Organization Act passed last session. I have had representations from a fruit packer in my district who is most perturbed at the requirements set by the Citrus Industry Organization Committee. Half of this man's business is packing citrus and the other half packing other fruits, but he has received a circular letter dated June 30, and signed by D. H. Sanders, Secretary of the Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia, which states:

Further to your application for licence as a packer I wish to advise that after consideration by my committee your application has been deferred until such time as we are able to more fully investigate the facilities and equipment at your premises. In this regard we wish to point out that C.O.C.'s requirements for granting of a full licence are as follows:

- (1) Waxing and washing equipment.
- (2) Department of Primary Industry licence for export packing.
- (3) Stamping equipment.

The next paragraph merely advises that the Quality Control Officer would be calling to discuss the matter. The final paragraph states:

Upon receipt of a full report from Mr. Mawby we will again give careful consideration to your application if you should desire to continue as a packer. Until you receive further advice from us we would remind you that on and after Monday, July 4, 1966, it will be illegal for you to continue to pack citrus for sale under the terms of the Citrus Industry Organization Act, 1965.

This man tells me it will cost him about \$2,000 to install the required equipment; in fact, in the paragraph that I omitted to read the committee said that he should consider the economics of such installation. In his case he is afraid that the economics of installation are such as to make it prohibitive and that this will rob him of about half of his present business. For that reason he has approached me to see whether anything can be done to help him. Is it the intention of the Act to put these comparatively small packers out of business by fixing requirements that are uneconomic for them to meet? If that is not the intention of the Act or of the committee administering the Act, will the Minister intercede on behalf of my constituent, if I give him the name and address, and see whether the committee can make some other arrangements that will allow this packer to continue operating?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: If the honourable member will furnish me with the infor-

mation necessary I shall have the matter investigated. The Citrus Organization Committee, set up last year by Act of Parliament, has certain powers. The committee was appointed by grower representatives and by Cabinet; in turn, those representatives, with me, selected the other members. The allocation of the grower representatives was worked out so that wide representation would be given from the citrus-growing areas covered by electors' representatives. The other members of the committee were selected from the trade, and an independent chairman (Mr. Slade, former Director of the Public Buildings Department and an able administrator) was appointed. The committee set out to establish good public relations and it has held many meetings throughout the State. It has also published circulars giving advice to people in any way associated with the trade in order to keep them up to date as to the requirements of the committee. In the past some people who have packed citrus have not kept up the required standard, although I am not suggesting that this applies to the present case, because I have no knowledge of it at the moment. However, as some people have purchased oranges in bulk from orchardists and have not maintained proper standards of packing this has reacted generally against the sale of citrus. Because of that, it is necessary to fix standards to ensure that it does not happen again.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Agriculture say, first, whether any regulation in South Australia requires citrus fruit to be waxed before it is sold; secondly, whether the Agriculture Department supports the waxing of fruit for local consumption; and, thirdly, what is the additional cost to the industry per case of waxing fruit for local consumption?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not know whether the member for Mitcham was referring to the local or to the export market. However, I will take up with the department the question of the cost of waxing and so on, and provide the Leader with a report as soon as possible.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Section 21 (1) (e) of the Citrus Industry Organization Act provides:

Subject to this Act the committee may, by order, exempt from the operation of this Act a grower who produces a small quantity of citrus fruit.

As this matter concerns a grower in my district, will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from the committee what is the maximum

quantity of citrus fruit a person can grow and still be entitled to exemption from the provisions of the Act?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will ascertain from the committee just what it considers is a small grower. Generally speaking, the opinion is that a grower with fewer than 50 trees would be exempt under this section. However, there are exceptions. Orchards in a dry area may be such that a grower may have more than 50 trees but still not be a productive grower. I believe each case is treated on its merits. I referred the case of a constituent of mine to the committee, and it acknowledged that he was not a commercial grower in the sense that he should come under the provisions of the Act. I will ask the committee about the case to which the honourable member refers and see how it arrives at its decision.

CHEESE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question, directed to the Minister of Agriculture, arises from a press release from one of his officers several weeks ago. The comment, relating to cheese exports and published under the heading "Cheese Plants being Rebuilt", states:

Several cheese factories in the Adelaide Hills were taking advantage of the low seasonal milk production to rebuild their premises, the Department of Agriculture's milk products adviser (Mr. B. D. Hannaford) said yesterday. The change to rindless cheese and the influence of the Japanese market had given rebuilding plans more impetus, he said. The Australian Dairy Produce Board announced recently that export payment rates would be based on rindless cheese. Some factories would have to change to make the new product. Other changes were necessitated by the growth of the Japanese market, buyers for which required high standards of hygiene.

I ask my question for three reasons: first, because South Australia is a big exporter of cheese; secondly, because I believe South Australia is the world's biggest exporter of cheddar cheese; and thirdly, because I have a cheese factory in my district. Can the Minister of Agriculture say how many officers of his department are attached to the milk products division, and will he outline the specific work the milk products division is doing to help South Australia's export drive?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am afraid I do not have these facts in my head, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH MAIN.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last week I asked the Minister of Works whether he could obtain a report on work projected this year on the

Tailem Bend to Keith main. The Minister of Agriculture and I have been extremely interested in this matter. In addition, can the Minister of Works say whether the work on the tanks to be constructed will be done by day work or by contract?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that pipes already delivered will be laid as far as Binnie's Lookout by the end of July, 1966. Owing to limited finances, the only work which will be carried out on this project after July will be the construction of the two tanks, one at Binnie's Lookout and one near Coomandook. However, work will be commenced on the pumping station at Tailem Bend and construction will probably extend into the 1967-68 financial year. Whether pipe-laying can be resumed during 1967-68 depends upon sufficient Loan funds being available. In reply to the second part of the question, I was told yesterday by an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that tenders had been let for the construction of the tanks, so that it appears that the work will be done by contract.

Mr. Nankivell: Will the camp be closed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As far as the operations of the Engineer-in-Chief are concerned the camp will be closed. As far as the caterers are concerned, there are no contracts for any specific duration. Every contract has a clause allowing parties to terminate the arrangement within a few days. I should inform the honourable member and the member for Eyre that I have discussed the matters of the Polda and Kimba water supply and the Tailem Bend to Keith water supply with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief. Although I do not wish to make any promise at this stage, I said that I desired that any money that might become available that would permit this work to be continued should be used for this purpose. I am just as keen as the honourable members to see that something is done so that these jobs can be completed. Although a firm promise was made about the Polda and Kimba scheme, I have not been able to honour that promise.

PARA HILLS PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: On November 23 last year the Minister of Education said that the Para Hills Primary School would open on the first day of the 1967 school year. Can he say whether that forecast stills stands?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will check the date for the honourable member.

PREMIER'S BIRTHDAY.

The SPEAKER: I wish to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Leader of the Opposition on the occasion of the Premier's birthday, and to assure the Premier that these sentiments are endorsed by members of the House generally.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 5. Page 295.)

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): Last evening when I was granted leave to continue I was telling the House of one of the legacies that had been left to the Minister of Education by the previous Government in connection with approved adult education facilities at Wallaroo. I also informed the House that the previous Government had avoided its responsibilities and that it had broken faith with the Wallaroo corporation and the people of the town. I also intimated that certain submissions had been made to the Minister of Education for improved adult education facilities at Wallaroo but that I wanted to put the submission before the House so that members opposite would know that their Party when in Government had lagged behind in the provision of facilities in the country.

The submission refers, first, to a woodwork class that has operated in Wallaroo. At present the classes are conducted in a lean-to shed rented from the Wallaroo corporation, and the shed is unsatisfactory in that there is inadequate space for working and storage, inadequate facilities and equipment, and the condition of the buildings and floor is poor. The building has been the subject of criticism and inspectorial reports for many years. For instance, in 1956 Mr. H. Macklin Shaw said:

Improvements could be effected at Wallaroo for dressmaking and woodwork. I believe it is still feasible to erect a suitable unit to house both these activities and thus provide much better facilities than exist at present. In 1961, Mr. H. M. Bone said:

The centre's most urgent need is for a craft building at Wallaroo which could be used for both secondary and adult craft work, including adult classes in welding.

In 1963, Mr. D. A. Lillecrapp reported:

A woodwork class which has been in operation for many years is held in a dilapidated old lean-to shed. It lacks storage space for models, accommodates only 10 students, and does not even possess a proper tool cupboard. This shed reflects no credit on adult education. The fact that the class continues is a credit to the enthusiasm and competence

of the instructor, Mr. M. Rowe. I believe the erection of a craft building at Wallaroo is contemplated. It is urgently required.

Despite the fact that these inspectorial reports had been made to the Government over a period from 1956 to 1963, and that the Government of the day had promised that some building would be erected at Wallaroo, it failed in its duty to see that a building was placed there.

No dressmaking class is conducted at present because of lack of equipment in the centre generally. Previous classes were held in the Country Women's Association rooms in portion of an old shop. Although these premises would again be used for classes because of the lack of suitable alternatives, they are far from ideal, the main disadvantages being (1) poor lighting and power facilities; (2) inadequate working space; and (3) unattractive appearance and makeshift provisions necessary.

I now want to outline to the House the negotiations that had taken place up to the day on which these submissions were made to the Minister. Following the submissions by the council of the Adult Education centre and the Wallaroo corporation regarding various alternative building sites and sites in existing buildings, advice has been received that the site of the old hospital is now held for the adult education centre. This advice was contained in a letter dated June 21, 1963, from the then Secretary of the Education Department to the Town Clerk of Wallaroo. That letter stated:

You are further informed that the necessary approval has been obtained for this building to be erected on the site on which the old hospital formerly stood, and in these circumstances the other sites which have been the subject of correspondence and personal discussion will not now be acquired.

I do not know what more one would need to support the belief that this was a definite promise on behalf of the previous Government to take steps to erect suitable facilities for this work to be carried out, yet that work was never done. Since then the current adult education enrolments are interesting. A comparison between Wallaroo (population 2,200), Kadina (3,750), and Moonta (1,500) reflects the facilities available. The facilities at Wallaroo are very poor, at Kadina there are good facilities centred at the Kadina Memorial High School, while at Moonta the facilities, although scattered in Moonta and Moonta Mines, are reasonable. At Wallaroo, in 1963 the enrolments totalled 14 in two classes; in 1964, there were no enrolments and no classes; and in 1965 there

were 10 enrolments and one class. At Kadina, in 1963 there were 94 people in five classes; in 1964, 151 in nine classes; and, in 1965, 199 in 14 classes.

At Moonta, in 1963 there were 30 in two classes; in 1964, there were 17 in one class; and, in 1965, 41 in three classes. For the whole of the adult education centre enrolments were 351 in 1963 with 24 classes; in 1964, the figures were 407 and 25; and, in 1965, 659 and 47. The overall expansion of adult education activities in 1965 is due to the appointment in 1964 of the first full-time principal at the centre. Two surveys were taken at Wallaroo, and both were conducted after the appointment of the principal. In the first, a circular was distributed through the primary schoolchildren, but the second was a door-to-door survey of 210 houses carried out by the Apex Club of Wallaroo. This club is held in high esteem by the community, and it is gratifying to know that these young men are vitally concerned in an adult education centre being established in the area.

Replies to the circular indicated interest in classes in art, cake decorating, dressmaking, floral art, welding, woodwork and typewriting. The second survey was more accurate. Replies were received from 210 people out of a population of 2,200. Selected sections of the town were chosen for the survey to obtain a better result. Out of the 210 replies received "no interest" was answered by 113; interest in one subject, 68; and interest in two or more subjects, 29. Twenty-seven people were interested in cake decorating, 19 in woodwork (the centre could accommodate 10 people but 19 were interested in this class); 19 in motor maintenance; 18 in welding; 17 in dressmaking; 14 in decimal currency; 13 in floral art; six in public speaking and meeting procedure; five in millinery; and individual suggestions were received from 11 people. Using the above survey as a basis, it is considered that, given suitable premises and equipment, Wallaroo could sustain at least six full-time adult education classes for many years. To these classes could be added short term courses which could be held in the same premises. Interest in many subjects not listed above could also be stimulated if facilities were available, for example, art metal work, jewellery making, and art. Recommendations made to the Minister were as follows:

To provide facilities to accommodate most of the classes mentioned above, the erection of the standard boys craft shop with theory room is recommended. This type of building could

readily be adapted to provide facilities for most of the classes by the following alterations:

- (1) Model store to be used as welding room.
- (2) Timber store to be used as general store, as adult education classes carry no stock of timber.
- (3) Provision of dual purpose benches would allow for art metal work.
- (4) Theory room could be used as dressmaking room.
- (5) Teacher's office if opened off theory room could be used as fitting room.
- (6) Provision of electric stove and covering of dressmaking tables with plastic would enable cake decorating classes to be held.
- (7) Art and floral art could also be held in dressmaking section if tables covered.
- (8) Dressmaking room could be used for general classes such as discussion groups of any type, public speaking, etc.
- (9) Ablution area could be used for general store space.

In conclusion the committee considered that the provision of suitable premises and equipment would enable an increase in adult education activities in Wallaroo. This is the only major town in the area served by the Yorke Peninsula Adult Education Centre that does not have either a high school or an area school where such facilities normally exist. I have proved to the House that an adult education centre of some sort should have been erected by the previous Government. It was not because an attempt was not made by the people of that area to have a centre established, because from 1956 to 1963 inspectors' reports suggested, from time to time, that a centre should be established. I claim that because of the promise made by the previous Government, the Minister of Education should not have to be concerned about the erection of premises at Wallaroo. After these submissions were made to the present Minister he carefully considered them, and I am confident that some attempt will soon be made by his department to establish facilities at Wallaroo to accommodate the classes to which I have referred. In recent years this State has grown rapidly and all available resources have been required to put a roof over the heads of schoolchildren, without having to provide for adult education classes. Nevertheless, the Minister gave the committee a sympathetic hearing, and we are confident that he will do his best to assist in this matter. It was a legacy that was handed to him and something that he should never have been asked to deal with. At the annual meeting of the Yorke Peninsula Local Government Association held at Bute, the following motion was carried unanimously:

That a deposit of 5c be charged on all beer, wine, etc., bottles; this is to be instituted over a period of two years, commencing at 2c and working up to 5c.

