

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 27, 1967.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

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

QUESTIONS**CHOWILLA DAM.**

Mr. HALL: My question concerns the proposal to build the Chowilla dam, upon which South Australia will depend for much of its future water supply which will be so necessary for development. As a report in this morning's press states that this proposal will possibly not be discussed at the forthcoming Premiers' Conference in Canberra, can the Premier say whether he is confident that the other States will continue to support this proposal and whether that is the reason why he is not going to raise the matter at the Premiers' Conference?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. It is completely the other way around. The point is that, at the moment, the States represented on the River Murray Commission are committed to the proposal. No other State has listed the Chowilla dam proposal for discussion at the Premiers' Conference. I expect that there may be further discussions after a report by the commission has been compiled, but the report is not to hand at present. I do not know whether any other States will raise objections to a proposal to which they, along with us, have previously been committed. At present, the position stands as it has been. We are committed to the Chowilla dam proposal and I do not intend to invite objections from someone else. As matters stand, we have heard some off-stage rumblings from another State because of the increased cost of the proposal compared with the original estimate, but I repeat that no other Premier has listed this matter for discussion at the Premiers' Conference and I do not think I should encourage objections from other States if those objections are not to be raised otherwise. As things stand, we are going ahead with the proposal. I have not had any formal communication saying that any other State is objecting to the proposal being proceeded with.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree with the Government's attitude, but a statement attributed to the Premier of Victoria some time ago sounded like an objection, although he has not followed it up. The Premier has said the River Murray Commission is at present investigating certain matters and that, until a report is received from the commission, no further action by the Government is contemplated. Will the Premier say what matters the commission is currently considering, and whether they relate to the estimate of cost based on the tenders received? Further, do they relate to any possible alternative to the construction of Chowilla dam? This matter is most important, and the public should be told whether any possible alternatives to Chowilla (which we on this side might consider unacceptable) are being considered.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I prefer to have a specific report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Beaney) so that there will be no inaccuracies in my reply. I understand that the commission is looking at the increase in the estimated cost of Chowilla dam. Of course, this matter is of considerable importance to all States involved because the increase in estimates is so substantial that it will have a direct effect upon their Loan works for the next five years. I understand that the commission is also examining alterations to the Chowilla project to see whether costs can be saved in certain directions. It is examining alternative headwaters arrangements. As the honourable member will be aware, we have reports on alternative arrangements which show that none of them can be conceivably satisfactory, and this is the stand which the Government and the commission take. So far as I am aware, those are the immediate matters before the commission. I will, however, obtain a precise report from Mr. Beaney and let the honourable member have it next week.

CHURCH RATING.

Mr. CASEY: It has been brought to my notice that a church organization has paid to the appropriate council the full amount of rates applicable to the church property. Earlier last year an amendment to the legislation was introduced by this Government and passed by both Houses. That amendment gave an exemption from rating to property classified as a place of worship. However, because of an oversight on the part of clerks in certain councils, some church organizations have paid the full rates that would have been applicable but for the amendment. Will the Minister of Education

ascertain from the Minister of Local Government whether these local councils can make necessary adjustments so that the church organizations that have paid rates through error can claim rebates on their rates for next year, as I understand that the Act does not permit councils to give a cash rebate of money that has been overpaid?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague.

WIRABARA FOREST SCHOOL.

Mr. HEASLIP: About a week ago I asked the Minister of Education a question about the toilet system at the Wirrabara Forest school, which has needed attention since 1965, and the Minister said he would be pleased to take the matter up, treating it as urgent. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I examined the docket regarding this matter and decided that I should like to discuss it privately with the honourable member, because in a few years' time the attendance at this school will be reduced to about nine students and the cost of doing the work is about \$15,200. I want to discuss with him whether it would be more advisable for the parents concerned to send their children to a neighbouring school to which transport can be provided and at which educational facilities would be much better, in view of those circumstances.

Mr. HEASLIP: Seven or eight months ago, prior to the Christmas vacation, the Wirrabara Forest school was listed as one of those to be closed, but no action was taken and the school was re-opened after the holidays. I have received complaints from the school committee regarding the necessity for septic tanks. The Public Buildings Department has been advised that the public health authorities have condemned the present system. Having written to the Minister on May 3 regarding the matter, I have waited until now for an answer, yet he now asks me to take up the matter verbally with him. This matter is urgent because these children are being subjected to a health hazard and action should be taken immediately. Can the Minister say whether the department intends to keep the school open and provide facilities, or whether the school will be closed, thereby solving the problem?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It was only as a matter of courtesy and common sense that I thought I should discuss the matter with the honourable member instead of just saying that the school was going to be closed. The Gov-

ernment likes to consider the wishes of parents before closing a school in this way, and this is what I had in mind. I wanted to discuss all aspects of the question with the honourable member, because \$15,200 of public money would be involved in repairs to this school which, in two or three years, might only have nine pupils. If the honourable member was concerned about the proper running of our schools and the use of public money, he should be willing to enter into a proper discussion of this matter. I am prepared to discuss it with him from all aspects.

SEEDS.

Mr. RODDA: The all-important pasture industry in this State understandably demands a high standard of field selection, etc., and only seeds in clean bags will be received for cleaning. However, seeds in secondhand bags are received in the South-Eastern districts from other States and are cleaned in the plant that is used for our certified seed, over which so much trouble is taken. As this practice is exposing our industry to contamination, will the Minister of Agriculture take steps to obviate this ingress, which may upset the purity of our pasture seeds?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention. As the members for Victoria and Albert are aware, I am considerably interested in the small seeds industry in the South-East, and I should not like anything to happen to jeopardize it. I shall ascertain the true position and inform the honourable member later.

NUCLEAR POWER.

Mr. HURST: Recently, I read in the press a statement by the Chairman of the Electricity Trust concerning possible nuclear power stations in South Australia. As I am exceedingly interested in this form of power generation because of the augmenting of the water supply by the desalination of water, can the Minister of Works say whether the trust is considering this form of power generation?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member was good enough to indicate that he would ask this question, I have obtained the following report:

The Electricity Trust continually examines all possible methods of power generation to ensure that future development in South Australia can proceed as economically as possible. For many years, the trust has been keeping in close touch with developments in the field of nuclear power generation. During this period

considerable progress has been made in bringing costs into line with costs of production from conventional plant. However, most of the advances have applied to large plants in the range 500,000 to 1,000,000 kilowatts of electrical power per nuclear reactor. Several plants of this size are on order or under construction in the United States of America and the United Kingdom where very large power networks exist. Such plants could not be used in South Australia. Plants of a smaller size, which could be fitted into the South Australian power network, are not yet economical in comparison with conventional power production. Progress in producing an economical nuclear power plant in the range 150,000 to 300,000 kilowatts has been disappointingly slow, and it will be necessary to install non-nuclear power plant in this State at least until 1975.

The power system in South Australia will continue to grow and there will no doubt be further developments in nuclear generation. The trust may, therefore, find itself giving serious consideration to the installation of nuclear power in the late 1970's. It is, however, not possible to forecast accurately the trend of events, because further improvements in conventional power production are also possible. Such improvements may well delay the advent of economic nuclear power in the future as they have done in the past. The trust will continue to keep itself informed of new developments, and will maintain a flexible programme in order to take advantage of any economic improvements that may arise either in the nuclear field or in other forms of generation.

EGGS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of moves to limit the production of eggs by means of licensing producers? If he is, will he say what is the Government's attitude to such control?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: From information I have received, I understand that this matter was discussed at a conference held recently at Surfers Paradise, at which it was resolved by the delegates present to approach the Commonwealth Government concerning some form of licensing. As I have as yet received no approach on the matter, I cannot say what the Government's attitude would be. I have merely received verbal information which I am not accepting at this stage until a definite proposition is forthcoming for consideration. I understand that the matter is being considered by the Department of Primary Industry, but the department has not yet forwarded me any information.