It was considered by delegates that a higher deposit should be charged on bottles, as they remain the property of the bottle co-operatives which accept no responsibility for damage caused by bottles left lying around. The delegates considered that if a higher deposit were charged, more bottles would be returned, and that is why they passed this motion. Our attention is often drawn to the broken bottles on the beaches, around ovals, and on the roadside. In fact, I think His Excellency the Governor, himself, drew attention to this fact, calling the nuisance the "Australian daisy". The delegates believed that unless a charge were placed on bottles, many people would continue to throw them out of cars on to the roadside, evidence of which, no doubt, every honourable member has seen as, indeed, I have. Parties held on beaches often result in bottles being left behind, over which traffic passes, breaking them and resulting in personal injury. This is a source of concern to various local governing bodies, and I bring the matter before the House in the hope that the Government will take some action, as a result of which this carelessness may be more thoroughly policed. Yesterday, I referred to the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures, and today received the following letter (containing no "Dear Sir", but merely headed, "The Economy"):

The reference by you, Mr. Hughes, to a "depression" reported in this morning's press is most disturbing. It is an ugly word and its use by men in public life should be avoided at all times. Indeed, nothing could precipitate down-turn in our economy more than such talk as this, and the fact that you link it with my statement in the *Advertiser* of June 30, 1966, headlined "Faith Justified in the Economy" is most improper.

If the chamber is to blame, as you suggest, then surely it is only because we did not do more to prevent your Government imposing further burdens upon industry and commerce. The desire to gain political advantage at the expense of industry was most ill-considered. I can only hope that further statements by either you or your colleagues will not force me to spring to the defence of the chamber and reveal publicly the truth of your actions.

May I suggest also that you discipline your supporters in the unions to hold their tongues about the slight down-turn in employment at this present time. The "warning to migrants" given by Mr. V. J. Martin of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of South Australia in this morning's paper, together with your statement that there had been a "tightening of purse strings" can only result in an increasing loss of confidence by every member of the community.

The letter was signed "Frank R. Curtis, President" but, apparently, Mr. Curtis jumped to conclusions and got his facts a little mixed up, because never at any time yesterday did I refer to a statement appearing in the *Advertiser* on June 30, 1966, headed "Faith Justified in the Economy".

Mr. McKee: It was the member for Stirling.

Mr. HUGHES: It may have been, but I do not know what he said, nor am I responsible for what he said. I referred to a statement emanating from the chamber on May 13, 1966, and I suggest that, before jumping to conclusions, people wait and read a member's speech. If that letter is intended as a threat I assure the President of the Chamber of Manufactures that I do not scare easily. Indeed, if he has anything to expose (as he insinuates he has, in his letter) I certainly invite him to expose it. I have nothing to hide, and I stand by what I said in the House yesterday.

Mr. Quirke: We don't usually take notice of that sort of rubbish, anyway.

Mr. HUGHES: No, and I am glad of the honourable member's support in calling the letter rubbish. Much conjecture has taken place during the last few weeks as to who will succeed Sir Thomas Playford as Leader of the Opposition. Whoever is finally elected as Leader will receive from this side of the House the respect merited by that high office.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUGHES: I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): At the outset, I wish to express my loyalty to the Throne, and to join with members in expressing sympathy to the relatives of departed former members of the House, and more especially to the family of the late Sir Richard Butler, a former Premier of this State who, until the time of his death, was a prominent citizen of Walkerville, in my district. I also associate myself with the congratulatory remarks made from both sides of the House in connection with the announcement of Sir Thomas Playford's retirement as Leader of the Opposition. As has already been said, it is truly an historic occasion when such an outstanding man announces his retirement. I only hope that the foundation he laid so well, on which so many fine industries and institutions in this State have been established, will survive from Government to Government, irrespective of the persuasion in power.

This debate has been proceeding for several weeks now, during which a number of speeches have been made, some of them good and some of them rather longer than we might have expected. However, the amazing thing is that in this debate so much has been said about so little. Speeches have been based on an absolute paucity of material contained in His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. We had the extraordinary position yesterday (and today, to some extent) of Government members on the defensive, making an apologia for the Government's shortcomings since it has been in office. This apologizing for the Government's performance so far was extremely interesting. I was reminded of the Address in Reply debate just 12 months ago, when member after member on the Government side got up and extolled and congratulated his Party on winning the election. Members on this side also extended congratulations to the Labor Party. At that time great hopes were expressed by Government members about what would be done in the following year. Only 12 months later, in this debate, we have the spectacle of successive Labor members getting up and making excuses. The main excuse we heard from successive speakers was that the Government had been in power only 14 or 18 months and could not be expected to do everything overnight. I contrast the attitude of Government members today with their attitude 12 months ago, and with their attitude in the Address in Reply debate about two years ago, when they were in Opposition.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech contained not one word on production either primary or secondary or about how the State had fared in this connection in the last 12 months, except for the reference that revenues had been affected by drought and that certain policies in that regard were going to be proceeded with in the next 12 months. Not a word was said about how these important sectors of the community would fare in the next 12 months. The Speech promises a plethora of legal and money Bills and social amendments. In this connection, I am sure that the Attorney-General will be busy indeed in the next 12 months. I paid particular attention to the wording of the Speech and searched in vain for some indication of the Government's intention to stimulate the sagging production and economy of this State. I tried to read between the lines but could not find any reference to the stimulus that I expected to see referred to. In looking at the Bills to be introduced, one looks in vain for some encouraging legislation that would provide stimulus, which I suggest

a responsible Government, doing its job properly and having its ear to the ground, would be considering. Members will see that plenty of Bills will be introduced which will cost big money but few of which will return any revenue at all.

I say sincerely that the Speech was rather disappointing because I expected so much to be contained in it. In fact, it is notable not for what it says but for what it does not say. Understandably, the two largest paragraphs of the Speech relate to finance, and they do not make very bright reading at all. The picture portrayed in the references to finance is serious and one that I know all members of the House will consider carefully. I honestly believe this matter worries most members of the House. I am concerned at the financial drift occurring at present. Quite plainly the State appears to be drifting further and further into debt. I believe that the Premier announced yesterday that the deficit was expected to be about \$8,000,000. That concerns me greatly because sooner or later that sum will have to be made up, and this will be difficult to do. It is not for me to suggest to the Government how it should be done: that is for the Government to decide. I believe all members share my concern. I trust that the deficit, which will have to be made up one day, will not be made up at the expense of many of the important projects and undertakings, which members realize exist in their own districts and which should be pushed ahead because of their importance to the welfare of people throughout the State.

At the time of the last election, the Premier and other members of the Government promised the public that they would fulfil undertakings that the Liberal Government had either started or promised. They now complain that they are surprised to find themselves overcommitted on Loan expenditure. It has been said outside (and it was said in the House by the member for Port Adelaide and other speakers during this debate) that the Government has been forced to defer some public works and to slow down others. The Speech states:

My Treasurer found last year that the Government had been previously committed to expenditure in 1965-66 of Loan moneys in excess of those available for 1964-65 on works in hand or commenced even without new works being undertaken.

A couple of weeks ago the Minister of Works was reported as saying that several rather large capital works (which we had hoped would be proceeded with) had been deferred. Two matters referred to were the Outer Harbour terminal and the considerably slowing

down of work on the Keith to Taillem Bend water scheme. I repeat that at the election in 1965 the Premier and members of his Party promised that they would undertake all public works that the Liberal Government had either started or promised to undertake. Now the Labor Government is moaning and complaining that it cannot do this and says that the Liberal Government overcommitted the Labor Government. The member for Port Adelaide used that phrase yesterday. This means that the Labor Party has not kept its promise. It is saying, in effect, that the programme is now beyond it.

The inference behind all this, of course, is that the Liberal Party did not want to win the last election. I am repeating what has been said in this House and outside it by Government members. They have said that the Liberal Party did not want to win the last election and that it set up an impossible programme to make things difficult for the Labor Party. No-one can deny that this was said, but I am sure that everyone will agree that it is one of the weakest and stupidest statements ever made to explain why the Labor Party has broken faith with the electors and finds itself in financial straits. This is as bad as when Ministers went around recently saying that the previous Government had left the Treasury broke. All members recall how last week, the Leader of the Opposition debunked this story effectively and completely. He scotched it by the effective way he introduced into the debate an authentic document he had had prepared before he went out of office showing the credit balance in the Treasury at that time and the various funds. It showed how the Loan and Revenue Accounts balanced and how the Trust accounts were in credit. In other words, when the Liberal Party went out of office there was a surplus.

Mr. Shannon: A trust account must be in credit, mustn't it?

Mr. COURCE: Yes, it should be. It is a policy of Liberal financing that a Government should always be in credit, but that certainly does not apply with the present Government. On the occasion of which I have been speaking the Leader issued a challenge to the Government to produce a similar document showing the position as at today or as at 12 months after the last election. It would be interesting to compare such documents, in view of the \$8,000,000 deficit we are now to expect. However, I have not seen any sign of this challenge having been taken up. The plain fact is that one of the main causes of the rapid

deterioration in our funds today is the different policy and different method of housekeeping now being practised. The Labor Party is certainly entitled to carry out its own policies in its own way, just as we carry out our policies in our way. However, the difference is that under our methods we were in credit financially when we left the Treasury. The Treasury today is way behind, and I am afraid that in order to make that good some day some vital projects in this State will suffer.

I would expect the Labor Party to carry out its own policies and election promises, but it should not complain and blame our Party if those policies result in deficits and if in consequence the public confidence is whittled away. Of course we as Liberals wanted to win the last election. We fought hard and we were beaten; the Labor Party won, and we offered it our congratulations. But, Sir, for members of the Labor Party to say in this place that we did not want to win the election is one of the most stupid things I have ever heard. We wanted to win the last election, just as we are going to win the next election, because the people are beginning to wake up to the Labor Party's record and to how they are being led up the garden path.

Mr. McKee: You are a spent force.

Mr. COURCE: I now wish to refresh the memory of members opposite. At the last election the Liberal Party's programme of public works as set out in our policy speech was one that we intended to finance and go on financing. It was a programme that could be undertaken and fulfilled, in addition to the very large programme which we had undertaken and which was well under way when we went out of office.

Mr. McKee: It was a 20-year plan, wasn't it?

Mr. COURCE: The honourable member will not be here long enough to see his 20-year plan come in.

Mr. McKee: You wouldn't like a small wager on it, would you?

Mr. COURCE: I think we had better see, first, what happens to a Bill of which notice was given today. Let us have a look at some of these commitments on public works which the Government has been complaining about so bitterly and on which it has suggested that the Liberals over-committed it. The inference from remarks we have heard is that some of these works were not completely necessary. The Liberal Party, as a Government, had commenced works and many of them were well on the way to completion, while there were other

works that we said we would commence. The biggest of all the works under construction at the time of the change of Government was the Royal Adelaide Hospital rebuilding scheme, which was an enormous project. Then we had the Group Laundry, which was opened last year, and the Morgan-Whyalla main duplication was three-quarters completed. The part not yet finished, of course, is the under-water crossing of the Gulf. This work is now proceeding. Then there was the Kangaroo Creek reservoir work and the road deviation around it. One project that we wanted to get on with was the Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme, but what has happened? The Minister of Works has said that that work has to stop, or if it does not stop completely it has to proceed at a snail's pace. Another one that we said we wanted to go ahead with (and this is one that the Labor Party has agreed to proceed with) was the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, which project was investigated by the Public Works Committee early this year. That item was contained in our policy speech. Other works that were proceeding at that time were the huge new Government office block in Victoria Square and the new Public Library. Can any member here honestly say that those are not vital or urgent works? Which of these items I have enumerated has embarrassed the Government? It is very ready to blame our Party for over-committing it.

Mr. McKee: You are not embarrassing us.

Mr. COURCE: The only time I become embarrassed is when I look across the Chamber at the honourable member, the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

Mr. McKee: The feeling is mutual.

Mr. COURCE: I am sure it is. Which of these projects that I have mentioned would the Government itself not have started?

Mr. McKee: Are you a member of the Public Works Committee?

Mr. COURCE: I am, and the member for Port Adelaide is, too. The plain fact is that the Labor Party, having got into this mess financially, is desperately looking around for excuses and trying to find a scapegoat in this issue. Well, its effort has fallen pretty flat indeed. I point out that I get no pleasure at all in emphasizing this rather dire financial position in which the State finds itself. However, I consider that it is the absolute duty of members of the Opposition, if they are going to do their job effectively, to point out to the Government and to the people the state things

are getting into and the excuses that are being put forward. That is one of the jobs of an effective Opposition Party, and we intend to do it.

Mr. Hughes: I don't think anybody objects to that.

Mr. Jennings: Not if the Opposition is fair dinkum.

Mr. COURCE: The first item referred to in His Excellency's Speech, following the formal paragraphs at the beginning, concerns the work of the Premier's Department, so it must have been considered important. This subject has been touched on by successive speakers, some of whom have been rather critical of the operations of that department. That this has occurred is, in my opinion, an indication that there is considerable uneasiness in this House regarding the effectiveness of this department, following the high hopes held for it at its inception. This part of the Speech refers to one new industry, namely, Chrysler Australia Limited. I make it perfectly clear that the decision of that organization to expand in South Australia is warmly welcomed by all members of this side of the House, just as it is no doubt welcomed by members of the Government. This decision is supported by us all, but there is no acknowledgment of the fact that this expansion was initiated during the former Premier's term of office. In the Speech the new Government gets the whole credit. I do not care if there is no acknowledgment of past events, but let us be fair and not give the new Government credit.

The decision to build at Tonsley Park was a big step forward, and the early planning for the plant at Port Stanvac was carried out in consultation with Sir Thomas Playford. I am reliably informed that the initial planning began about 10 years ago. The Chrysler management had so much confidence in this State when the previous Government was in office and the industrial climate was so healthy that it decided to move from Keswick and build a big new factory at Tonsley Park. That was a deliberate decision. Naturally, the next decision was to build an engine plant in South Australia instead of in Sydney, and this decision, too, was made in consultation with Sir Thomas Playford. The actual announcement was made last year, and I give the present Premier full marks for the way in which it was handled. However, that is the only matter mentioned in the Speech in relation to the new department set up specifically to encourage new industries to come to this State and others to expand.

Mrs. Steele: The only industry mentioned was one started during the term of the previous Government.

Mr. COUNBE: That is so. One reason why this industry has gone to Port Stanvac is that the oil refinery is already there, and we know the refinery was attracted to this State by the direct activity of Sir Thomas Playford. This has created an ideal industrial site suitable not only for the Chrysler plant and the oil refinery but for other people. We all know that the housing development in the area was carried out by the Housing Trust and private developers as a direct result of Liberal planning. The only industry announced by the Lieutenant-Governor was one which, although tremendously important and welcome, was started by the present Government and was coming here in any case. Apart from this, all that is mentioned is that inquiries have come from other sources. This is all that this new department has done to justify its existence. Perhaps some confidential consultations are going on—I expect and hope they are—but all that has happened in the 14 months the department has been in existence is that inquiries have been made from other sources. No mention is made of the difficulties being experienced by many industries or of any steps being taken to assist them over a difficult period. The closing down of Diecasters at Elizabeth was conveniently overlooked. All we saw was the opening of a very large potato crisp factory a month or so ago. This was shown on television, and it was magnificent publicity. I thought it reached the apex.

Mr. Hughes: The member for Rocky River spoke about Diecasters and, as I thought I dealt with that effectively, I thought you would bring up something else.

Mr. COUNBE: It is so important that I think it is worth repeating.

Mr. Hughes: Because you don't know the facts.

Mr. COUNBE: Perhaps I know as much about this as does the honourable member, who is Chairman of the Industries Development Committee. He should not throw pebbles.

Mr. Hughes: I am not throwing pebbles.

Mr. Hurst: Why was it closed?

Mr. COUNBE: I will tell the honourable member privately if he wishes. As I shall be dealing with the matter in more detail next week, I do not want to trespass on Standing Orders by dealing with it now. However, I hope next week to be able to point out to the Government several steps that can be taken to make the Premier's Department more effective.

I will suggest something along the lines suggested by the present Opposition when it was in office two years ago. We are concerned about the slowing down of business buoyancy and the lack of confidence so apparent in the business world today.

Mr. Quirke: You will get into trouble from Mr. Curtis, too! You'll get a letter!

Mr. COUNBE: I am not concerned about that, and I think it is important to mention this. We all know that the private building industry is slowing down, and we are all concerned about it. The Opposition would be failing in its duty if it did not draw attention to this.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: So much office space has been built that saturation point has been reached, I believe.

Mr. COUNBE: A big building is being erected opposite Parliament House and, if there is all the surplus office space the Minister has mentioned, perhaps we can use it. However, I am not referring to office space; I am concerned about private house building. The Minister may be interested in big buildings but I am more concerned about building houses for the people.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I am interested in housing, too, but I am pointing out why building activity has slackened.

Mr. COUNBE: Does the Minister think this is one of the reasons?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I have been informed by a competent architect that it is.

Mr. COUNBE: The member of Unley (Mr. Langley) gave a better reason—that we had had too much fine weather. That was the gem of the lot! There is no doubt that the private building industry is slowing down and that some sectors of the manufacturing industry are facing difficulties. We cannot gauge much from the share market, as it is up one day and down the next, and oil shares have some effect. However, my impression is that people are hesitating to invest or outlay money for expansion; they are postponing development programmes in their own companies or in fields in which they are interested. There is a general and marked lack of confidence in the business world, irrespective of what the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) says he has been told in a letter.

Mr. McKee: I believe that applies to the present Opposition too.

Mr. COUNBE: I have not received a letter.

Mr. McKee: No, I mean a lack of confidence.

Mr. COUNBE: We are expressing a lack of confidence in the Government. Recently comparisons were made with other States, but of the States that were compared, five appeared to be booming, with New South Wales the exception. Many businessmen are worried and private builders are concerned; "spec" building has almost stopped; and carpenters and masons are looking for work. Yet the Premier, as Minister of Housing, said last week that he was concerned only with the Housing Trust and could not worry about private builders. They may not have been his exact words, but that was the effect of what he said.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They weren't his exact words.

Mr. COUNBE: Perhaps not, but that is the effect of them. No doubt the Premier and other Labor members realize the significant contribution made by private builders to the number of houses constructed in this State.

Mr. Shannon: For many years the number of houses built by private builders has exceeded those built by the Housing Trust.

Mr. COUNBE: And so it should, but they should work together. I am concerned at the effect on the private builder today. The member for Unley (Mr. Langley) suggested fatuously that the slackening in the building trade was caused because fine weather had resulted in buildings being completed ahead of schedule.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Progress has been faster on large buildings because of that.

Mr. COUNBE: Perhaps, but I am speaking of house building. The member for Unley admits there is a slackening off but then tries to fob us off with this stupid excuse. Either we have never had fine weather before or the member for Unley does not know what he is talking about. I suggest that he has never considered the real reason for the faster completion times. The decrease in new commencements of houses was caused because large builders concentrated their work force one on or two major jobs because of the lack of follow-up jobs, so that they finished the work more quickly.

Mr. McKee: Do you know that there is not the demand for carpenters and joiners today?

Mr. COUNBE: Of course, that is the point I am making. Little demand exists for them and that is why they are not working, which we regret. Fewer houses are being built and a larger number of skilled tradesmen are available from the jobs that did not even-

tuat. That is why much of the work is completed ahead of schedule. I shall quote from the *Monthly Review of Business Statistics* of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, No. 343.

Mr. McKee: Have you a report for 1961?

Mr. COUNBE: These are the figures for the last 12 months. Unemployed people on benefits in South Australia in March, 1965, totalled 640, whereas in March of this year the total was 1,635. Why, in the 12 months that this Government has been in office, has the number of unemployed people on benefits almost trebled?

Mr. McKee: Why not ask Mr. Holt?

Mr. COUNBE: In the same period in Western Australia there were 1,231 unemployed people on benefits in March, 1965, but only 620 in March, 1966. The position is far more serious than the honourable member realizes.

Mr. McKee: Wasn't your Government in a similar position on many occasions?

Mr. COUNBE: Perhaps, but if it was, it got out of it.

Mr. McKee: Yes, it got right out of Government.

Mr. COUNBE: The present Government is going the right way to get out of Government, too.

Mr. Ryan: Is that a threat or a promise?

Mr. Quirke: A bit of both!

Mr. McKee: Do you think these figures could be due to the fact that the Commonwealth Government is trying to promote a war, whereas it usually promotes a depression first?

Mr. COUNBE: The member for Port Pirie is a past master at bringing out the old catch cries and shibboleths. The monthly summary of statistics by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics for South Australia, No. 83, of June 1966, shows that the number of male unemployed people registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service as at March, 1965, was 1,129, whereas in March, 1966, the figure had risen to 3,397. That, of course, is almost exactly the figure I quoted just now. The number of people receiving unemployment benefits in the same period rose from 640 to 675. Buildings, to which I referred earlier, are dealt with on page 8 of the same publication, where reference is made to the new building approvals in the metropolitan area. It is, after all, in the metropolitan area that most houses are built, because two-thirds of the population lives there. In March 1965, 594 approvals were given, but this had dropped

by March 1966 to only 429, a decrease of about 25 per cent. This emphasizes my point that the building industry is slack.

Mr. Hudson: How is the metropolitan area defined there?

Mr. COUMBE: It is not, but I suppose I could find that out.

Mr. Hudson: You would probably need to check this because, as building shifts farther out to the new suburbs, it may affect the classification.

Mr. COUMBE: It may technically, but this is dealing with the number of building approvals given. It does not matter whether the metropolitan area is tight or expanded: the figures I have quoted are from the same source and affect the same area.

Mr. Hudson: But over the years it can be assumed that, if relatively more houses are being built, this will affect the classification of the metropolitan area, which will affect the answer you give.

Mr. COUMBE: I thought the honourable member was making a useful contribution not a diatribe. I shall not waste time looking this up. I worked on exactly the same figures for the same area in both cases. The member for Glenelg has a different idea of the metropolitan area when dealing with another Bill.

Mr. Hudson: I am trying to help you.

Mr. COUMBE: I am most grateful. Opposition members are worried, and every honourable member should be concerned about this problem. We had hoped that His Excellency's Speech would indicate that the Government had awakened to the problem and would suggest some remedial action to stimulate this industry that is at the moment sagging. But there is nothing in the Speech dealing with either secondary or primary industry over the last 12 months, and no remedy or even acknowledgment of this problem is suggested or made.

Having said that, I shall be the first to welcome a suggestion of a measure by the Government to stimulate industry. The present Government has completely ignored this problem; it is falling down on its job. Any Government worth its salt if it had had its ear to the ground would have woken up to this problem. Having dealt with industry and the Premier's Department, on which I shall speak later, I hope, more constructively—

Mr. Ryan: Let's have it now and get it over with!

Mr. COUMBE: I was wondering from his Excellency's Speech what had happened to decentralization these days. We never hear about it now; it appears to be a forgotten

phrase. For years when the Liberal and Country League Party was in Government, we heard fulminations and suggestions by the Opposition about decentralization—how important it was and what a vital measure it was. The previous Government was urged to do something about it, so, as we all remember, it set up a special committee to examine the problem. It was a committee of the Industries Development Committee.

Mr. Ryan: And then the Government refused to give the committee any authority.

Mr. COUMBE: It was representative of both sides, and especially the country members were most vocal about the matter. Some of those vocal members are Ministers today. The member for Murray (Hon. G. A. Bywaters) and the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) were vocal about decentralization and you, Mr. Speaker, were on the committee. You all spoke about decentralization. Now it is a completely forgotten phrase in this Parliament; we never hear of it. Certainly it is not mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, yet it was one of the things that the Premier's Department was supposed to handle—the attraction to this State of industry, and decentralization. I think the last time we heard about decentralization was in the Labor Party's policy speech, when it was highlighted.

Mr. Shannon: It served its purpose in March 1965.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, and now is the pay-off. We shall wait a long time before we hear about it again.

Mr. Shannon: March 1968 will be a boom time.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. As regards the Premier's Department, it is interesting to note that since I gave notice last week of my intention on July 13 to move a certain motion (which I shall not now canvass) suddenly the Government has got very busy. First of all, there was a broadcast by the Attorney-General the other night in which he deplored the fact that we were criticizing his department. Then for a large part of his broadcast he adroitly talked about the schemes of the Playford Government that had misfired. No Government is perfect. For every scheme that misfired under the previous Government, let us look at all the wonderful schemes in South Australia that did come to fruition. The Attorney-General would be well advised to look at the record of the present Premier's Department because, as I said just now, the Chrysler factory scheme was started under the previous L.C.L. Government, but all we get in the

Speech is "and other inquiries have been received". There was not only a broadcast: two public relations officers have been appointed. The public relations officer who was formerly working with the Attorney-General has now been seconded to the Premier's Department, and we have a brand new public relations officer in addition in the Premier's Department. So we have two of them. They work with colour slides, as they do in the Tourist Bureau—with magic lanterns. The Government is concerned about this position. The passage from *Hansard* reads:

The public relations officers shall be responsible to him (the Premier) in one department and do work necessary to attract new industries and assist decentralization.

The word "decentralization" is now being used, and I hope we see some evidence of its use. At last, we may see effective work carried out in this department, and I shall be the first to welcome tangible results. Of this public relations officer it was said at the same time that the Public Service Commissioner, when conversing with the Premier on the appointment, had said to the Premier that he did not know how the work had been carried on under such a load. Surely, that supports our contention for far more effective work and staffing in this department.

Paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the advent of natural gas, something which we all welcome. I assure the House that having several times last year spoken at some length and in some detail on this subject (as well as dealing with a number of technical matters) I do not intend to cover that ground again, as we shall have an opportunity later to debate the matter, when the relevant legislation is introduced. However, I wish to comment on the next move that will have to be made, in introducing this new product into South Australia. Since the Premier, the Minister of Mines, the Director of Mines and Deputy Director returned from their fact-finding overseas trip a few weeks ago, many statements have been made on this subject, both in the daily newspapers and on television, which seem to visualize the implementation of the scheme almost overnight. I must agree wholeheartedly with the Premier, who described the find as the most exciting thing to happen in South Australia for the past 25 years. Indeed, I said exactly the same thing in the House about 18 months ago, when I returned from a visit to the Gidgealpa field with officers of the Electricity Trust, mining experts and leading industrialists. I said then that it was the most exciting thing to happen since the advent of

Leigh Creek coal, and I applaud the Premier's recent statement on television, to the effect that his Government intended to proceed with the development of the project with all possible speed.

There is no question that action in this regard is urgent, now that sufficient reserves have been found. The sooner we harness the product to our industrial use, the better it will be, for obvious economical reasons. In Victoria, Sir Henry Bolte, is vigorously formulating plans to establish a gas line, following offshore finds in that State (at least, he was, until he possibly read in this morning's paper about the Labor Party's views on what it intended to do about natural gas). Sir Henry wishes to establish the line in Victoria early, to attract industries on to the line before it reaches Melbourne, as well as when it reaches the city, and before other States that may establish a line can secure those industries. Therefore, we must get our thinking straight and establish plans so that we can negotiate and secure industries before they go to Victoria.

Mr. Shannon: We shall have to be watchful, because our economics may not be as good as Victoria's.

Mr. McKee: You're putting the cart before the horse. Fools rush in!

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, I notice the member for Port Pirie rushes in every time. The Victorian Government is already negotiating with the Esso-B.H.P. group that undertook the exploration work, in relation to prices at the city gate at Malvern (a technical term used where the producer gives over to the distributor). We have not even come close to that stage, and we have no time to lose, especially when we realize that we have not really got off the ground yet. In his last annual report, tabled in the House, the Director of Mines (Mr. Barnes) said:

The matter is considered urgent for two reasons: (1) to see whether this State can attract any of the new industries which develop around competitively priced natural gas; and (2) to assist in resolving the dilemma of the Electricity Trust whether it should budget to utilize natural gas at the Torrens Island power station, or not.

The Director of Mines hit the nail on the head when he stressed the urgent need to establish the pipeline, and so attract all the industries we could, which would follow such an installation. I believe the Electricity Trust has made some decision about its future in regard to burning. I recently asked the Premier in the House whether he would table a report from the Bechtel Pacific Corporation (the organization retained by the Government to carry out

a feasibility study of the Gidgealpa field and the pipeline work), but he could not give me any indication that he would do so; in fact, he said he would not. I point out, however, that both the Queensland and Victorian Governments tabled in the respective Parliaments reports made by the expert retained by those Governments, which became known as the Hetherington reports. The same expert produced those reports, one after the other, and they were made available for all members to see. I have been privileged to read extracts from both reports and, although I do not agree with all aspects, I have at least seen them. I strongly believe that that should occur here, and that the Bechtel organization's report should be laid on the table of the House for our guidance. The matter is so important that we should all be completely conversant with this complex subject, so that later this year when the relevant legislation is introduced all members will have a first-hand knowledge of the matter. Now that the Gidgealpa reserves appear to be adequate, the next matters to be determined are the financing, construction of the pipeline, and the selling price of the product at the city gate. Regarding the pipeline itself, a new and most important aspect has entered into the negotiations since last year, namely, financial assistance by the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) has indicated that he will be prepared to assist financially. I do not know how much assistance will be given and I doubt whether the Treasurer knows at present. However, this is a real and distinct break-through of great importance in the provision of cheaper capital for the construction of a pipeline than can be provided privately. We know that it will lead to lower charges and amortization and to cheaper gas at the outlet.

It is a completely new aspect of financing. I understand that the Treasurer is to confer later with Mr. McMahon on the matter. I point out the importance of this Commonwealth intervention because this fuel must compete economically with other fuels, such as furnace oils, and the unit costs for each British thermal unit of natural gas must be as low as possible, having regard to establishment costs, amortization and other charges.