KINGSTON BRIDGE.

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Lands obtain a report from the Minister of Roads on progress toward planning the bridge at

Kingston on the Murray River? Will he ascertain when tenders are expected to be called for this work, and when construction is expected to begin?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Premier say whether Cabinet has reached any conclusions about helping farmers suffering from the effects of the prolonged dry weather? Can he say whether employment on Government works will be provided for farmers or what other form the assistance will take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Cabinet has considered the matter. I am sorry I have not had time (the final consideration was given to the matter this morning) to write to the honourable member in reply to the letter he sent me. Cabinet believes that, regarding specific assistance through banks and pastoral companies, in most cases sufficient provision is already being made in relation to farmers in difficulties. Where there is any difficulty at all, I should be grateful if the honourable member would refer such cases to me, as he has done in numbers of cases so far. In every case so far sufficient provision has been made either by the farmer's own bank or by the pastoral company concerned. It is not intended that a specific sum be made available by the State Bank. That bank, naturally enough, will look after its own clients. Where assistance is needed, we are certainly prepared, at a Government level, to make representations to the people who have been carrying the farmer concerned or are involved with him in some way. I am prepared to accede to the honourable member's request in his letter that I send a letter to all the banks concerned asking for their assistance in this matter. We have considered the provision of extra work in the area but, at the moment, some people have steady contracts with the Highways Department and it is not possible to replace them with work by farmers on highways projects. If that were done, we would simply create unemployment in another area. In fact, the work available from the Highways Department takes up all the work that can be provided for people who have relied on Highways Department contracts previously: no spare capacity exists to allot this kind of work to other people. If the honourable member will let us have any particular case (or if he will inform his constituents that, if they are facing difficulty, they should let us have the details), representations will certainly be made by the Government

to see what assistance can be obtained through their particular banking institutions. If they are in difficulties about meeting their obligations to the Minister of Lands, he will consider postponing rental payments in order to tide them over the difficulty.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That is for individuals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is not intended to provide an acreage bounty which, at this stage of proceedings, would involve payment to people on an acreage basis which, in many cases, would not be a worthwhile project: some people who did not need relief would get it. At the moment, as far as we can see, everybody who faces individual difficulty has been coped with. If the honourable member will publicize that fact among primary producers and say that we will make representations in any case where difficulty arises, I believe that, at present at any rate, we shall be able to tide them over. If the drought gets worse, then naturally enough the matter will have to be further considered.

NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: In reply to a question I asked on March 22 last, the Minister of Education said that plans for a new type of solid construction building for the Nuriootpa High School were virtually completed and that, on completion, they could be inspected by the Nuriootpa High School Council. Can the Minister say whether these plans have now been completed and, if they have, whether they can be made available for the school council to inspect?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will ascertain that information for the honourable member and let him know as soon as I have a report.

INSURANCE.

Mr. BURDON: Recently, one of my constituents approached me about comprehensive insurance on his motor car. Apparently he was receiving a substantial bonus on his premium as an accident-free driver. However, when the registration on his vehicle expired, he did not renew it for several months. When he did so, he was informed that he would have to pay the full premium because he had broken the continuity of his policy and this nullified his bonus claim. Can the Premier say whether that is normal practice and whether it is permitted? If it is permitted, will the Premier raise this matter with the insurance companies with a

view to having such breaks in the registration of a vehicle regarded as not affecting the continuity of a policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know which insurance company was involved in this case. In South Australia, three groups of insurance companies undertake comprehensive insurance: the Fire and Accident Underwriters Association of South Australia, the non-tariff group, and some companies that are not members of either group. Just how far I can get agreement between these companies on their attitudes to comprehensive policies is difficult to say at the moment. If the honourable member will let me have the details of the case involved, I will have it taken up with the particular insurance company. If the company is a member of Fire and Accident Underwriters Association or the non-tariff association, I will see whether the group will agree to the proposition that the honourable member has put forward. At present, in respect of comprehensive insurance for motor vehicles in South Australia, widely differing attitudes are held and premium rates and policies are offered by the various groups and companies. I frankly think that the only way in which we shall be able to reduce this to a system comparable with the system existing in some other States is by the competition of a Government insurance office.

PUBLIC RELIEF.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises out of an article that appeared on page 1 of the *Sunday Mail* last Saturday concerning the unsatisfactory level of relief payments in this State, and out of the item that appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser* in which both the Premier and the Minister of Social Welfare commented on, and defended, the present arrangements in South Australia. On May 30 last I received a copy of a letter dated May 29 addressed to the present Premier (then the Minister of Social Welfare) by Miss Shirley D. Lean. That letter comprised two typed pages and I do not think it necessary to read the whole letter, although I desire to read two paragraphs in order to make my question clear. The first paragraph to which I refer states:

From contact with families in receipt of Commonwealth widow pensions, it has now become apparent that their position in regard to relief payments is worse than it was in October, 1964. By virtue of the fact that the relief scale has not changed since the end of 1964, the subsequent increases to the Commonwealth widow pension, namely, an additional \$1 per week to rent supplementary in October,

1965, and the \$1 per week increase to the pension in October, 1966, now place widow pensioners outside State relief scales.

The rest of the letter in effect amplifies that paragraph, and the final paragraph states:

I should like, therefore, to inquire whether my above impressions are correct and whether it is the intention of the Government, during the term of the current Parliament, to at least rectify some of the disadvantages which seem to have arisen for the pensioner families of this State, by virtue of the fact that the relief scales have not been changed since this Government took office.

On receiving the copy of the letter, I wrote to the honourable gentleman and asked that he or his successor, whoever that might be (it was not known at that time), should send me a copy of the reply to Miss Lean's letter. As I had not received a copy of a reply, I spoke to Miss Lean this morning, and she has not received a reply from either the Premier or his successor in office, the Minister of Social Welfare, although the latter Minister has no other portfolio with which to deal.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is getting on to comment.

Mr. Ryan: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As this matter deals with something that is obviously a matter of justice—

Mr. Ryan: Question!

Mr. Burdon: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Premier whether he is prepared to answer the question asked in the final paragraph of the letter and say whether the State Government, irrespective of assistance from the Commonwealth Government, will do something about this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should have thought that the honourable member, from answers given in this House, and Miss Lean, from answers that have been published over a considerable period, would have been aware that the whole matter of public relief allowances in South Australia had been referred to the Social Welfare Advisory Council.

Mr. Millhouse: And in the meantime, people suffer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, this Government has been considerably more generous than the previous Government in the public relief area.

Mr. McKee: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am prepared to give the member for Mitcham some information about this. For many years during the term of the previous Government the allowable income standard under the public relief

scale did not alter, regardless of any increases in Commonwealth benefits. In other words, whenever there was an increase in Commonwealth benefits (and this happened many times during the term of the previous Government) the allowable income under the public relief scale did not change.

Mr. Millhouse: That is not correct.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is correct.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In this case, anyone receiving public relief benefits from the State of South Australia, upon an increase being made in Commonwealth pension, did not suffer any decrease whatever in State public relief payments.

Mr. McKee: They did under the previous Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be no discussion during a Ministerial reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Those people who, at the time of the last increase in Commonwealth pension, were receiving public relief benefits in South Australia had those benefits continued. There was no decrease in the benefits paid to those people from public relief in South Australia. In the meantime, we have asked that the whole of the public relief system be revised urgently and the Social Welfare Advisory Council has had this matter before it since it was appointed. It has made a series of investigations of public relief systems under Liberal Governments in other States as well as of our system, and not only are public relief payments in some other States shockingly poor, but in some cases they are almost non-existent. Not only have we increased public relief payments in South Australia as a result of our refusal to reduce payments made to those receiving relief at the time of an increase in Commonwealth pension, but we have also altered the means test by refusing to demand of people seeking public relief that they be virtually destitute before they can obtain relief.