I again make the plea that the Government table in this House the report of the Bechtel Pacific Corporation, which I understand covers the reserves and a feasibility study. A feasibility study was carried out on behalf of the Liberal and Country League Government

about two years ago and the present Government would have that information. Some of the work has been done. The first report covered a wide aspect of these matters and was most comprehensive. I shall be surprised if there is any variation between the first report by Otto Wetzell of New York and the report now being made by the Bechtel Corporation, except so far as concerns the discovery of additional reserves.

I hope that legislation will be brought before us later this year. We must look not only at the financing of the arrangement but also at the constitution of the authority that will construct and operate the pipeline. We know the importance of constructing the line at the lowest possible price and of managing the project on strict lines. The composition of that body, whether it be a board or a trust, is vital. In my opinion, it should comprise representatives of the Government, the oil companies and the distributors so as to give a fair cross-section that is so vital in keeping down operating costs.

I emphasize that the Government, as well as having a financial interest, must have a controlling interest, because the people of South Australia who harness their factories, appliances and machinery to use this new product are not to be held to ransom by any new producer. It is most important that the constitution of the authority to construct the line and control the financing be spelled out. I understand that the Government is at present conferring with the Bechtel Corporation, the producers at the well head and likely consumers in the country and metropolitan areas on prices and that legislation is being prepared. This matter is urgent and I hope that the Government will get on with it. I commend the Government for its determination to go ahead with the project and express the hope that adequate information will be given to members.

The legislation will deal with one of the most important and far-reaching matters to come before Parliament and, if members are to give it the consideration that it warrants, they must be well informed on the subject. The only way they can obtain this information, apart from reading about what happens in other parts of the world, is to read the document that I hope the Government will table. Our decisions on this matter will greatly influence industrial development for many years.

The last item with which I wish to deal is education and this rather vexed subject of free books. The Labor Party raised the matter of the supply of free books prior to the last

election, which was held in May, 1965, and recent announcements by the Minister of Education have stated that the free books scheme will operate from February, 1967, and that thereafter, in primary schools, for the first year all textbooks will be free and that in subsequent years the books will be returned to the school and issued to children then coming into the class in which the books have been used. I do not know for how long this will go on. I expect that some system will be worked out for the replacement of books that become knocked about and not able to be used. Some lucky children will get new books.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Someone will be obliged to pay for the old books.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. All children can have new books if their parents are prepared to pay for them.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The unfortunate parents of the child who has the book at the time it becomes no longer usable will have to pay for it.

Mr. CUMBE: The book is only free once.

Mr. Langley: This scheme is annoying the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: It is hurting everybody.

Mr. CUMBE: I wish the Minister were present. My point is that, apart from the principle of free books, there is now much agitation and concern among headmasters as to the machinery for putting this scheme into operation.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The possible machinery!

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. I, as well as other members, have suggested "Why not take a leaf out of the Liberal and Country League book and follow the example of that Party for once?" In 1959 the policy speech of the L.C.L., as announced by the Premier at that time, proposed monetary grants to parents of children attending secondary schools. The grants were to be \$16 a year for each child in Intermediate, \$18 a year for each child in Leaving and \$20 a year for each child in Leaving Honours. This money, given as a cash grant to parents, has been appreciated by them.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There were no complications.

Mr. CUMBE: This operated almost overnight without the slightest hitch. We suggest that, if the Government is to have a free book scheme (and apparently, that has been supported by the people), why not put it into operation as a monetary grant to parents?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That is what most people thought would happen.

Mr. CUMBE: They did. They had seen the monetary payment system introduced in 1959 by the L.C.L. Government and said, "The Labor Party will give us free books and I expect the system will be the same as the Liberals have adopted." Believing that the system would work satisfactorily, people voted for the Labor Party so that free books would be provided on that principle. But what will they get? In 1967 children will get new books free, whereas in 1968 they will get only second-hand books.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Parents will be lucky if they do not pay for the first lot of books.

Mr. CUMBE: True. The Minister said that all children could have new books if the parents were prepared to pay for them. We seriously suggest to the Minister that if free books are to be introduced this should be done on the cash grant system. When this suggestion was made, the Minister said that this would almost double the cost because of the difference between the retail and wholesale price. What is to prevent him from producing the books in the same way and at the same wholesale price and still making cash grants to parents? This would make parents happy—they would lap it up.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What will happen, of course, is that this system will be brought into the secondary schools.

Mr. CUMBE: I am glad that point was made because it was put to me forcibly by a group of headmasters and headmistresses who are most concerned about the matter on two grounds: first, that the system of secondhand books will be introduced into the secondary schools instead of the cash grant system; and secondly, that storage and accounting problems will occur. To a man and to a woman, the group I saw opposed the Government's scheme. However, they would all warmly welcome free books if their introduction were to be by way of a cash grant to the parents. I ask the Minister to reconsider this matter before it is too late. I am not trying to make political capital out of it.

Mr. Langley: Who are you kidding?

Mr. CUMBE: If the honourable member wants me to make political capital out of it, I will. I say to the Minister that this scheme will rebound against him and his Party. I would welcome members opposite commenting on this system during the Address in Reply debate in 12 months' time, when they will have seen the reaction from headmasters and school committees. As I have said, the speeches made

by Government members on finance measures 12 months ago were completely different from the speeches made on those matters this year. This year we heard speeches of apology. I should be interested to hear members opposite comment on how this scheme is working in 12 months' time. I believe that if the Minister allowed for wholesale savings on books and introduced the cash grant system it would overcome many problems. In 1967, my child will be in grade 7 and will be entitled to free books. Let us suppose the daughter of the member for Glenelg goes into grade 7 at the same school in 1968. She will receive second-hand, the books that my child received new. Why should my child receive new books when the honourable member's child has to have secondhand books?

Mr. Langley: For years books have been handed down in schools.

Mr. COUMBE: Why has this been possible? When a child gets a book the first thing he does is to take it home where it is covered. He then takes great care of it. Does the honourable member think a child will take such care of a book that is not his own property?

Mr. Langley: Yes.

Mr. COUMBE: Rubbish! When I was a young lad, like many other members I could not afford some of the textbooks, so I bought them secondhand. They were in fairly good condition when I bought them; I looked after them and even now they are still in fairly good condition. If I were lent a book which, at the end of the year, I had to give back to the school, why should I worry about it?

Mrs. Steele: People don't appreciate things they get for nothing.

Mr. COUMBE: The point I want to make is that a responsible group of headmasters and headmistresses approached me and unanimously opposed the Government's system. These are the people who will be concerned with the day to day handling of these books, and they have expressed this view. They are not crackpots: they are people who have lived their lives in this profession.

Mrs. Steele: The Teachers' Institute made this point in a submission to the Minister.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, and that is a body of responsible teachers which was unanimously opposed to this system. I have enjoyed this debate. I have enjoyed some speeches more than others, and some have been longer than others. However, the most interesting fact about the speeches has been the different attitude taken by Government members this year

from that taken by them last year and that taken by them two years ago when they were in Opposition.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the motion. From the outset I wish to say that I am proud of the Government's record over the last year in all fields but particularly in relation to the tremendous social advances that have been made and in relation to the legislative achievement. I am not downcast in any respect, as the member for Torrens might like to suggest. I am looking forward as a result of His Excellency's Speech to a year in which the legislative achievement of the Government will be even more rewarding than it has been over the last 12 months.

I congratulate the mover (the honourable member for Chaffey) and the seconder (the honourable member for West Torrens) for the speeches they made. I know from my own experience on a similar occasion last year that it is a great honour to be able to move or second this motion. I think every member will agree that those two members acquitted themselves very ably on this occasion. Along with other members, I express my sympathy to the relatives of several former members who passed away over the last year. I, too, congratulate the Premier on his birthday today and the Leader of the Opposition on his birthday yesterday. I hope the Leader is not feeling the ill effects of yesterday too much. However, judging by the way he was vocalizing during the speech of the member for Torrens, I think he must be feeling in pretty good health. I regret very much the fact that the Leader will shortly be resigning from his office. I think the Opposition will miss him a great deal.

Mr. Hughes: I'll say they will.

Mr. HUDSON: I know that members on this side of the House (and particularly myself) will miss him. However, I think we might see the Leader from the back benches still playing an important role and still making constructive speeches. I think we all recognize on an occasion such as this that despite his occasional roguishness he has a very basic interest in the functioning of this Parliament and in the development of South Australia. I do not think any member on this side would want to take away from him his past achievements. Probably one of the best tributes I can pay the Leader is to say to him that no matter who on his side of the House succeeds him the Opposition will be nowhere near the same. I am sure that whoever is his successor will need a great deal of assistance, which no doubt he will get. I hope Sir Thomas is not too helpful

to the new Leader, because we do not want to see anybody operating too efficiently in that capacity. I think even the honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) would agree with every word I have uttered. We know that the Leader, when he becomes a back-bencher, will undoubtedly display an even closer interest in the workings of the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

Mr. McKee: That is what I am looking forward to; we might even get him on the committee.

Mr. HUDSON: Considerable reference has been made in this debate to the state of the economy in South Australia and to the fact that certain difficulties have been experienced in one or two industries over the last 12 months. I do not think anyone looking at the statistics could deny that there have been difficulties, but I think it is as well to understand quite clearly why these difficulties have arisen and to make it clear to everyone that the specious reasons advanced by certain members of the Opposition do not carry any weight at all. For some months now (in fact, for over two years) there has been in operation in Australia a credit squeeze, imposed by the Commonwealth Bank (now known as the Reserve Bank), and, as every honourable member knows, the Reserve Bank is under the direction of the Commonwealth Government via the Commonwealth Treasury. Any actions taken by the Reserve Bank must have the full approval of the Commonwealth Treasury. That provision was inserted by Mr. Chifley into the 1945 banking legislation, and it has never been taken out by successive Liberal Governments. If any member looks at the figures published in the Reserve Bank's monthly bulletins he will see that early in 1964 a decision was taken to restrict credit via the banking system. The amount held in statutory reserve deposits in the last months of 1963 varied around the \$420,000,000 mark. The figures for early 1964 are as follows: in January there was an increase in statutory reserve deposits held at the Reserve Bank to \$494,000,000; in February, to \$599,000,000; and, in March, to \$674,000,000. Therefore, within the space of four or five months the Reserve Bank called up from the trading banks some \$250,000,000 into statutory reserve deposits, giving a clear indication to the trading banks that it wanted those banks to pull their horns in and to restrict credit. By March, 1965 (and it is interesting to note the date of this peak month for statutory reserve deposits) the amount of those deposits had risen to \$766,000,000, so over a period of a

little over one year the Reserve Bank had increased the amount in statutory reserve deposits from some \$420,000,000 to \$766,000,000, an increase of almost \$350,000,000.

This increase would obviously have had (and did have) a serious impact on the liquidity position of the trading banks throughout Australia, and that impact was even more severe because that whole period was one during which Australia's balance of payments was adverse and consequently there was a running down of our international reserves. Whenever there is a running down of these reserves, this has an immediate impact on the liquidity of the trading banks, for there is a direct connection between the two: a running down in those reserves of \$100,000,000 will reduce the liquidity of the trading banks in Australia by the same amount unless it is offset by the Reserve Bank's making releases from statutory reserve deposits. Over this period I am talking about, Australia's international reserves declined; this had an impact on the liquidity of the trading banks, and instead of the Reserve Bank's offsetting that liquidity effect it increased it still further by the increased calls into statutory reserve deposits. Most credit squeezes, if not accompanied by other measures designed to have a psychological effect on confidence in the community, operate very slowly. It takes a long time for the restriction of credit imposed on the banking system to permeate throughout the banking system and gradually have an impact on the economy of the community.

This particular credit squeeze operated slowly because, unlike the credit squeeze of 1960, it was not accompanied by shock announcements and the adoption of other policies, such as the 20-30 rule in relation to insurance companies, that accompanied the 1960 credit squeeze. It has operated slowly and with little publicity. Nevertheless, it has operated with the full knowledge and co-operation of the Commonwealth Government. One has only to look at the Budget Speech delivered by Mr. Holt last year, when he was still the Commonwealth Treasurer, to realize that even as late as August last year the Commonwealth Government was still following a restrictive monetary policy and intended to back it up in that Budget with a restrictive taxation policy which had a much greater impact on this State's economy than anything our Government even contemplated doing. In that speech Mr. Holt said:

For these several reasons, then, it seems desirable that there should be some moderation of the rate of increase in overall demand and

certainly an avoidance of anything that would make for a stronger increase in demand. We are, of course not unaware of factors, such as reduced monetary liquidity and the fall in farm incomes, which are likely to have a steadying effect on demand.

Despite that awareness, he then went on to outline certain taxation measures which in total were to raise for the Commonwealth Government almost \$170,000,000 extra revenue in a full year. The impact of this taxation on South Australia would be between \$17,000,000 and \$20,000,000 a year: this sum would be taken out of this State by the Commonwealth Budget. This sum is many times greater than the extra taxation that had to be imposed by the South Australian Government last year. These two acts—the extra taxation imposed by the Commonwealth Government coupled with the credit squeeze—have had substantial effects in this State. They have tended to have disproportionate effects here, first because the credit squeeze has a direct impact on the housing industry and secondly because this particular credit squeeze has had an impact on the motor car industry and, as we all know, that industry is very important to this State and any decline in it has a disproportionate impact on the employment position here. The effect does not end with that, of course, because if men are laid off in that industry or earn less they will spend less, and the reduction in their spending will have an impact on sales in other industries. Therefore, this leads to further reduction.

Mr. McAnaney: The motor industry in South Australia is employing more men now than it was a year ago.

Mr. HUDSON: Is the honourable member sure of that?

Mr. McAnaney: You said the Commonwealth Government took over \$18,000,000 in taxation, but it gave more to the South Australian Government.

Mr. HUDSON: Let me go in detail through the taxation measures imposed by the Commonwealth Government, because they are of some significance.

Mr. McAnaney: This Government got an increased taxation reimbursement of \$9,000,000.

Mr. HUDSON: The Government would have received that whether or not the extra taxation had been imposed. That is independent of the extra taxation; it is pursuant to the formula agreed on by the Premiers last year.

Mr. McAnaney: Where does the Commonwealth spend this extra money? It is spent all over Australia.

Mr. HUDSON: Part of it was designed to increase its surplus, as the honourable member should know.

Mr. McAnaney: The Commonwealth gave out more than it collected.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Commonwealth Government thinks restrictive measures are necessary for an anti-inflation policy, it operates so that its Budget has a deflationary effect on the economy.

Mr. McAnaney: Would that affect South Australia more than the rest of Australia? Did that Government pick on us?