Mr. McKee: They could not have a television set previously.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not required of people who apply for public relief that they divest themselves of assets before they obtain relief. In consequence, the amount of public relief paid in South Australia has been considerable and the honourable member's Leader has criticized me about the amount spent by the department, referring to me as a Minister who was throwing money around like a drunken sailor. The Government intends to revise the whole public relief scale

during the life of this Parliament and we have asked that the Social Welfare Advisory Council urgently complete its investigations and make its recommendations so that we shall be able to do that, but I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that, in order to do that, we shall need increases in revenue, and those have been denied to us so far by his colleagues elsewhere.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I express regret that the Minister of Social Welfare did not see fit to answer the letter—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I have repeatedly asked the honourable member not to comment when asking questions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I put it as part of the explanation, Sir. In view of the answer given to my previous question by the Premier, I ask the Minister of Social Welfare whether or not, up to October, 1964, class A widow pensioners were entitled to supplementary relief in this State. Further, can the honourable gentleman inform the House whether class A widow pensioners are still eligible for relief from the State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain the necessary information, but I remind the honourable member that the size of the family enters into this matter.

MILLBROOK SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the sale of part of the Millbrook Primary School property?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Following representations by the honourable member, I have decided that the proposed sale of part of the Millbrook school property shall be temporarily withheld pending the obtaining of further information on the proposed re-alignment of the road and its effects on the school property, because this was a new factor, and the re-siting of the bus shelter. The school committee will be asked to submit any plans it may have for the use of this land to the Education Department.

STRATA TITLES.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that more than 1,000 home units cannot be sold in South Australia at present, and I think that the main reason for this is the lack of strata title legislation. Only today I had an inquiry from a person from New South Wales who wanted to buy a home unit but could not do so, because of this problem. Can the Premier say whether the strata title legislation will be

introduced early in the session? If that is not intended at present, can the legislation be introduced soon?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect that it will be introduced early in the session. The Parliamentary Draftsman has been working on this matter for a long time and there are many difficulties in respect of legislation in other States. In fact, some of the provisions in that legislation are plainly unworkable and, luckily, some of those matters, particularly those in relation to insurance, have not been raised. However, the Bill is expected to be drafted shortly and to be introduced early in the session. It is desirable from all points of view that the legislation should be on the Statute Book soon.

LIBRARIES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education an answer to my recent question concerning the opening of free lending libraries in the city and in the country on Sunday afternoons?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The sections of the State Library open to the public on Sundays are the Reference Library (including the newspaper reading room and the periodicals room), Youth Lending Service, and Children's Library. As the Adelaide Lending Service is not open, books from the Reference Library may not be borrowed at this time. Until sufficient funds are provided for additional staff, it will not be possible to introduce Sunday opening of the Adelaide Lending Service.

The opening hours of local public libraries are entirely in the hands of the councils controlling them. As the majority of borrowers from such libraries are local residents, on the whole, they have access to the library during normal weekday periods and Saturday mornings. The hours normally extend to 8 p.m. on at least two week nights. The response to the opening of the Youth Lending Service and the Children's Library in the State Library comes largely from those families who find it difficult to pay a visit from the outer suburbs during the week. Even if they can, easy parking facilities are not available to them. In local public libraries, parking facilities are normally available.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Education an answer to the question I asked last week concerning the number of staff in the new central cataloguing and processing service for school libraries?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: At present the Supervisor of School Libraries has a staff of five. The number of additional people likely

to be required when a central cataloguing and processing service for school libraries is established is being considered, but no decision has been made on this matter yet.

SOUTH-EAST IRRIGATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The irrigation basin of Keppoch-Padthaway is fed by the Morambro Creek, which rises in Victoria. As, in dry years such as this, no water enters that basin, concern has been expressed that more should be known of this basin before irrigation is extended. A letter I have received from the Secretary of the Padthaway Progress Association states:

I should like to ask you to make a request to the Minister of Mines for a full investigation into whether or not the continuous pumping of underground waters around Padthaway is in any way affecting ground water levels in the hundreds of Willalooka and Petherick, and also into the origin of our underground water, its changes of salinity, and the water level, etc. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister of Mines to have the water potential capacity of this area fully investigated?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

WILLALO SCHOOL.

Mr. QUIRKE: During the Supplementary Estimates I asked the Minister of Education a question concerning lighting in small country schools generally but omitted the name of the school I had in mind. The school is at Willalo. Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question, and can he say when this installation will be made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: When a reliable source of electric power (particularly an Electricity Trust of South Australia supply) becomes available in country areas, it is the practice of the department to provide a supply to schools. However, should it appear that a school will close because of low attendance or consolidation, then a supply would not be provided. Although the honourable member did not name any school it was assumed that he was thinking of Willalo. On the information then available, the head teacher of this school was advised in February that electricity would not be connected. Latest information indicates that the present enrolment of 21 will be maintained, and there is little possibility of consolidation. In view of these facts, the Education Department now intends to proceed with the supply of electric power to the school. I shall obtain information for the honourable member in answer to the latter part of the question.

HIGHWAYS BUILDING.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last Thursday about the cost of the new Highways building, the number of officers to be accommodated, the date of completion, and what funds would be diverted from the road-building programme to be used for this building?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Roads reports that a contract has been let for the construction of an additional wing to the Highways building at a cost of \$1,762,324, including 10 per cent for contingencies. About 400 officers will be accommodated in the new wing, and the expected time for completion is May, 1969. A total of \$1,762,324 of the Highways Fund will be used to construct the building, and payments will be spread over three financial years.

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Premier say how many drilling plants are now operating on the Moomba gas field; how many holes are required to be drilled on that field; what is the estimate of gas available from it; and when will the estimate be available to this House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No rigs are drilling on the Moomba field at present. Mines Department estimates are that Moomba plus Gidgealpa fields contain 630 billion cubic feet of proven gas reserves, which can provide sufficient deliverable gas over 20 years for stage 1 of the gas pipeline project, which comprises an 18in. line with one compressor station.

Moomba No. 5 well is about eight miles north of the original discovery well, and is being treated separately at present. Consequently, only a nominal 10 billion cubic feet of proven gas has been credited to this well, although the potential of this northern area greatly exceeds this figure. Further productive wells in this area are necessary before reliable assessment of gas reserves can be made. I shall obtain further information from the Minister of Mines concerning the other matters raised by the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I heard correctly, the Premier said that the reserves of Gidgealpa and Moomba now total 630 billion cubic feet of gas. I understand that the Gidgealpa field has 500 billion cubic feet, meaning that the Moomba field is now estimated to have only 130 billion cubic feet which, of course, is much less than the figure

quoted some time ago. Also, can the Premier say when building is expected to commence again on the Moomba field? Can he give any reason for the hold-up in the essential drilling that would enable this important pipeline to be established?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier say when work is expected to commence on the Gidgealpa pipeline?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not possible to make an announcement concerning this matter. Certain preliminary arrangements have not yet been completed between the company and its customers. As soon as those matters have been resolved, some firm dates can be obtained.

CONTROL OF WATERS.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that Lake Alexandrina and the Lower Murray are to be brought under the Control of Waters Act. As some people are contemplating plantings and using lake water in the intervening months, I ask the Minister of Works whether, if they start their schemes, they will be entitled to water when the Act operates.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: There have been many rumours, but nothing definite has been decided as yet.

REMARK SEEPAGE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer to a news item to the effect that an evaporation pond is to be built at Renmark for the seepage waters from the Renmark irrigation settlement. It appears that this problem should receive the fairly urgent consideration of this House because of the dangers involved if one of the seepage evaporation ponds became insecure (I believe one did burst at Renmark last year, causing considerable deterioration in the quality of the water). Because of the risk involved if one of these evaporation ponds fed its water back into the river to all the settlements below Renmark, has the Government had engineers examining the implications of this new work? If it has not had this proposition carefully assessed, will the Government, as a matter of urgency, take up the whole question of evaporation of seepage waters to see that the deterioration of the river is not permitted to the detriment of settlers who may be below the point where the pond is established?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The departmental engineers have carefully considered this and have indicated to me that they are confident the proposed evaporation pond will be established with the greatest degree of safety. However, I agree with the honourable member that this matter is of vital interest to everyone, particularly those in the Upper Murray, and I shall obtain a full report for the House and let the honourable member know when it is available.

FRUIT FLY.

Mr. COUMBE: Last year when the fruit fly outbreak occurred, a large part of the city of Prospect was in the proclaimed area. As I have received several approaches on this matter, can the Minister of Agriculture now inform the House how much longer the weekly visits of departmental officers will continue to be paid to householders for spraying and investigating fruit trees, because now that it is autumn most of the vegetation has been removed from the trees naturally?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will investigate the matter and let the honourable member have a report.

HOSPITAL FEES.

Mr. HALL: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked during the debate on the Supplementary Estimates concerning hospital fees that were increased by the Government last year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government expects that the increases in hospital fees, operative from April 1, 1967, will yield additional revenues of about \$600,000 in a full year. The effect in 1966-67 will be small, probably approaching \$100,000, or two months' cash collections.

PINE PLANTINGS.

Mr. RODDA: As it is intended to plant out about 6,000 acres of pine this year, can the Minister of Forests say what effect the present dry spell is likely to have on planting, whether it will interfere with this year's programme and, if it will, whether steps will be taken to plant next year, in addition to the normal 6,000 acres, whatever is missed out this year?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Naturally, we are concerned about the dry weather and are hoping for rain before the time for planting expires. This matter is being carefully watched; I assure the honourable member that we are anxious to see that as much planting as possible takes place, because we receive some

assistance from the Commonwealth Government in this regard by way of a loan according to what is planted over a certain figure. It is therefore in our own interests that we have as many plantings as possible. Although we expect to be able to plant this year, I cannot say what may happen next year if this year's plantings are reduced. I assure the honourable member that we are keen to see that planting commences as soon as possible.

SWAN REACH SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Education received a report from officers of his department about the improvements necessary for the Swan Reach school? If he has, can he say whether and by what date those improvements are likely to be effected, or whether it has been decided to remove the school to a site on higher land?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain for the honourable member a report on those questions and let him have it as soon as possible.

SILVERTON TRAMWAY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked concerning payments to the Railways Department by the Silvertown Tramway Company, when I pointed out that such large payments could considerably distort the State Treasury's accounts according to whether they came to credit in June or July?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is correct as to the period and manner of payment by the Silvertown Tramway Company of the South Australian proportion of barrier ore freight revenues. The amount is payable at the end of each month and, though it is occasionally received in time for banking before the month's accounts are closed, I am informed that this has not occurred in the month of June for many years. Accordingly the payment on account of June 1966 is in fact included in the current 1966-67 accounts comparably with what has happened for the previous years. There is no reason to anticipate that the situation will be different in June, 1967, so there is every expectation the current accounts will include 12 monthly payments, and not be distorted by including 11 or 13 payments.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works furnish me with a progress report on the Highbury and Hope Valley sewerage scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Work was commenced in September, 1966, with the laying of a short section of the 9in. approach sewer in Willowbank Road as far as the intersection with Valiant Road. This was laid at the time to serve a South Australian Housing Trust area and a school to the north. In February, 1967, work was resumed on the approach sewer to extend it to Lyons Road which was done in order to avoid working in swampy ground during the coming winter and also at the request of the landowner.

A short section of rising main was laid in Reservoir Road ahead of road construction by the Highways and Local Government Department. Following completion of the southern portion of the scheme, work will proceed on the approach sewer from the Dry Creek Valley trunk sewer at Kelly Road for the northern section including the Hope Valley Primary School. Work on the scheme should be completed during the 1968-69 financial year.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads obtain information on progress of the reconstruction of the Morphett Street and Victoria bridges, which work is being undertaken by the Adelaide City Council? As it seems that that work is now ahead of schedule, will the Minister also ascertain for me the new projected date of completion of the bridge, as well as information concerning when the new road ascending Montefiore Hill towards the site of the proposed festival hall is likely to be completed and when it is expected that the temporary detour road will be abandoned?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

KATARAPTOKO ISLAND.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Lands indicate the date of the proposed proclamation of a national park at Kataraptoko Island?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, although the matter has been under consideration. As the honourable member knows, several lessees are involved in the matter. I have had representatives of the Commissioners of the National Park and Wild Life Reserves investigate the area, and they have reported to me on the suitability of it as a national park. Representatives of the Field and Game Association also want to see me about the establishment of a shooting reserve in the area. I have not yet discussed the matter finally with the lessees. When all these matters have been

dealt with, I shall be able to let the honourable member know whether it is intended to proclaim Kataraptko Island as a national park and, if it is, when it will be proclaimed.

STATE'S FINANCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Tonight the Treasurer is off to the Loan Council and the Premiers' Conference. I take it from this, and also from the assents to Bills passed already this session, that a decision has been taken as to the items to be transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account. Therefore, can the Treasurer say what items of expenditure will now be met out of Loan and not out of Revenue, and how much they amount to?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can tell the honourable member that decisions have, for the most part, been made on this matter. However, as I am not going to quote items or figures off the cuff, I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it intended to debit against the Loan Account, instead of against the Revenue Account, any amounts of money already paid out of General Revenue by the Government?

2. Were such amounts included in warrants prepared and executed, pursuant to section 32g of the Public Finance Act, 1936-1964?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. All disbursements are made out of cash in the hands of the Treasurer held in one composite account at the Reserve Bank. Some of the disbursements for non-Government hospital building grants have been recorded in the first instance as being a debit to Consolidated Revenue Account, and it is intended that these be now recouped to that account using authority for Loan Expenditure for that purpose. The accounts for 1966-67, of course, have not yet been finalized and presented.

2. The warrants prepared and executed pursuant to section 32g of the Public Finance Act, to authorize disbursements out of the public revenue, provide for monthly release of funds in very broad groups, it being impracticable and undesirable to specify each individual line of possible expenditure. These warrants did, in fact, provide for release of adequate funds to meet these particular amounts as well as other expenditures which have been authorized from Consolidated Revenue Account. A warrant for release of adequate funds from Loan Account to recoup these particular disbursements has now been

prepared and executed, and the further recouping disbursement will shortly be made in accordance with authorities given by the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1966.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week I twice asked the Premier about tenders for the supply of spectacles for pensioner patients at Government hospitals. On Thursday the honourable gentleman undertook to get me an answer to this question as a matter of urgency. Can he give that answer now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not yet to hand, but I will send a message about it to the Minister of Health.

BORDERTOWN RAILWAY YARDS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: At the end of last session I asked for a report about when it was expected that stage 3 of the work on the railway yards at Bordertown would be completed. I was told that it would be a physical impossibility to do the work during the coming financial year. Can the Minister of Social Welfare, representing the Minister of Transport, say what is the estimated cost of the work and why it would be a physical impossibility to carry it out during the coming financial year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report from my colleague and let the honourable member know when it is to hand.