Mr. HUDSON: It would affect us more than the rest of Australia. South Australia has had a rapid expansion in population. The member for Stirling keeps interjecting: if he were a student he would have to be thrown out. The rapid increase in population creates an extra demand for housing in South Australia relative to the other States, and (I will have to shout the honourable member down if I am to finish) prior to the imposition of the credit squeeze by the Commonwealth Government, housing had been geared at a high rate. Any housing depends on bank finance, as the member for Stirling should know. He should also know that any restriction on bank credit has an immediate impact on the demand for houses. The demand would now be significantly greater if credit conditions were made much easier. Many people are waiting for finance through the banking system but are unable to get it. The gap that exists between the sum they can borrow (\$7,000) and the sum they often need, and the way in which this is met by temporary finance, are big problems. I am sure the member for Stirling is aware of this. The housing industry is very sensitive to any changes in monetary conditions.

Mr. McKee: I do not think he is aware of it.

Mr. HUDSON: Then someone should tell him. In the motor vehicle industry there has been a contraction in production, although the industry is starting to pick up now. The trend is being reversed, and I think it will continue to be reversed. I think there will be an upswing in production. If one checks the production figures one can see that the decline in motor vehicle production dates from about September 1965. There was then a decline in the period immediately following the presentation of the Commonwealth Budget. That decline was sharp and, considering the size of the State, we have a much greater share of the motor vehicle industry than have other States, and any decline affects this State more than

it affects other States. Just as housing is going ahead because of our rapid population increase and high rate of immigration, so any bank credit squeeze will have a greater effect on this State than on any other State. If the member for Stirling cares to study what I have said he will find the facts completely true and accurate.

Mr. McAnaney: If I had not studied them I would not be arguing with you.

Mr. HUDSON: Perhaps the honourable member should study them again. It is well known that credit squeezes take a long time to become effective, through administrative lags and the further lags in the banking system. If loan approvals for new housing for Australia are considered and the monthly rate checked, it will be found that the effect of tighter credit is shown, and comparing months of one year with those of the previous year it can be seen that for February-March, 1965, the number of approvals for housing in the whole of Australia started to fall below the number for the previous year. However, that trend has continued, and the Commonwealth Government has now recognized that it went too far, because a few months ago it made additional money available for housing throughout Australia. That is a clear recognition by the Commonwealth Government that when a State Government gets into the position where it has to do something about housing, there is little it can do apart from appealing to the Commonwealth Government to make more finance available. We are at the mercy of the chariot wheels of the Commonwealth Government because it has the power of the purse, and each State Government has great difficulty in using any stimulus in its own State without assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. McAnaney: You quoted the statutory reserve figures to March, 1965, but now they have dropped.

Mr. HUDSON: This will have an impact in six to eight months. The peak for statutory reserve deposits was \$766,000,000; there was a decline in the middle of 1965, but the sharp decline is not to be found until March, 1966, when the latest figures show that deposits stood at \$664,000,000, with a further reduction in April of \$140,000,000. This shows clearly that the Commonwealth Government has now recognized the need for a stimulus, particularly in housing and commercial building, to the economy in general. At that time, the Commonwealth Government met

State Ministers of Housing and made additional money available. It was not enough, and the process of easing the credit situation will have to go further.

Mr. McAnaney: The Commonwealth Government will have to make a special grant to South Australia. The other States are doing well.

Mr. HUDSON: They are not doing well.

Mr. Langley: There's a deficit in New South Wales.

Mr. McAnaney: Why not look at their employment figures?

Mr. HUDSON: Other States are having the same relative difficulties. The member for Stirling will discover later this year that the expansion in the motor car industry will result in South Australia picking up more rapidly than the other States pick up. He should not be too much of a Jeremiah or he may have to eat his words—or he may get a letter from Mr. Curtis, President of the Chambers of Manufactures, telling him off. Of course, to a member of another political Party, the President may not be so discourteous as he was when he wrote such a letter to the member for Wallaroo. We have heard a song and dance by Opposition members about the deficit for the last financial year. The deficit on the current Budget is \$6,800,000, which added to the Consolidated Revenue Fund's deficit of \$1,200,000, makes the total deficit about \$8,000,000. This deficit would have been at least \$2,000,000 less but for the Legislative Council. I noted with interest the remark of the member for Torrens, who said, "Labor is entitled to carry out its own policies." Apparently, this does not apply to revenue measures. Several such measures of this Government designed to help meet the situation, were either defeated by the Legislative Council or amended.

Mr. Jennings: You mean emasculated.

Mr. HUDSON: The effect on revenue was such that the total revenue was less than previously. Much blame for the size of the deficit clearly rests with the irresponsible characters in the Legislative Council. Would they have operated in the way they did last year—

Mr. Quirke: You are not permitted to say "Legislative Council".

Mr. HUDSON: All right then, in another place. I nearly said "irresponsible idiots", too.

The SPEAKER: That might be a reflection, in which case the honourable member would be out of order.

Mr. HUDSON: When the previous Government was in power would the other place have operated as it did last year? Imagine the delightful scene of a meeting between Sir Lyell McEwin and the Leader of the Opposition in his position of some 18 months ago as Premier of South Australia, if the Legislative Council had turned down a proposal of the previous Government to levy 1 per cent stamp duty on all house and motor car transactions! I could compose a conversation piece to suit the occasion, as I imagine it would be historic, to say the least.

Mr. Quirke: You have a note of envy in your voice.

Mr. HUDSON: I agree that I am envious, but we should like to have been able to tell the other place where to get off about those matters, and to tell it who was the Government; but Party politics, being what they were last year, produced a different result. However, let us make this clear to the people of South Australia: a considerable part of this year's deficit is the direct responsibility of those financial geniuses to be found in another place. We on this side would like honourable members opposite to be as honest as the Leader of the Opposition was when he was making remarks earlier this session about the pressure on the Government to increase expenditure and on the attitude taken by members on revenue matters. At page 52 of this year's *Hansard* he said:

Under the old system when the Treasurer made up his Budget, at the same time he had to provide for the rate of income tax that would be charged to finance his Budget and, immediately, there was a division in the House, not necessarily a Party division but a division as to whether the Treasurer was charging too much income tax and spending too much money, or whether he was not spending enough money and not taxing sufficiently. It was a division that balanced, but having listened to the questions asked of the Treasurer and Ministers this afternoon I am wondering whether most did not involve increased expenditure in some way or another. Frankly, if I had asked a question it probably would have excelled the rest. However, the utmost pressure is always on the Treasurer for increased expenditure, which applies not only to members on my side of the Chamber but to those on both sides.

That was a true statement. The Leader of the Opposition is too old and wily a hand at the game not to know that last year he and other members opposite were playing this game to the hilt. I can remember the debates last year on the Loan Estimates and the Budget. It was said, "You are not spending enough in this direction; you are not spending enough in that direction", and so on; and then I remember the debates on the taxation measures

designed to provide the revenue to meet that expenditure. When we read discussions on the size of the deficit in circumstances where important revenue measures are thrown out by an irresponsible Chamber, a Chamber not directly elected by all the people, and in circumstances that are, to say the least, astounding for a democratic community, we need to be honest and say, "All right; you can't have it both ways. You can't scream about the size of the deficit and on other occasions say that the Government should be spending more here, more there, and more in still yet another direction, and then, as soon as the taxation measures come along, say 'Oh, well, these are not right. It is not the way to levy money. This is wrong.'" As far as I remember, only one member of the Opposition was prepared to say out in the open what he would have done to raise extra revenue, and that was the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), who said that he wanted to impose an entertainments tax.

We have this deficit with us and no-one can deny it will be a problem in the coming year. It has certainly been made much more of a problem than it would have been because of the action in another place by the friends of the Opposition. I suggest that the Opposition's friends in another place can be charged with acting irresponsibly in doing what they did last year to the Government's revenue measures.

Mr. McAnaney: Were they acting having regard to the Premier's policy speech?

Mr. HUDSON: No. That is a good point. The member for Torrens said that Labor was entitled to implement its policies. If the member for Stirling looks at that policy speech he will find that succession duties got a mention and on television it was specifically stated that succession duties would be increased on the higher-valued estates. Also, on television it was specifically stated time and time again that stamp duties would be increased, but that was one of the measures that was emasculated.

Mr. McAnaney: You got off succession duties pretty quickly!

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the member for Stirling is a candidate for the leadership of his Party next week. He will have to improve the standard of his interjections because, by the way he has been carrying on this afternoon, he must have been losing votes hand over fist. His odds would have been lengthening.

Mr. Casey: You will notice that the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) does not interject now.

Mr. HUDSON: I have noticed that. Last year the member for Torrens and all other members of the Opposition who spoke on the subject supported the introduction of service pay. At page 204 of the 1965-66 volume of *Hansard* the member for Torrens said:

This question of service pay appears to be the largest single item in the Estimates. I want to make it quite clear that I am not opposed to the service pay proposals, provided fair and equal treatment is given to all Government employees eligible for it.

At the same time last year the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) made it clear, not by way of speech but by way of interjection to the Premier, that he was concerned that everyone entitled to service pay should get it. But what do we find the honourable member saying this year? It is a change in tune. If members opposite would come out into the open as the members for Mitcham and Rocky River did, they too would make it clear that their support of service pay last year was a phoney support. This is what the member for Mitcham said this year.

Mr. Heaslip: What did I have to say?

Mr. HUDSON: I am dealing with these matters in rising order of importance; I will get to the member for Rocky River later. The member for Mitcham said:

It has been extravagant in other ways, too. One of the first things the Government did was to grant service payments to daily paid workers for no reason at all (something which has been calculated to add over \$2,000,000 per annum to the wages Bill of the Government). I think that estimate of \$2,000,000 is probably correct, but the member for Mitcham said that we did it for no reason at all and it was politically completely extravagant.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was a political reason.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Rocky River suggested it was purely political, and the Leader of the Opposition suggests the same thing. But let me suggest to members opposite that, when the question of wage increases arises, they say that nobody ever deserves a wage increase; but members on this side have a different approach. We consider that the ordinary Government employee has not been well paid, and we were greatly concerned to see that his position was improved relative to other workers in the community. I think that every member on this side, at the time the service pay decision was made, would have been completely sympathetic in this regard, and would have come out into the open and said, without any political bias, "This has been needed for a long time." When service pay was

introduced last year honourable members opposite were not prepared to say, "We are opposed to this; it should not be done." Did the member for Rocky River, when service pay was being debated last year, say that it was wrong and should not be introduced?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He had trouble at Appila at the time.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but I am sure that with his experience of costs, the notion of paying people extra money and doing away with "firewood from friendly farmers" would have penetrated the mist. I hope that during the debates on the Loan Estimates and the Budget this year we shall see a more honest approach to financial matters. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition knows the score on this point and can tell his boys a thing or two about it. Let us say that by some fantastic chance the Opposition were successful at the next election and faced with the problem of a deficit of this magnitude: what would it do?

Mr. McAnaney: You created it, and you would want us to get you out of the trouble.

Mr. Casey: The member for Gouger has gone white.

Mr. HUDSON: The deficit was partly created by the Legislative Council, as the member for Stirling well knows. If it had not been for the bowls trip—

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUDSON: I think that the Commonwealth Government, from the policy it is following in regard to the Reserve Bank, through approaches that have been made in relation to the Housing Ministers' Conference, and with the results of the Premiers' Conference at the Loan Council meeting, has indicated that it is prepared to contemplate some relaxation in its approach to economic conditions in this coming year. The overall allocation of Loan money was increased from an initial allocation last year of \$590,000,000 to an allocation this year of \$645,000,000, an increase of \$55,000,000, compared with an increase in Loan money made available on the initial allocation of only \$10,000,000 as between 1964-65 and 1965-66. I should think that, should the occasion demand it in terms of economic conditions, and should there not be the kind of pick-up required in one or two critical industries, we shall see a further relaxation by the Commonwealth Government in this regard.

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

Mr. HUDSON: Before the dinner adjournment I was discussing the employment and

budgetary situation in South Australia, and earlier I had referred to the restrictive actions taken by the Commonwealth Government. I want to give the House more detail than I have already given about the restrictive actions taken by Mr. Holt in his Budget in August

last year. Looking specifically at the taxation measures adopted by the Commonwealth Government of that time and estimating South Australia's share of increased taxation levied by the Commonwealth at 11 per cent of the Australian total, we get the following position:

Additional Levy for Whole of Australia	\$	Additional Levy for South Australia	\$
Income tax	37,800,000		4,000,000
Increased Customs and Excise Duty on Petrol (about 3d. a gallon for standard and super grades)	50,000,000		5,500,000
Tax on beer	41,800,000		4,400,000
Increased customs and excise on spirits	12,800,000		1,400,000
Increased customs and excise duty on tobacco	26,600,000		3,000,000

The total additional taxation levied by the Commonwealth Government in the Budget last year was \$169,000,000 for the whole of Australia and \$18,300,000 for South Australia. We have heard much from Opposition members about what the South Australian Government is supposed to have done in relation to business costs but, when we look at the specific State taxation measures taken by the Government, we find that one such tax was effectively changed last year, when land tax was increased to provide an additional \$800,000 in a full year, compared with the additional taxation of \$18,300,000 levied by the Commonwealth Liberal Government on South Australians.

Mr. Hurst: Is the Opposition objecting to that?

Mr. HUDSON: The Opposition does not say a word about it. The additional taxation on petrol that raised an additional \$5,500,000 from South Australians alone would have had a much more adverse effect on business costs than would anything the Labor Government in South Australia has done. Opposition arguments on this matter are completely specious and are designed to direct the attention of the public from the fact that the blame for any defects in the economy at present lies at the door of the Commonwealth Government, not at the door of the State Government. I hope that in the months ahead the facts to which I have drawn attention tonight will be given much wider publicity than has been given to them in the past year.

I now desire to examine the Budget deficit in more detail. Again, the Opposition, in playing politics in its worst form, looks at the amount of the revenue deficit for the year (\$6,800,000) and says, "Isn't this a terrible thing to have happened?". However, it should be made quite

clear from the outset that, were it not for that deficit, which was initially budgeted at \$3,000,000, the employment position in South Australia would be worse still. If honourable members opposite had any basic training in economics, they would know that one thing that stimulates employment is the promotion of expenditure—either Government expenditure directly or expenditure on public works. On the one hand, Opposition members are trying to tell us that we ought not to have a deficit and, on the other, that we ought to do something about employment. As is usual with the Opposition's arguments, there is simply no consistency in them.

The reason why the deficit is \$6,800,000, or \$3,800,000 more than the budgeted amount, can be summarized in the following way; first, the Legislative Council disposed of two Government revenue measures and emasculated a further one. The net effect of these actions was that the Government was deprived of \$2,000,000 revenue. The dry season has necessitated increased pumping costs on the Mannum to Adelaide main of about \$500,000 more than the amount budgeted.