CARAVANS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On May 18 last I wrote a letter to the then Premier regarding the advantage that is given to local manufacturers in tendering for the supply of caravans in this State. The letter was typed, but the typiste whom I got to type it for me used capital letters for some nouns in the letter. Before sending it off, I altered these in ink to smaller letters. I received it back with a reply from the then Premier, dated May 22, which states:

Dear Mr. Millhouse,
I decline to accept the enclosed. There are competent stenographers on the staff at Parliament House.

Yours faithfully,
Frank Walsh (Premier).

Now that there has been a change of Premier, and as pettiness is not one of the weaknesses of character of the present Premier, can he say whether he will accept that letter if I tender it to him?

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier desire to reply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether I should reply to one who professes to have no pettiness and then proceeds to announce it. If the honourable member will send me the letter, I shall look at it.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:
ANNUAL LEAVE.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to a question asked by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) last week, I gave some figures to the House in relation to the additional week's leave. However, as I am afraid I may have misled the honourable member and the House on this matter, I wish to make the position clear at the earliest possible opportunity. The figures I quoted at the time were based on the calculation of an increase of one in 45 for all Government employees which would have accounted for \$2,600,000 a year. In fact, on the basis of the Government's announced proposal, however, it would exclude teachers, police officers and certain other categories and confine the additional week's leave, as far as public servants were concerned, to only an extra two working days, where public servants are already in receipt of three grace days at Christmas.

Mr. Millhouse: What proportion receive three days at Christmas?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A considerable number. Then, the actual cost to the Government in a full year is decidedly less on the proposal as announced, and the actual figure next year will be considerably reduced from the figure I gave to the honourable member. In fact, on the basis of an increase of one in 45 in the categories that receive the week's annual leave and the proportionate cost assigned to those who receive two extra working days, the cost for a full year would be a maximum of \$1,750,000. However, it is expected that the actual cost will be substantially less because, as I explained to the honourable member last week, it is based simply on the calculation of an increase of one in 45 in the service where this is applicable but in many branches of the service, in fact, an increase of one in 45 will not be necessary, and the extra week's leave will be taken without an actual increase in the number of members in staff. Therefore, it is expected that the figure will be decidedly less than the maximum I have quoted. During the

next financial year when only pro rata leave will be available to a certain number of public servants, the actual cost to the Government will be much less than half the \$1,750,000.

Questions resumed:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was particularly interested in the statement which the honourable gentleman has made and in which he changed the estimate—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I merely said I was interested. I refer to the statement made in which the Premier changed the original estimate of the cost to the Government of the leave which it is intended to grant. As the Premier found it necessary to alter the estimate he gave in the House on Thursday, will he say whether the figures of the cost that would be involved were before Cabinet when it decided on this matter, as I presume Cabinet did?

Mr. Shannon: Who told you Cabinet made a decision?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask whether Cabinet did make a decision on the matter and whether or not the decision was made without any estimate of the cost being before the members of Cabinet.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Cabinet had several meetings at which this matter was considered. Full estimates of cost were before Cabinet on each of those occasions.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should be obliged if the Premier could supply fairly urgently details on how much of the \$1,750,000 will be spent on additional employment and on how much of the sum will be spent on overtime worked by officers already in the employ of the Government who, as a consequence of the additional leave being granted, will have to work additional hours to enable other officers to be absent on annual leave. Can the Premier supply a dissection of the \$1,750,000 in terms of new employment as against overtime?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has asked for these figures, but I am afraid that they are not obtainable. It is not possible at the moment for the Public Service Commissioner to give an accurate estimate in this area. As soon as the position is clear, I will try to provide the honourable member with the information.

E. & W. S. DEPARTMENT.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (on notice):

1. What was the number of daily-paid employees in the Engineering and Water Supply Department at the end of each of the months of March, April and May, 1967?

2. What number was similarly employed at the end of May, 1965, and May, 1966, respectively?

3. What was the total expenditure to May 31, 1967, by the department, on Loan programme works and works provided for by Budget votes (maintenance, etc.), respectively, in this financial year?

4. What was the corresponding expenditure for the same period in the financial years 1964-65 and 1965-66 respectively?

5. What was the total amount of water pumped, and the cost in each case, through—

(a) the Morgan-Whyalla main scheme; and

(b) the Mannum-Adelaide main scheme for each of the financial years 1959-60, 1964-65, 1965-66 and 1966-67 to May 31, 1967?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In reply to the honourable member's question, I have a schedule and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

E. & W. S. WORKS.

	E. & W.S. Works.	R.M.C. Works.	Total.
1. March, 1967	4,540	41	4,581
April, 1967	4,528	42	4,570
May, 1967	4,570	44	4,614
2. May, 1965	4,440	38	4,478
May, 1966	4,409	43	4,452

3. Expenditure:

	Loan. \$	Vote. \$
May 31, 1967	20,926,100	10,288,100
4. May 31, 1965	25,664,600	8,402,778
May 31, 1966	24,211,900	9,996,500

5. Water pumped:

(a) Morgan-Whyalla

	Quantity. Gallons.	Total cost. \$
1959-60	2,590,753,000	881,386
1964-65	4,223,257,000	1,568,406
1965-66	4,501,618,000	1,891,447
1966-67 to May 31, 1967	4,663,600,000	Not available

(b) Mannum-Adelaide

	Quantity. Gallons.	Total cost. \$
1959-60	14,975,000,000	2,138,242
1964-65	4,955,000,000	1,413,314
1965-66	15,385,000,000	2,185,905
1966-67 to May 31, 1967	9,344,500,000	Not available

COUNTY BUXTON.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (on notice): What quantity of water is held in each Government tank in County Buxton?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This answer also contains a list of figures, and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I object, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The following are the quantities of water held in each Government tank in County Buxton as at June 23, 1967:

Tank.	Gallons.
Barna	Nil
Moongi	581,000
Caralue	498,000
Cortlincye	166,000
Pilepudla	530,000
Curtinye	193,000
Malgra	392,000
Wilka	Nil
Mootra	Nil
Pinkawillinie	609,000
Bascombe Rocks	Nil
Tola Nos. 1 and 2	Nil
Lacroma	184,000
Atora Nos. 1 and 2	442,000
Yalanda	221,000

Total 3,816,000

Rooru (which is all carted water) 464,000

COUNCIL FRANCHISE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many Legislative Council enrolment cards have been sent out since the beginning of May, 1967?

2. How many completed cards have been returned?

3. Is any check to be made of the qualifications of those who have thereby applied for enrolment, before their names are added to the Legislative Council electoral roll?

4. If so, what checks are to be made, and when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of Legislative Council enrolment cards posted to electors from the State Electoral Department since the beginning of May, 1967, was 252,112. These cards were all posted on May 24, 1967, in connection with the current exercise. For further information it is advised that in two months (between February 23, 1967, and April 20, 1967), the number of claims posted by the State Electoral Department to electors who had purchased property was 10,998.

2. The number of cards returned to the State Electoral Department since May 24 now stands at 78,700. Of this number about 4,500 are incomplete in respect to signature or witness.

3. A check is to be made of the qualifications of those who thereby claimed enrolment before their names are added to the Legislative Council electoral roll.

4. All the normal checks which apply on receipt of a Legislative Council claim will be made. Checking has already commenced and will be carried on until each and every one of the claims have been determined for eligibility. Section 36 of the Electoral Act, 1934-1965, provides:

36. (1) Every person claiming enrolment or transfer of enrolment shall supply the Returning Officer for the State in the case of a claim for enrolment on the Council roll, and the registrar in the case of a claim for enrolment on the Assembly roll, with any evidence in support of his claim which that officer demands.

(2) If the evidence so demanded is not furnished the name of the claimant shall not be entered on the roll or transferred, as the case may be.