Again, the dry season and the slowing down in national trade have caused a decline in expected harbours and railways freight revenue of about \$1,000,000. Furthermore, the award for teachers involved payment of salary increases higher than had been expected. I suggest that, when all those matters are considered, the excess of actual revenue deficit for the year over and above the amount budgeted for is adequately explained. I think I have said sufficient to show that the Opposition's arguments on this matter are without foundation.

I was pleased to see the remarks in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech regarding the development of natural gas in the State. It is clear that much has to be done before that development can become a reality. I suppose that four main issues must be considered before natural gas can be used effectively in the economy of the State. The prime one is the finance to build the pipeline, together with the fact that, because natural gas is a public utility, it must be under the control of the Government of South Australia. This means, of course, that the most satisfactory way of financing the construction of a pipeline will be with Commonwealth assistance, and I do not think any member would disagree with that. I know from remarks that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition that he agrees that we need Commonwealth assistance for this purpose.

Mr. Jennings: He said that.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, earlier in the debate. Finance and control are two problems associated with the pipeline. Another important aspect is ensuring that natural gas can be supplied at a sufficiently low and economic cost to promote full utilization of the available supply. Of course, who will use the gas is tied up with the route the pipeline will take. If satisfactory and economical consumption of the gas could be obtained by industries at Port Pirie, for example, it would be sensible to select a route that would enable a simple branch to Port Pirie to be made. Similarly, branches could be made if natural gas could be effectively used at Whyalla, Port Augusta or Wallaroo. Clearly, when the route of the pipeline is being considered, many feasible routes will be possible, and the particular route to be taken will have to be determined in relation to the consumption of the gas. Obviously, the Electricity Trust must be the main user of the gas but there will be subsidiary users, some of which might come in later years in the form of industries that have not yet been established in South Australia. The whole question must be closely considered in relation to the route from Gidgealpa to Adelaide.

As this matter will undoubtedly occupy the time of the House in many future debates, I hope discussions can continue on the same basis as they have been conducted so far. The matter should be discussed in such a way that members of both sides of the House are informed, and so that those who have to make the important decisions are also informed. I believe all members agree that the development

of natural gas is far too important to the future of the State for Party politics to be allowed to befuddle the issue.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: In those circumstances can you understand why we cannot have the report made available?

Mr. HUDSON: At this stage, I can say only that I have full confidence in the Premier and the Minister of Mines.

Mr. Hall: We are not allowed to judge the report for ourselves.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not able to judge, either, because the report has not been made available to me. However, I am not a whinger and can take this sort of thing in my stride without any difficulty. I am confident that the time will come when the Government will be able to deal adequately with these matters.

Mr. Jennings: Have we seen a report yet of the former Premier's last trip to America?

Mr. HUDSON: That is a good question, but I would not have been so discourteous as to raise it.

Mr. McKee: Not after the way you buttered him up this afternoon.

Mr. HUDSON: No, to be consistent with what I have said I shall have to leave this matter to a later speech. I believe the Government is being reasonable in saying, in effect, that it will give a full report on the matter when many important questions that have not yet been decided are decided. I think that is fair enough.

Mr. McKee: You must be fair on these things.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. If the Government gave an obviously premature report to the House I could imagine the screams that would come from members opposite. They would ask how far all these unsolved questions took the matter.

Mr. Hall: You admit that you are holding back the report so as to avoid criticism?

Mr. HUDSON: With even the use of a little commonsense (of which he is capable) the honourable member could understand the position.

Mr. McKee: I would not be sure of that.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Gouger is an able man who has a great future, although I am not sure where. He knows from what I have already said that many important issues still have to be determined. Until the matters of the finance and control of the pipeline and the proper determination of who will be the major consumers of the gas are determined, nobody will be able to make a final report on any of the matters associated with it. I think

that is quite obvious to anyone who thinks about it even for a moment. I know the member for Gouger has obviously thought about the matter deeply, as his constructive interjection has shown. I began prompting these interjections when I said I hoped we would be able to discuss natural gas without playing politics.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: How can we discuss it without the information?

Mr. HUDSON: We can discuss its background, and the Leader devoted most of his speech to this question. If he now says he cannot discuss it without the report in front of him then I must conclude that his earlier remarks were windy nonsense. I did not think they were, because he made some constructive suggestions about the pipeline. Interjections have been made by leading members of the Opposition.

Mr. Rodda: Would you like some from the rough stuff?

Mr. HUDSON: Despite these interjections, I hope this topic can be discussed reasonably in future and without the silly goings on that often take place in this House. I think natural gas is far too important to the development of South Australia to be dealt with in other than a most serious way. I was pleased to see, from the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, that at last action would be taken in South Australia to establish lotteries and a Totalizator Agency Board. I do not believe these matters are fiddling social issues, as the member for Mitcham described them; I think they are important. Because of the financial straight-jacket imposed on the Government by members of another place, T.A.B. and lotteries have become important from the State's budgetary point of view.

Mr. McAnaney: How much will you get from T.A.B.?

Mr. HUDSON: The Government cannot hope to get a great sum from either T.A.B. or lotteries in the first year of operation.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Money so raised is to go to hospitals and not to the Government.

Mr. HUDSON: The money will go to hospitals but it will nevertheless improve the budgetary situation, and the Leader knows that as well as I do. I think that the first year of the operation of T.A.B. would result in a contribution to hospitals of between \$200,000 to \$300,000. That would be about as much as could be expected from the turnover figures for the first year of operation of T.A.B. in Victoria and Queensland. Without doubt, once T.A.B. becomes fully established (and that

will take about four or five years), even if we do not reach the turnover figures, on a per capita basis, received by Victoria, South Australia will have a turnover that should mean a contribution of at least \$1,500,000 a year to hospitals. When we look at the budgetary position at present we see that that is a very substantial amount. From the long-term point of view it is obviously an amount that is important: it is not a fiddling question, even from the point of view of Government revenue. Even if a person believes that T.A.B. is morally wrong, or something of that description, he nevertheless must recognize that in the kind of financial straight-jacket in which this State Government finds itself, and in which all State Governments of Australia tend to find themselves, the additional revenue that can be obtained from T.A.B. is a matter of no mean importance.

I would think also that the lottery, once properly established after the first year or two, should provide revenue for hospitals, again of a significant amount. If any member looks at the figures in relation to the other States he will see that the Victorian home contribution to the Tattersalls lottery in Victoria is about \$18,000,000 a year, or \$6 a head of population. In Western Australia, the turnover for the State lottery is a little over \$4,000,000 a year, again about \$6 a head of population. Assuming that in South Australia we achieved a figure of only \$4 a head per annum, this would mean a turnover of \$4,000,000 a year when the lottery was fully established. The House will see by my figure of \$4 a head per annum that I am being fairly conservative. The position with the lottery, if the same percentage deduction to cover costs and contribution to hospitals is followed in South Australia as applies in the other States (and here I do not know what the position will be, but I am assuming that it will be 40 per cent), this will mean that of the \$4,000,000 turnover \$2,400,000 a year will go in prize money, leaving \$1,600,000 to cover costs and to provide a contribution towards the hospitals. In Victoria, costs represent 9 per cent of total turnover. In Western Australia, the costs represent 13.5 per cent of the total turnover, and I would think that, with the turnover in South Australia likely to be more or less equivalent to the Western Australia figure, we would have to expect costs of about 13 to 14 per cent of total turnover. Allowing for costs of that percentage, this would still mean a net contribution from the lottery to hospitals of about \$1,000,000 a year, and again this is obviously

a matter of some importance in relation to the Government's budgetary problems.

Mr. Quirke: It is rather a degradation for the State to have to resort to that to get its finance.

Mr. HUDSON: It may be, but I am afraid it is a degradation that is imposed very largely by the fact that the Commonwealth controls the financial position of each State Government to a large extent.

Mr. Quirke: If the Commonwealth Government were more generous, you would still have these lotteries because there would be more money to spend.

Mr. HUDSON: That may be true, too, but the position at present is such that, in view of the natural antipathy of Governments to do something about these social issues, we must recognize that they will be important revenue producers. I hope that these items can be given a relatively high priority.

I was very pleased to learn that the publishers of Colliers Encyclopaedia are no longer operating in South Australia. As members may recall, I raised this question last year as a result of many complaints I had received from constituents. This company was operating on a door-to-door basis, and was attempting to avoid altogether the Book Purchasers Protection Act of South Australia by representing all its contracts between the company and the individual purchaser as being drawn up under the law of New South Wales. The requirement in South Australia under the South Australian Act is that every contract will be unenforceable against the purchaser unless there is printed conspicuously on the contract, in capital letters in bold, black type of size not less than 18-point face so as to be clearly seen, the words "This contract is unenforceable against the purchaser unless and until the purchaser notifies the vendor in writing not less than five nor more than fourteen days after the date hereof that he confirms it." Now this requirement in our Book Purchasers Protection Act was specifically designed to take the cream off, as it were, this door-to-door selling racket. The management of Colliers regarded this provision as completely unworkable from its point of view, and it took the view that if it complied with this provision, which was the law in South Australia, very few of the contracts it wrote would be confirmed by the purchaser within the five to fourteen days period, and that it would not make a profit on that sort of basis. I think that is probably correct.

Mr. Quirke: I think it is certainly correct.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and I think the Act was designed to make that the position, and to prevent this kind of door-to-door selling where a person with slick talk and smart salesmanship would "con" the unsuspecting purchaser in his or her own home into a contract for a very sizeable sum which later on that person found he could not afford. The old principle of "Let the buyer beware" was all right in its time, but I think that these days the methods of selling have changed to such an extent, and the size of the commitment that can be entered into by the ordinary person as a result of hire-purchase has become so great, that we have to say as a matter of legislative practice, "There are many fields in which the legal principle of *caveat emptor* should not be followed, and legislative protection should be given to the purchaser."

I think it is very comforting for a member of Parliament to see an Act such as the Book Purchasers Protection Act operate effectively to eliminate the kind of practice against which it was directed. Too often we find that this sort of legislation works for a little time, and then the smart businessmen with their legal advisers think: this has a loophole around it, and we can operate in this way to avoid the Act altogether. Therefore, to provide the same level of protection that was provided previously, the Act continually has to be amended to close up each additional loophole as it arises. I hope that this position will not occur with the Book Purchasers Protection Act, and that it will continue to prove effective in its current form. Members can serve the community by giving publicity to certain companies that are not complying with the South Australian law. I was taken to task last year by the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) for stating the name of a company (I am not sure whether it was this or another company) in a question I asked the Attorney-General. I take the view that so long as one has done one's homework and one is sure of one's ground and sure that the company concerned has been flouting the law in order to promote its own profits, one is justified in stating the company's name. One of the most important ways a member of Parliament can protect the public is by giving this sort of thing adverse publicity. It worked with Colliers, and I hope it serves as a warning to other possible transgressors of our law.

Mr. Jennings: It is one of the principal reasons why we have privilege anyway.

Mr. HUDSON: Of course. The individual member operating in this way gives a company adverse publicity, but he must be careful to

be sure of his facts, and needs to check and double check to ensure that he is not doing an injustice. He holds the power in his hands by means of the publicity that he can give.

In my district the problem of drainage has been serious for a considerable time. Much of today's problem is the product of many years of development. The legislation concerning the south-western suburbs drainage scheme was first proposed in 1957, but I refer tonight to the Seacombe Road drain, or drain 10, which was not part of the original legislation. At the time of the proposal there was little development south of Seacombe Road, but since then the building rate has greatly accelerated and has been high indeed over the last few years. The country south of Seacombe Road is high and steeply sloping, and any run-off of rainwater is rapid. With each house built and each bitumen road constructed, the rate of run-off increases. Now, even a small shower of a few points of rain produces a run-off of water over Seacombe Road causing that road to be awash in several places, and causing streams of water to pour down the streets running north from Seacombe Road. Any substantial fall produces such a run-off of water that the flooding of houses is completely unavoidable.

It requires about 40 or 50 points to produce flooding, but only a few points is needed for the road to be awash and for dirt and stones to be carried over it. As a result of this year's rain, which has been well scattered and not come in large quantities at one time, the road has been awash sufficiently often to damage the surface severely. Seacombe Road today has one of the worst road surfaces in Adelaide, and the rapid run-off of water produces this continual deterioration. The position is different from that on Marion Road where water lies because it is unable to drain away. The rate of deterioration to the Marion Road surface has not been the same as that to Seacombe Road. Last year I was pleased when the Government, with the co-operation of the Public Works Committee, accelerated the investigation of the Seacombe Road drain, and passed the necessary legislation in February this year. I realize, as an individual member, that often one does not get one's way regarding the projects one wants. I regard the need for the Seacombe Road drain as urgent indeed, because of the nature of the surrounding country and of the further building that seems likely to occur south of that road.

Mr. Heaslip: Isn't that another project the Government has shelved?

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member for Rocky River carries on in this asinine way, his implication being that the Government can wave a magic wand and its public works programme can be completed within a few months, whereas he knows as well as I that priorities have to be established (that is a part of the job of the Government), and he probably knows better than I that the priorities established are not always those that suit the individual member. However, in discussing this matter I make it clear to the Government that the nature of the land south of Seacombe Road means that a substantial downpour can cause a degree of flooding that is likely to be worse than the flooding that takes place around Marion Road or in any other suburban area affected by a drainage problem. Flooding affects houses north of Seacombe Road as the water rushes over the road, and also one or two houses adversely placed in streets that slope down north from Seacombe Road, where the water rushes down the hill and through the front doors of houses. If the development south of Seacombe Road continues at the same rate, this problem will become worse.

It must be recognized that the laying of the main drains is not the final solution of the problem. Local councils have to put in the ancillary drains, and considerable work and expenditure is required by councils before the capacity of the main drain can be effectively used. This evening's newspaper referred to a problem in Tarlton Street, Somerton, with the ancillary drains provided by the council, and this problem has yet to be solved by the Brighton council. In relation to any of these drains it is 18 months to two years after the commencement of the work on the main drain before full relief can be obtained by the residents. Of course, we have a legacy from the past in this matter. A tremendous amount of work has to be done.

Mr. Heaslip: Has it been shelved because of lack of money?

Mr. HUDSON: There was a credit balance at the end of March this year.

Mr. Heaslip: Certainly not!

Mr. HUDSON: That is not correct. The position with respect to the intake of revenues and the payment of Commonwealth reimbursements is such that, even if we end the year with a deficit, we are still running in credit at the end of February, at the end of March, and even into April. Therefore, the position at the end of February and at the end of

March, 1965, is not fully relevant: it is the position at the end of the year that counts, and at the end of June, 1965, there was a deficit. I hope that it will be possible to proceed with the work on this drain soon.

A further problem in this area is caused by the quarry at Marino. For some years now it has created a dust nuisance for the local residents. Of course, the quarry existed before the building of houses in the area and I suppose it can be said to the local residents, "Well, you knew what you were in for. The land you got was a little cheaper as a result, and you have nothing to argue about now." However, one has to face the fact that in the modern world if we allow residential development in a particular area of a city we must provide a standard of living in that area broadly equivalent to the standard of living in other areas. I do not think that the residents of Marino are justified in asking for the quarry to be closed down, but I believe that they are fully justified in the action they have taken to see that the dust menace created by the quarry is properly controlled.

Mr. Quirke: Is it a stone quarry?

Mr. HUDSON: It provides material for roads.

Mr. Quirke: They have to blast?

Mr. HUDSON: Blast and crush. Much of the dust problem does not arise entirely from the blasting and crushing operations: part of the problem arises from the dumps of waste and quarry material left around the quarry area so that, when a strong wind blows in the summer and these dumps are fully dried out, clouds of dust are blown all over the place. In a very dry summer the dust problem is such that residents up to a mile or so away from the quarry are adversely affected. It cannot be said that these residents when they first built in the area could honestly have expected this sort of problem to arise. In co-operation with the local Marino Progress Association, various doctors in the area were contacted and they provided the progress association with the following letter:

Dear Sir, As doctors practising in the Marino area we view with alarm the proposed extension of Quarry Industries Limited's activities at Linwood Quarry, Marino. We wish to commend your association on the positive steps taken to prevent this undesirable spread. It is our considered opinion that (1) dust caused by quarrying at this stage represents a definite danger to respiratory and lung diseases; (2) any increase in quarrying activities or any prolonging of the same will certainly increase the danger of respiratory and lung diseases, and also prolong the danger period;

and (3) blasting at the above quarry causes fright to children and people susceptible to nervous disorders.

This statement is signed by five local doctors, one of whom considers that the incidence of respiratory and lung diseases in the area is unusually high and is a product of the activities of the quarry.

The local residents over the last few months have become particularly active, because they consider they have been led up the garden path. For a few years now they have been told that remedial measures are in hand. At one stage, over 18 months ago, they were told that, once the quarry was connected with the water supply, the use of water would eliminate the dust menace. However, that proved not to be the case because, although the quarry was connected with the water supply, the menace still prevailed. They have been told other stories about dust control measures that would be taken—for example, crushers that they were informed in January of this year would lead to the elimination of the dust problem in the area. That again proved not to be the case. Because they consider they have been led up the garden path, they have become much more irate about the problem than they might otherwise have become, and for the last six months, as we have seen in the press, they have become very active indeed. I have taken deputations to the Minister of Mines, the Minister of Health and the Attorney-General. Well-attended meetings have been held in the area and I am confident that, unless the residents get some solution to their problem, they will ultimately reach the stage of saying, "We will take our own legal action. We will take civil action to restrain the quarry." I believe that Quarry Industries, which controls this quarry, realizes the problem facing the local residents and that it has to do something about it. I believe it will spend the money necessary to ensure that adequate measures are taken over the next few years.

My speech, like that of everyone who has spoken in this debate, has lasted far longer than it should have. Every member gets up and says, "I do not intend to speak for very long." The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) was probably told 20 minutes ago that I would be only 10 minutes longer. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) told me three-quarters of an hour before he finished his speech that he would be only 10 minutes longer. I sometimes wonder whether, if we had a time limit imposed, we would not be able to discipline ourselves to a greater extent than we do in our talking on

matters in this House. I realize that any time limit would have to be applied selectively.

In conclusion, I refer to the position that has arisen at the Glenelg Sunshine Club, a matter I raised the other day. That club purchased properties at Ramgate Street and Sussex Street, Glenelg, about four years ago, to provide accommodation for old people. It successfully approached the Commonwealth Government for a \$2 to \$1 subsidy for these activities. The amount of subsidy it has received from the Commonwealth Government since 1961 is \$20,848, a substantial amount. In the process of obtaining this Commonwealth subsidy, the club took deposits from prospective residents who were prepared to pay a deposit in return for a lifetime guarantee of somewhere to live on payment of a weekly rental. These deposits (\$2,000 in one case) were then used to attract a Commonwealth subsidy. However, from the earliest stages the club has not been happy; problems have arisen between members of the management of the club (the prime movers in the scheme, who live on the property) and certain residents. I think the club epitomizes the possible consequences of this sort of private arrangement, where people in control live on the premises and can therefore interfere excessively in the lives of the ordinary residents. That sort of arrangement does not take place with the Housing Trust. The trust and other organizations that leave the elderly people who live in the pensioner cottages largely to their own devices seem to be able to produce a situation where those people can live happily and contentedly.

What has happened at the Glenelg Sunshine Club clearly demonstrates the inadequacies of the Commonwealth scheme whereby assistance is given to private organizations, but is not available to the South Australian Housing Trust. With Commonwealth assistance similar to that available to private organizations, the trust could build many more pensioner cottages, thus avoiding the kind of situation that has arisen at the Glenelg Sunshine Club. When the club's management attempted to increase the rent paid by certain members about three years ago (when the dispute first flared up), the reason given was that it was necessary in order to cover running costs.

I have the figures of the income and expenditure of the club for the financial year ended March 31, 1965, which clearly demonstrate that in the intervening period the club used an excess of income over expenditure to build up its assets, so that it had the funds required to take legal action against its own residents.

For example, for the year ended March 31, 1965, there was an excess of income over expenditure of \$1,210, although the total income for the year was only \$2,486. The argument three years previously that revenue was not sufficient to meet running costs seems to be completely specious, and the club has now built up assets that amount to about \$3,200, and can pay hefty legal fees to try to evict residents. I am not sure what can be done about that most unsatisfactory situation, but I hope the pressure of public opinion will ultimately bring the management of the club to its senses. I have presented to the Chief Secretary a petition from 327 local residents protesting about what is happening at the club and about the fact that people live there in a continual state of upset and worry. Elderly people, unfortunately, are often easily upset and worried; they notice noise much more easily than a younger person notices it, and they ought to be able to live out the evening of their lives in peace.

Mr. Quirke: Is the increased charge the cause of the dispute?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but it has gone far beyond that and, if somebody went along and said, "Can't we sit down and have a reasonable conference about this, and find some solution to the problem that would be in everybody's interests," I doubt his chances of success. If the club is prepared to accept either me or some other public figure as a chairman, to get the parties together to see whether some agreement cannot be reached, and to let the whole thing settle down so that the lives of these elderly people are no longer interfered with in the way they have been, I am prepared to try to arrange it. Indeed, I think it should be arranged. I think the opinion of this Parliament and of the people in the area requires the management of the club to co-operate in this matter and to say, "Let's forget about the past and whose fault it has been," and to stop the recriminations, get people together around the conference table, and find some reasonable solution that does not involve the expenditure of \$2,000 or more of club money in evicting residents, and hundreds of dollars of private individuals' money in defending actions against themselves.

I hope the legislative programme for this year will be a successful and profitable one. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): It is perhaps debatable whether the session will be successful, but it is certain that it will not be profitable, faced, as we are, with the present financial

aspects of this State, and commencing the new financial year with a huge deficit. I do not intend to place a time limit on my speech. The reference by the member for Glenelg to time limits reminds me of last year's efforts by the Premier occasionally to silence us, saying "You are usurping the time of Parliament." I disagree entirely to limiting speeches made by private members. This debate has been characterized by the contradictions emanating from Government benches. Some Government members have set out to prove that nothing is wrong with South Australia's economy, whereas others have said that the present recession is due to such-and-such. Some Government members have said nothing is wrong, whereas others have offered excuses. In fact, the member for Unley went so far as to say:

I am sure most people read last night the figures regarding the housing position in this State. Those figures, which I am sure are authentic, give an idea of the activity in building since the Labor Government came into power.

The honourable member then gave figures relating to the period 1961 to 1965, and in the same paragraph said:

I am sure there will be a revival in this industry.

I am sure that, by making that statement, something must have made the honourable member think that the building industry required an injection of activity. I think that the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) claimed that, because there was a deficit, we had not had so much unemployment. I hoped he would follow further the relationship between employment and the deficit. We started this year with a deficit of about \$8,000,000. I remind the House that the deficit in New South Wales was reported recently as being \$4,700,000, and the heading on the newspaper report was "Big deficit". I suppose that would be a deficit of \$1.33 a head of population, whereas we have a deficit of about \$8 a head to start this new financial year.

So far the Treasurer has refused to tell this side of the House where he is going to get the money to make up these funds. It is clearly certain that it will not come out of the air. I take it that the deficit will have to be funded. If that is not done, it will come from this year's allocations. What will happen at the end of next year if this Government extravagance continues? Will we double our deficit, making a grant total of \$16,000,000? What will happen regarding employment then? It can mean only one thing—that there must

be a curtailment of Government activity, and such a curtailment causes unemployment.

Unemployment is hitting hard, and it is not revealed fully in the unemployment figures. The position is brought home to me by the many people in my district who have heavy commitments. They have recently arrived in this country and have purchased houses and furniture. Many of them are existing on the additional money they get from overtime work. They balance their budgets by working overtime. However, overtime is disappearing and these people are finding it most difficult to meet their commitments. In the present recession, this is not recorded, but the loss of overtime earnings is important to tens of thousands of workers.

The member for Glenelg also made some peculiar remarks. He lauded T.A.B. and lotteries as being points of salvation from the financial troubles in which this Government has placed us, and I understand that T.A.B. is to be the biggest revenue producer of all these social matters we are considering. It is interesting to compare the total yield from racing in all States on a population basis, as set out in the 1965 report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. In 1963-64, before T.A.B. was in full operation in the Eastern States, the yield from each person in New South Wales was \$1.47. In Victoria it was \$2.92. I think T.A.B. would have been operating to a reasonable extent in that year. In Queensland the yield was \$1.85, in South Australia \$2.22, in Western Australia \$2.97, and in Tasmania \$2.34. The Commonwealth average was \$2.14.

South Australia, with \$2.22, returned more than the average of all States from the racing industry. Of course, we know that racing in this State is heavily taxed at present. If the winning bets tax is still to be applied to betting and a T.A.B. system is implemented, a tremendous burden will be placed on the racing industry. Whatever occurs in the negotiations between the Government and the racing interests, the remarks made by the member for Glenelg show that the Government intends to greatly increase its income from the racing industry.

No other inference can be drawn, and I wonder whether the racing industry has fully considered the implications of this intention in its negotiations with the Government on T.A.B. There is a danger signal to the Government here. There is a load on racing that the Government cannot exceed, and I doubt whether the extra income to help to make up this deficit

will be forthcoming in the way the member for Glenelg has suggested.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Racing figures are already falling.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and there may be a good reason for that. Apparently, we are to give the sport and the industry another push. The member for Glenelg also gave Harbors Board returns as one of the reasons why the deficit was more than was expected. However, I thought these returns would have been higher this year than last year. I do not know whether the Minister can correct that, but we have had increased wharfage fees.

Mr. McKee: You are on the wrong trail there.

Mr. HALL: It was also said that a return to South Australia of the additional \$5,500,000 petrol tax would enable us to do more. Is it not a fact that, in the Commonwealth Government's consideration, there is a relationship between its return to this State of road moneys and the amount of petrol tax collected in Australia?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: This State is receiving the total amount that the Commonwealth gets.

Mr. HALL: I take that advice from my Leader. I have not checked that, but I know we run very close because of our population and area relationship, which is taken into consideration in the disbursement of road funds. I understand that we are getting about the full return of petrol tax money, yet the member for Glenelg, in his economic wisdom, considers that there should be a return of an additional \$5,500,000. This thinking is not good enough for the person who was the self-styled economist of the Government during the election campaign. In this context I refer again to the policy speech delivered by the Premier at the last election. Although this has been referred to before, we should again refer to his words:

Ours is not a policy of extravagance. It is one of accuracy in budgeting.

How could we have such a deficit today if we had any degree of accuracy in budgeting?

Mr. Freebairn: The member for Glenelg was forecasting a gain of \$10,000,000 a year from the amalgamation of the two banks.

Mr. HALL: Of course, the member for Glenelg blames another place. I have not the figures of the amount the Government did not receive because of the actions of another place but in many instances the Government, although it may have considered that it got less than

it wanted, agreed to the amounts in conference between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. I say without fear of contradiction that the amount the Government wanted but did not get was nothing like \$8,000,000. Much of the deficit with which we are faced was caused by Government mismanagement and miscalculation.

Mr. Coumbe: It has nothing to do with the weather, has it?

Mr. HALL: As the member for Torrens says, we have had all sorts of reasons, such as the weather and a bad season. After all, the season was above average. Reason after reason has been given but none is correct in relation to budgeting and the estimation of Government receipts. There has been so much inefficiency in dealing with these matters that the Government is propped up only by the efficiency of the Public Service. It would be in tremendous difficulty if it were not for the people who assist it.

I listened with interest to the statement by the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) that he would like a passenger terminal at Outer Harbour in his district. I feel sorry for him because he is one of the few members on the Government side in whose district a major public work has not been proceeded with. Members on this side know what it feels like, and we sympathize with the honourable member. Many public works which had been started or investigated and recommended by the previous Government and which were in districts of members on this side have not been proceeded with. The Outer Harbour passenger terminal is another of the major works that has been deferred and ranks with Giles Point, the Keith and Kimba water schemes and so on. I shall not outline the monotonous list of discontinued works. I assure the honourable member that when my Party again occupies the Government benches he will have his terminal, but he is backing the wrong horse. I should hate to be accused of bribery, but if he places his confidence in us he may obtain the goods. I remember attending a weekend seminar on politics in Canberra some years ago that was addressed by some notable speakers from Australia and overseas.

Mr. Hughes: Did you get the message?

Mr. HALL: Yes. The subject was trade unions, and a prominent British trade unionist addressed the group. He was a Labor supporter, although he seemed to have much commonsense. He talked about the difficulties of a Socialist Government in Britain and said that, no matter where in the world a Socialist

Government was in power, it always faced the difficulty of the community's not having confidence in it.

Mr. Langley: That was clearly demonstrated.

Mr. HALL: Here was an eminent British trade unionist saying that one of the greatest difficulties in the United Kingdom was a lack of confidence in a Socialist Government. I believe that is the core of the problem in South Australia. People have learnt quickly that they cannot place their confidence in the new Government's administration.

Mr. McKee: What happened to the Liberal Government in 1965?