This avenue of direct inquiry from electors will be followed in many cases. In addition, computer techniques will be used: (1) to assist in deciding those dwellinghouses where more than one elector has claimed to be the inhabitant occupier; (2) to print the names of all persons enrolled or claiming enrolment at each dwellinghouse.

HOUSING TRUST.

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. How many Housing Trust houses and flats are vacant at present?

2. How many of these are of the rental type?

3. How many are of the purchase type?

4. In which main districts are these empty houses situated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 517.

2. 33.

3. 254 plus 230 rental purchase.

4. Smithfield Plains and Elizabeth.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has an estimate been made of the cost to the Government of establishing a State Government Insurance Office?

2. If so, by whom has the estimate been made?

3. What is this estimate?

4. How was it calculated?

5. If no estimate has been made, when is it intended to make one?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2 to 4. See No. 1.

5. When the proposed commission is constituted.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (on notice): What is the estimated completion date for the connecting of electricity to farms on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The trust's programme for extension on Kangaroo Island covers the various hundreds in the following order:

Menzies.

Dudley.

MacGillivray-Haines.

Cassini-Duncan.

Seddon-Newlands.

Gosse-Borda.

Ritchie-MacDonald.

The work will extend over a number of years, depending on the resources available to the trust and the programme of work in other parts of the State. Work will commence in the hundred of Menzies in the financial year 1967-68, but it is not possible at this stage to indicate a final completion date.

LOAN EXPENDITURE.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (on notice): What was the net loan expenditure by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for each of the financial years 1964-65, 1965-66, and 1966-67, under each of the following headings:

(a) Metropolitan water works;

(b) All other water works in South Australia;

(c) Metropolitan sewerage works;

(d) Country sewerage works; and

(e) The Engineering and Water Supply Department as a whole?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The answer is as follows:

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT.
NET LOAN EXPENDITURE, 1964-1965 TO 1966-1967.

	Metropolitan water- works.	Other water works.	Metropolitan Sewerage.	Country Sewerage.	Total E. & W.S. Dept.
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1964-1965—					
Payments	7,343,882	9,543,330	9,499,894	2,061,486	29,099,984
Amounts recovered	627,724	505,924	1,356,124	80,016	3,157,196
Net expenditure	6,716,158	9,037,406	8,143,770	1,981,470	25,942,788
1965-1966—					
Payments	6,379,720	8,694,634	9,611,023	1,472,785	26,771,368
Amounts recovered	491,160	398,033	927,943	140,323	2,436,805
Net expenditure	5,888,560	8,296,601	8,683,080	1,332,462	24,334,563
1966-1967 (estimated)—					
Payments	5,835,000	7,714,000	8,433,000	1,025,000	24,745,000
Amounts recovered	500,000	900,000	900,000	160,000	3,000,000
Net expenditure	5,335,000	6,814,000	7,533,000	865,000	21,745,000

LOAN PROJECTS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (on notice):
1. What stage has been reached in the construction of each of the following Loan projects:

- (a) Kangaroo Creek reservoir;
 - (b) Middle River reservoir;
 - (c) Tailern Bend to Keith trunk main;
 - (d) Tod River trunk main reconstruction;
 - (e) Swan Reach to Stockwell trunk main; and
 - (f) Whyalla sewerage (new areas) scheme?
2. At what date is it expected that each of the above works will be completed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The replies are as follows:

1. The stages are as follows:

- (a) Kangaroo Creek reservoir:
 - i. The diversion tunnel has been completed. It is expected that tenders for the construction of the dam will be called before the end of July.
 - ii. The target date for completion is 1970.
- (b) Middle River reservoir:
 - i. The excavation has been completed and 25 per cent of the dam concrete has been placed.
 - ii. The target date for completion is mid 1968.
- (c) Tailern Bend to Keith trunk main:
 - i. Two storage tanks have been completed near Coomandook and Coonalpyn. Work has commenced on the coffer dam and pumping station excavation at Tailern Bend. The 30in. and

24in. sections of pipeline have been laid from Tailern Bend to Binnies Lookout—a distance of 31½ miles.

ii. Target date for completion is 1972.

(d) Tod River trunk main reconstruction:

i. and ii. At this stage 41 miles of main have been completed.

The construction organization, apart from a small group on cleaning-up work, has recently been transferred from Cummins to a new camp at Wudinna. The rate of progress of laying the main is about 10 miles a year, and the work now approved should be completed by August, 1971. At this date reconstruction will have been completed as far as Minnipa. It is hoped, subject to approval and the necessary funds being available, to continue beyond Minnipa at a similar annual rate until the whole main is reconstructed.

(e) Swan Reach to Stockwell trunk main:

i. Eight miles of 36in. M.S.C.L. main has been laid from near the site of No. 1 pumping station towards Black and White Hill north-east of Sedan. Excavation for two 1,000,000-gallon tanks has commenced at Black and White Hill.

ii. The target date for completion is 1970.

- (f) Whyalla sewerage (new areas) scheme:
- i. and ii. To the end of May, 1967, 40.6 per cent of 6in. sewers (153,000ft.) and 79.6 per cent of trunk sewers (79,000ft.) for the combined stage 1 and stage 2 of the scheme had been laid. Most of this work is in stage 1 for the new areas of town. However, some isolated sewers to serve the caravan park and schools have been laid at the request of the City of Whyalla Commission. The estimated cost of stage 1 is \$3,392,000, and \$1,258,000 for stage 2, a total of \$4,650,000. The expenditure to the end of May was \$1,535,704, and the scheme at its present stage would serve about 9,000 of the residents of Whyalla. It is expected that stage 1 will be completed in 1968 and stage 2 in 1971-72.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How much was paid in subsidy to school committees, and other voluntary bodies connected with schools, to May 31, in each of the financial years, 1964-65 and 1965-66?
2. How much subsidy has been so paid to May 31, 1967?

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

1. \$390,530 to May 31, 1965, and \$412,642 to May 31, 1966.
2. \$485,113 to May 31, 1967.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from June 22. Page 117.)

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Last Thursday it was my pleasure to second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply moved by the member for Wallaroo. It is an added pleasure for me this afternoon to say that, for the third time in succession, the Speech of the Governor's Deputy showed how the people of this State would benefit under the progressive Government of the Party to which I am proud to belong.

Mr. Coumbe: You must be joking!

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not joking: I am always serious. And on a serious note, it is with regret that we learned of the passing of the Hon. R. S. Richards and Mr. R. S. Goldney, two former members of this House, and of Mr. Dudley Octoman, a former member of the Legislative Council whom I knew personally. These gentlemen were respected not only in their districts but also in Parliament. It is also regrettable that His Excellency Sir Edric Bastyan was unable to be present at the opening of Parliament this year and I am sure that all members hope he will soon be on the road to recovery. He has served this State well over many years.

Several members of this House will soon retire. Four of them, the Honourable Sir Thomas Playford, the Honourable Frank Walsh, Mr. Quirke and Mr. Shannon, have jointly accumulated 100 years of Parliamentary service. Although Mr. Shannon may be in a different category from the other three gentlemen, I include him because these four gentlemen have worked tirelessly for the good of this State. It did not matter which Party they belonged to: they did their best. They have done sterling work and will always be remembered for it.

I have known Mr. Heaslip and Mr. Bockelberg both in the House and on the sporting field. As members of the same rink as I, they have carried me when we played bowls. Although they are older than I, they have the same type of hair. I value their help and I have valued their help and appreciated their spirit since I have been in this House.

Mr. Hurst: Do you use the same hair oil?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, the same Brylcreem. A milestone has occurred as, after two years under the guidance of our former Premier (the member for Edwardstown), we have now elected a new Premier who is the envy of the Opposition—

Mr. Burdon: And of Australia.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, of Australia. Although he has not yet had the time to show his full worth, he has already shown us that he is an outstanding man. I am sure his work will greatly benefit the State, as the work of our other Ministers has benefited it. It is regrettable that newspapers at times deem it fit to belittle people in Parliament without just cause, and in this respect I refer to the editorial in the *Advertiser* of June 20, which is headed: "Ready for the Final Round". I am sure that we are all ready for the final round and that the final round will not make

any difference as to which side of the House the Labor Party is on after the next election. The editorial states:

In the bid to restore its fortunes, the Government will rely heavily on the qualities and resources of its new leader, Mr. Dunstan. With a talent for dramatics and quick reaction to changing situations, the Premier may be trusted to make good use of his opportunities. Probably he will seek more than a normal share of the spotlight in order to obscure some of the weaknesses in the Ministry. Both in his choice of portfolios and his recent actions, Mr. Dunstan has shown an awareness that the Government is likely to be judged by electors largely on its performance in the industrial field, especially in arresting South Australia's recession.

The people in my district are happy with my performance and that of the Ministers. It ill becomes a paper that many people have said is in world class to stoop to this kind of journalism (if it could be so called) to try to belittle the Ministry. The papers have never belittled the Ministry of former Governments and I consider that our Ministers are equal to, if not better than, those of the past. Whether that is so or not, there is no reason to belittle one Party. After all, these Ministers have only been on the Treasury benches for two years. I do not know whether the person who wrote this article has met the Ministers, because speaking to different people often changes one's idea about them. If he belittles these men, who do an excellent job for this State, I will stand up for them. Whoever he may be, I challenge him to show that there are better Ministers than those we have in South Australia. I know of none.

I have often spoken in this House about people using a nom-de-plume when writing to the papers. I do not think it is fair when people are not game enough to put their names on something they write to the paper. No-one in this State minds concrete criticism, but one does not like people hiding under false names and saying things that are not correct. I brought to the attention of the House a letter to the editor concerning free school books and, when I asked the Minister a question, it was shown that the letter was nowhere near correct. I consider that this type of correspondence to the editor should be stopped. Members of Parliament have always been willing to put their names alongside articles and letters they have written. From time to time we receive correspondence about bargains and we also receive propaganda in our letter boxes. I receive political propaganda in mine as well as correspondence

from the people in my district. It is false to say that since it has been in power in this House, the Labor Party has done nothing but promises everything. This Government has done so many things during its two years in office which the people are just starting to appreciate.

The Opposition is sore because this Government was successful in initiating the system of free textbooks in schools. We have gone further than that. The Government has seen fit to provide to secondary school students in necessitous circumstances the same opportunities as other children have. I think the Minister of Education is to be congratulated on his efforts over the last two years in introducing many educational reforms. The people of this State have gone from strength to strength. The Government has also done little things which mean a lot to our school-children. We have been able to give extra subsidies to schools, thereby creating opportunities for swimming pools to be built. Our subsidy is now \$1 for \$1, not \$1 for \$7. This will enable many schools to have swimming pools and will be an incentive for teachers and former pupils who have been willing to give their time for the benefit of our school-children. South Australia's climatic conditions favour the teaching of swimming. Indeed, I should not mind at all if we could at present fill a swimming pool with rainwater, which we so badly need in this State.

In spite of reports that we hear to the effect that this Government does nothing, I point out what it has done in regard to health. Health cannot be bought and, unfortunately, many people are suffering from illness. During the term of the present Government, spending in this field has been stepped up to at least as much as (and in some cases more than) is spent in any other State. During 1962-63 \$16.78 was spent per capita on health in South Australia, whereas \$21.40 is now spent, representing the biggest increase that has occurred in any State in Australia. I am sure that the people of the State look forward to the opening of the new Home for Incurables. As this excellent building is on the boundary of my district and that of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) I have had much pleasure in studying its progress.

Important facilities now provided for the community are the lottery and a totalizer agency board, social reforms that were denied the people of the State for many years. I have not heard one complaint from a constituent concerning over-spending on either of

these facilities or reports of heavy betting on T.A.B. that has adversely affected a family. Indeed, we have made advances through implementing these facilities, particularly in regard to the money now being provided for hospitals out of the fractions from lotteries.

Mr. Hurst: They are worthy institutions.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sure they are, and I am pleased that the Government legislated for them. The people showed that they desired a lottery and have subsequently shown that they are willing to subscribe to it. For many years, despite the great increase in vehicular traffic that has occurred, the protection for pedestrians has waned. Indeed, it is impossible at peak periods for people to cross many of our main roads. That is particularly evident in my district. Unlike years past, when many commodities were delivered to the consumer's door, it is now the practice (with the advent of supermarkets and price cutting, together with the propaganda designed to bring people to the stores concerned) for shoppers to buy most of their commodities in the one locality.

I am pleased that, to alleviate the present position, one of the first zebra crossings to be installed in this State will, in fact, be installed in the heart of Unley. I am sure that members representing suburban districts, particularly, will be gratified to know that similar crossings will be put into effect elsewhere. That is a step in the right direction: motorists in Sydney heed these crossings and pedestrians receive the right of way at all times.

Obviously, it would be impossible for Parliament to function without the help of many people who work in this building. Time catches up with us all, and I now pay tribute to Mr. William Whicker, who joined the Government Reporting Department as a *Hansard* Reporter on July 2, 1934, and who yesterday commenced leave prior to his retirement. Mr. Whicker gained the qualification of Licensed Shorthand Writer in 1923; he took part in the reporting of proceedings of the Royal Commission on Lotteries in 1936; and more recently he supervised the reporting of proceedings of the Royal Commission on the Licensing Act. Mr. Whicker was appointed Senior Reporter on August 27, 1964. I am sure that honourable members are aware of his many fine qualities and of the excellent way in which he fulfilled his position as a senior member of the *Hansard* Staff. Another person to whom I also pay tribute is Mr. Lanyon (formerly Parliamentary Librarian), who recently retired after many years of service.

One of the matters, to which the Speech made by the Governor's Deputy refers, is the registration of builders which I consider was needed many years ago. For a long time we have enjoyed prosperity, and the building trade has been booming. Whereas, in the past, 20 or 30 builders catered to most of the needs of the industry, we find that in the last decade a big change has taken place and that many builders have had to sub-let contracts in order to compete with firms comprising three or four men. Such firms have been able to under-cut prices and have not had to provide for insurance, holiday pay, and long service leave, etc. Those provisions are important and can, in the case of an organization employing many men, amount to thousands of dollars. Above all, the people sub-letting were often unable to receive the money from the builders. I am sure that the registration of builders will help the public as well as the builders concerned: it will ensure that the building industry is put on to the right plane. I intend to elaborate on this subject when the relevant legislation comes before the House.

I am pleased with the Government's policy of a \$1 for \$1 subsidy to councils regarding drainage, which particularly concerns the Unley District. For too long various suburbs have been affected by flooding when water has flowed from higher ground. This has resulted in many people losing furniture, carpets and so on which, in many cases, they have been unable to afford to insure, let alone replace. Nothing but good can result from the drainage proposals that the Government intends to introduce. I am sure that the people of Unley and of other low-lying areas in the suburbs will be pleased that the Government has taken the initiative and intends to do something towards overcoming the problem of drainage. Nowadays tanks are not used and the water that once ran into them now adds to the drainage problem. I am sure that the new scheme will ensure that the problems we have faced in the past will not arise again.