Mr. HALL: What does the public think of the Premier's present attitude to the tyre-petrol re-selling controversy? From remarks made by members opposite, we expect that any minute a Bill to fix a minimum price will be introduced into the House. What sort of confidence does this instil in the community? What confidence can we expect when we see the industries that do not come here week after week? All we hear is that nothing was done by the previous Government. Yet this week we have seen reference after reference, culminating in a supplement in the *News*, of the tremendous industrial growth that has taken place in South Australia. It is not by words that the Government will be known but by its deeds, which are not forthcoming. The public does not have confidence in the Government. Only when confidence is restored will we see the tempo of industrial growth we want to see.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to provide employment. Time after time we have heard the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) talk about South Australia as being the low wage State. I have asked wage earners in my district what they think about this. Many, who have lived in other States, have come back here and have said they are glad to earn a lower wage in South Australia because they believe they can live better here on that wage than on a higher wage in Sydney, for instance. Money goes farther in this State. I believe the member for Port Pirie is on the wrong track if he believes we will improve the State in comparison with other States by increasing our costs. How can he, as a responsible member of the Government, negotiate with industries in other States or overseas in an effort to have them come to his district if he wants to increase costs in South Australia? Will he tell the House at some time how he hopes to produce this miracle?

Mr. McKee: What are you talking about—low wages?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He is too busy disallowing things.

Mr. HALL: Yes, or recommending an alteration to them.

Mr. McKee: This State was known as the low wage State, under the Playford Government, for 30 years.

Mr. HALL: The Premier said he had no intention of putting a spanner in the works of migration, yet he deliberately attempted to do this very thing only a few months ago. Perhaps members recall the stipulation the Premier placed upon companies involved in an agreement with the migration authorities to bring migrants out from the United Kingdom. My district includes an area where a company has built a town to which the migration authorities approve nominated migrants being brought from the United Kingdom. The Premier deliberately set out to stop the private building of houses for these United Kingdom migrants.

Mr. McKee: Get your facts right.

Mr. HALL: I have them right. The conditions laid down by the Premier were impossible for building companies to meet, and I doubt whether 5 per cent of the houses built now under the scheme would have been completed if the Premier had maintained the restrictions. It was only in the face of violent criticism by the companies and by the public, which supported them, that the Premier finally was forced to withdraw his restrictions.

Mr. McKee: He did not withdraw all of them.

Mr. HALL: He may have left one or two but he withdrew the main ones.

Mr. McKee: You want to sack your adviser; he will get you into trouble.

Mr. HALL: There are two main factors in financing a house: the first and second mortgage and the bridging finance. As much as we may regret the high rates of interest charged on money lent as bridging finance, reducing these rates would simply result in no money being available. If the Premier could get the money out of his bag to replace the money needed for this bridging finance (which he was going to deny the building industry), he might have a case. The industry was simply denied this money without there being any alternative source of income.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Have you looked at the figures for migration in the last two years?

Mr. HALL: I am talking about the Premier's action about two months ago. He deliberately set out to break that portion of the migration system in South Australia.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I'll break anybody who tries to put me over the fence for 1 per cent for a month.

Mr. HALL: If the Premier was so right, why did he capitulate?

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I didn't capitulate.

Mr. HALL: Of course the Premier capitulated, and the teeth were drawn from that stipulation; and once again building is going on in that area.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I have never heard anything so stupid as this.

Mr. HALL: I do not think the Premier knew what he was doing. In fact this move, which in effect was an attempt to stop immigration, was ridiculous.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I am not responsible for your thinking.

Mr. HALL: Thank heavens for that. Regarding paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech, which contains the 28 words referred to as disposing of the subject of agriculture, I think this word "pursue" is the gem, because in policy and taxation measures last session the Government did indeed "pursue" agriculture in this State. I have never seen an industry pursued so closely and so hard for loot, and it was only through the efforts and attention given to this legislation by another place (which is now history) that we still have these industries without the penalties that were to be put on them by the present Government. I think the word "pursue" is most descriptive of the Socialist intention regarding agriculture and other primary industries.

It is interesting to go into the relationship between primary and secondary industries and their interdependence. This Government should realize that as the Government of a major primary-producing State in Australia it is responsible for part of our national export figures. Those are the figures which support industry in our country. The Institute of Public Affairs Review contains an interesting report on a Treasury paper issued recently, and the portion devoted to the relationship between industry and agriculture is well worth considering. It states:

Experience has served to expose the fallacies underlying the propositions of the advocates of self-sufficiency. During the 1950's the manufacturing industries, it is true, grew rapidly, even spectacularly. But so, too, did the economy's demand for imports. Thus, instead

of becoming less dependent on exports, we became more dependent. . . . By the end of the decade, it began to be clearly seen that if the economy were to continue on the path of rapid growth, we would have to devote our efforts to increasing exports rather than to the pursuit of the "will-of-the-wisp" of import replacement.

The article goes on to point out the tremendous increase in the total primary-producing exports in the last few years. In fact, in the last five years our exports of primary produce have increased by 60 per cent. In the same time, the total percentage gained in export income by the secondary industries has been only 15 per cent. I believe that never before in our history has secondary industry depended so much on the export income that is earned by our primary industry. As the Government of this State which is trying to provide extra employment for its immigrants and for its own increasing work force in secondary industry, it would well behove it to pay more attention to the vital portion of our community—the primary-producing industries. These 28 words in the Speech dealing with agriculture are indeed a slap in the face to our export income earners, and I trust that it is not an indication of the amount of effort or consideration that the Government gives to this vital sector of our community.

Much has been said about natural gas. I believe that there is not a lot to be said regarding the field or the pipeline that must eventually be able to bring this valuable source of fuel to the populated centres of this State. However, there are some interesting figures in a recent *Commonwealth Affairs Bulletin* which indicate a facet of the use of gas which I believe has not been stressed strongly in this debate, and that is the tremendous growth in demand for natural gas that takes place when it is available to industry. Forecasts are made in this publication of the increased usage of gas that will take place if the gas is available. Using Australia as a whole as a market for the gas, it is estimated that of the total market for fuel it could be 8.8 per cent in 1970, 16 per cent by 1980 and nearly 20 per cent by 1990. It is rather a sobering thought that the United States of America uses each year twice the total amount of gas that has been discovered on the Australian Continent. It uses 12 trillion cubic feet per annum, whereas so far our proved reserves in Australia are just over 5 trillion cubic feet. Therefore, the American yearly usage rate is equal to about five months' supply of gas in Australia.

Obviously, as our industries can obtain this gas they will want more and more of it, and if we are to be successful users of gas in Australia we will have to mount an ever-increasing campaign to discover more deposits. We cannot just rest on the fields at Gidgealpa, Moomba, Mereenie, and Palm Valley, the Gippsland find and the gas source near Roma: we will have to find more of this commodity. From reports that are now circulating since the Gippsland find, I believe we will probably find it on the continental shelf off our coast. I am somewhat alarmed by the attention given to this matter in today's newspaper by the Labor Party. It appears that we are to discourage private companies, if we have a Commonwealth Labor Government, from conducting searches for oil or gas in our country. I believe that if this is so and we are to have this matter taken over entirely by Governments, we will see a great slowing down of exploration activity.

Speaking of the continental shelf, which has come into the news recently because of gas strikes in Gippsland, it is interesting to learn that a recent United Nations decision (I understand) has given sovereignty to the States adjacent to the continental shelf, and it is only now being found that other things than oil or gas are to be discovered on that shelf. I understand that large deposits of manganese have been discovered off the coast of the United States of America. Also, I read recently that large deposits of nodules of phosphate have been found off one of the American States. We do not know just what mineral deposits lie off the coast of South Australia. I believe it is up to the Government to mount an increasing search for our natural resources, and one of the avenues for search would be the continental shelf. It is dismaying to learn that the small boat for research off our shores is tied up in port, and has been since the last election. I am not saying that this vessel has sufficient equipment and is large enough to undertake serious exploratory work on the continental shelf, but because it has not left port this indicates the Government's attitude to the important subject of exploration.

Although the Minister of Marine, in a reply to my question last year, said the Government intended to build a larger vessel (a project suggested by the previous Government), nothing has been done about this. I forecast that we will not see any reference in the Loan Estimates this year to building a new research vessel. It should be possible for the Commonwealth

Government and the States to work in conjunction to explore the continental shelf, and when the ownership of deposits of oil or other minerals is decided, it should be possible for them to share the cost of exploration proportionately to the ownership of the minerals that may be discovered. A matter that was of some consequence in this House last year was the appointment of a public relations officer in the Aboriginal Affairs Department. At that time some disquiet was apparent on this side of the House at this new departure, and concern was expressed about the salary to be paid and the duties of this officer. However, for some time after that no-one gave much thought to this appointment. The first time I thought of it since then was about two and a half months ago when I received a telephone call from an irate parent of a schoolchild in a town in my district.

The parent asked me what the Attorney-General was doing by putting propaganda in the hands of school children. I did not take much notice of this until the parent saw me and handed me a copy of a speech the Attorney-General had made some time after the last election. This parent told me that the child, in the sixth grade, had written to the Aboriginal Affairs Department asking for project material. The child had received the material, but included in it was a speech made by the Attorney-General, the first words of which were, "After the defeat in March of this year of the Playford Government . . ."

Mr. Hudson: Hear, hear!

Mr. HALL: Whatever the sentiments of the member for Glenelg may be, this taxpayer, voter and citizen was irate, and justly so, that her child had received such political material. The Attorney-General has always said that he would take the responsibility for his department and that we should not criticize his officers.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I wonder whether the Minister of Education gave permission?

Mr. HALL: I do not know. Last year a Minister refused permission for the Commonwealth Government to send to schools a pamphlet on its policy in Vietnam. However, in this instance, it was a direct communication between the department and a school child, and was not from the Government to school teachers. I am not questioning the contents of the speech, as the Attorney-General is able, and has the freedom and right in this community, to say anything he wishes, but the speech made

three small but objectionable political references. It commenced with, "After the defeat in March of this year of the Playford Government", and continued—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Do you suggest that you weren't defeated in March?

Mr. HALL: The Attorney-General may be adroit when handling his speeches, but he cannot sidetrack me that way.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am sorry if you are so upset.

Mr. HALL: Is the Attorney-General accepting the responsibility or blaming his public relations officer?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I'm not blaming anyone.

Mr. HALL: The speech continued:

However, the state of affairs is not satisfactory, but in 1962 under pressure from the Labor Party Opposition something was done. In this country the Attorney-General can express his opinion, but he should not put this material in the hands of schoolchildren.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And should not ask the taxpayer to pay for its distribution.

Mr. HALL: Obviously that is what has happened, as the taxpayer paid all the costs of distribution.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He won't pay any more; I can assure the Attorney-General of that.

Mr. HALL: Political references have obviously been included in this literature. The only inference is that it is a deliberate attempt to influence that child. Recently, a Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Allen Fairhall) held a meeting in Adelaide.

Mr. Hudson: Well organized!

Mr. Langley: Public, too.

Mr. HALL: The meeting was held to explain the Commonwealth Government's policy on Vietnam, and Mr. Fairhall was willing to answer questions.

Mr. Langley: You had to have a ticket to get in.

Mr. Freebairn: The member for Unley knows that a ticket was required for admittance.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Mr. Fairhall did not want to answer questions.

Mr. HALL: A responsible Commonwealth Government Minister was willing to face a crowd in the town hall, and explain the Commonwealth Government's policy.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And a completely select crowd at that.

Mr. HALL: This meeting was disrupted, to a large extent, in an organized way. How was this done? Tickets were issued so that the Minister could have a reasonable audience. I would not expect Government members to admit that the element that disrupted the meeting would be reasonable. Does the member for Glenelg think it was reasonable? Does the honourable member think it was fair to prevent the Minister from speaking? Perhaps Labor members may think it was fair. A system of tickets was used so that the audience could be counted. One of the main people seen in the foyer directing the disruptive element was the Attorney-General's public relations officer. He was there disrupting this meeting.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This is a lie. My public relations officer did not disrupt any meeting. The honourable member should not be allowed to make an unfair accusation against a public servant.

Mr. HALL: Let us say he was there.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is about time you stopped making accusations against public servants.

Mr. HALL: You have done this before.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If you think I am not telling the truth, why don't you stand me up about it?

Mr. HALL: I am willing to go along with the Attorney-General there. At least, his public relations officer was in the foyer.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why don't you withdraw your accusation? You are telling lies about members of the Public Service.

Mr. HALL: The Attorney-General must be reasonable; I have gone through the story briefly but have not finished yet.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why don't you object to what I am saying about your lies?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: This is a repetition of the town hall meeting.

Mr. Jennings: I hope it was more interesting than this.

Mr. HALL: It was interesting to go into the library one day and see that great journal of the Labor Party, the *Herald*. I read in the *Herald* that the Attorney-General's public relations officer is Chairman of the Young Labor Contingent in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: President.

Mrs. Byrne: And he is very capable, too.

Mr. HALL: I am sure he is capable. I wondered about this. There was a report, I think, in last week's *News*, headed "Aborigines—Concern of the Commonwealth Government". The report stated:

The Commonwealth should take over the responsibility of Australia's Aborigines, Mr. David Combe, Public Relations Officer of the Aboriginal Department, said here last night.

Again we have this man paid by the public advocating a change in public policy.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Supporting Mr. Wentworth, a member of your Party.

Mr. HALL: I am not concerned with Mr. Wentworth. I have not heard of and do not know his views on this. I am reading this as a South Australian citizen. Here is my taxation money going to a change in public policy advocated by an employee of the Attorney-General. This is the place for the Attorney-General to state his policy. The Attorney-General or his Leader, not his public relations officer, is responsible for policy. This is a ridiculous travesty of public responsibility. Yesterday we read of the appointment of another public relations officer and we find there is a nest of them in the Premier's Department. No-one would deny the Premier or the Leader of a Government the right to have assistance to do their jobs efficiently, but what would members opposite say if the Chairman or President of the Young Liberals had been employed by one of our Ministers and had gone around advocating a change in Government policy?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And they did, as you know perfectly well.

Mr. HALL: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There was a publicity officer for the Attorney-General in the previous Government.

Mr. HALL: That is utter nonsense; that argument does not stand up at all. The Attorney-General knows that. This man left the Attorney-General's office, went to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and is now with the Premier's Department. I do not know whether or not the Attorney-General has been presented with these protests by the public. Whether the protests of the public have been made or not I do not know; nor do I know whether the public protests have forced the Attorney-General to change the mode of operations of his public relations officer.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have not heard of any protests except from Liberal members.

Mr. HALL: Anyway, this man has now gone to the Premier's Department, but I do protest that a member of the Labor Party holding an official position and paid by the taxpayer should be so closely involved in political activities as he has been. If a member of the Public Service upheld the traditions of the Public Service, he would not be so involved.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You apparently were not here when Mr. "Tace" Hannan was Crown Solicitor!

Mr. HALL: I ask the Attorney-General to reconsider his past behaviour in this matter.

Mrs. BYRNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 7, at 2 p.m.