As a result of travelling extensively about the Unley District in the last two years, I can tell members that people in my district are happy with the Government's performance. Therefore, I believe the Labor Government will remain in office after the next election.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to join with other members in expressing my concern at the passing of former members of this House. I wish to place on record my appreciation of the services rendered by these men. Due deference has been made to the

services in this place of the late Hon. R. S. Richards, formerly the member for Wallaroo. I wish to refer to the past services of the late Mr. Goldney, who was my predecessor as member for Gouger. He was held in high esteem for the services he performed in the district and in this House. Although he was not the most vocal member, he certainly knew what was happening in this place and was fully aware of his Party's attitudes and policies. In the face of strong opposition, he returned many times to this House, and I pay a tribute to him.

I am sorry that His Excellency the Governor was unable to deliver the Speech at the opening of Parliament. Since then we have heard that he has not been enjoying the best of health and has been admitted to hospital. I am sure we all agree that the sooner he regains his health the happier we will be, for we have a high regard for the service he gives to South Australia and we are aware of his particular association with Parliament and with the Government of this State.

On reading the Governor's Deputy's Speech twice, I was puzzled in trying to find a theme. What does the Speech say and what does it promise for the future? Surprisingly, I find that it makes much reference to agriculture. At last the Government has found the primary producing industries of the State. That is a gratifying change in the Government's attitude and we hope it foretells an alteration in its consideration of policies. On my first reading of the Speech, I decided it should be called "Operation Standstill"; on reading it again I have decided to call it "Operation Fall-back", because it still deals with some promises that were bandied about at the time of the last State election. I see that we are now to have some planning in regard to two important hospitals.

Undoubtedly, in referring to its successes, the Government is dealing with the results of plans made by Sir Thomas Playford. It is rather strange that so much criticism has been made of Sir Thomas by the Premier, for the successes to which the Speech refers are the result of Sir Thomas's management of South Australia. It is a strange coincidence that, on the one hand, we are told that Sir Thomas is to blame for the present recession in South Australia whilst, on the other hand, he is obviously the cause of so many of the successes to which the Speech refers. This applies particularly in relation to primary production. We know how successful were past Liberal Governments in matters of road

building, water distribution and so on, which are so essential in agricultural production. We could go further and deal with the land tenure system, in relation to which the policy of the previous Government gave full encouragement to people to freehold and offered an incentive for capital expenditure in freehold development. We certainly have a contradiction in the Government's attitude when on the one hand Sir Thomas is denigrated and on the other is referred to in relation to his guidance of South Australia.

The items listed in the Speech comprised industrial promotion, a rather detailed survey of agriculture and horticulture, minerals, Aboriginal welfare, education, planning and preliminary work for hospitals, and planning for the new Government Printing Office and for the Agriculture Department office block. Rail standardization was dealt with and there was even mention of the Tailm Bend to Keith water scheme, which I thought the Government would leave out of its publicity references. Housing and electricity were also dealt with. What was said was more a recital of past success than a promise of anything substantive.

When we were considering the Supplementary Estimates we dealt in some detail with the Government's financial programme and I do not intend to repeat the Opposition's opinions about the present financial mismanagement in South Australia. There is a great divergence between the viewpoints of the Government and the Opposition about the financial juggling that is at present being carried out by the Government. We can find in the speech by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) many matters which are dealt with in the Governor's Deputy's Speech and which are of general interest to the Opposition.

The honourable member made a lengthy reference to industrial development, which is of great importance to South Australia because of the cure we are seeking for the recession, because of the employment position and because of the need to attract capital to South Australia. I was disappointed with the honourable member's remarks. This is not personal criticism: I appreciate that he is fighting for his political life and I do not want to go into that subject. However, I consider his state of satisfaction with the Government's efforts to be misplaced.

He referred to the proposed gas pipeline in South Australia. On that matter I continue to disagree with him and repeat my

earlier statement that the Government of South Australia is turning its back on decentralization because of the policy it is adopting about the route of the proposed pipeline. For weeks last year the Opposition endeavoured to find out the reason for the Government's refusal to examine fully the merits of the western route for the pipeline to the metropolitan area but no worthwhile reason was given. We advanced many points for consideration, some of which referred particularly to matters that have been dealt with by the member for Wallaroo. He knows that a company has purchased about 1,000 acres of land in his district so that, if the price of gas is suitable, the company may be able to set up a fertilizer factory in South Australia.

Mr. Quirke: Many other people are doing it, too.

Mr. HALL: That is an important point. Many other important finds of gas are being made and other fertilizer works are planned or in the course of construction. This is a competitive industry. While we were in the Eastern States recently, we were told that soon there was likely to be in Australia a huge excess capacity for nitrogenous fertilizer produced from natural gas. Much will depend on who gets in first and, consequently, secures the available market for this commodity.

I am disappointed about the rather obtuse attitude that has been adopted by the Premier and some other members opposite when they have said, "We shall bring the gas pipeline direct to Adelaide but will supply branch lines to an industry on the seaboard of Spencer Gulf if one wants a supply." In those circumstances a pipeline must be longer than would otherwise be the case and must be constructed after a definite contract has been signed by the industry concerned. The economics are against such a proposition.

Mr. Shannon: The Government wants industry to encourage it, whereas it should be encouraging industry.

Mr. HALL: Yes, industry must do the encouraging, according to the Government. If a direct pipeline is provided and the Spencer Gulf ports are ignored, what will the cost of the additional spur line to take gas to Wallaroo, Port Pirie or Port Augusta be charged against?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Presumably against the industry.

Mr. HALL: Yes. When gas is available in Victoria and Queensland at much shorter distances, as it will be, a fertilizer factory will

not be able to afford the cost of bringing gas 480 miles, plus the cost of taking it in a branch line to Wallaroo, unless much Government subsidy is paid.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is conceivable that they would charge the price of gas at the take-off point, plus the cost of conveying it from that point to the industry.

Mr. HALL: Yes. An important factor is that in South Australia the gas field is so far away. The cost of the pipeline would be an impossible burden for a company and the only way to determine the relative economics of the eastern and western routes is to call tenders for both routes at the same time. If that were done, the difference in cost would be known and that would enable us to settle whether we could afford to ignore the claims of the Spencer Gulf ports. Until this is done no Government member can claim that all action has been taken to preserve the rights of the Spencer Gulf ports. It is a matter of great concern that tenders for the Chowilla dam, an important project for this State, are far above the estimated cost. A true picture can be obtained only by tenders: an estimate is not sufficient. The member for Wallaroo, when speaking of natural gas, said that immediately the need was established and an economic proposition could be arranged by both parties, they would receive a supply of gas. This was the Premier's promise. Before any pipeline is built a price for gas must be established, because the competitive element is so strong that no company can enter this field without knowing the final price of the raw material.

The member for Wallaroo said that the Government was trying to encourage an industry at Wallaroo and that he hoped for the full support of the Opposition. He spoke too long; also, he has been absent for a long time from the affairs of the Industries Development Committee. I have been reliably informed that for the first five months of this year no substantially new reference was made to that committee. I do not know whether that fact is correct or not but, if it is, it demonstrates the need to revitalize industrial promotion in South Australia. We need a new attitude. I found this new attitude on my visit to the Eastern States, when I travelled 134 miles in a day through the suburbs of Sydney with an officer of the Industrial Promotion Service of the Department of Decentralization and Development of New South Wales. I found

an active promotions department, fully conversant with all aspects of development in the city of Sydney, and offering industry an immediate service.

Last night, after speaking on promotion and development at a meeting at Tailem Bend, I was approached by a person interested in decentralization in the Tailem Bend district. I told him there were certain difficulties in extending industries to country areas unless there was a real interest from an industry to process local materials. He said such an industry tried to establish at Tailem Bend a year or so ago and wanted land, but was offered surplus Highways Department land on a 10-year lease basis. This offer was not good enough.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. HALL: I was told this by an individual who was involved in the matter. The industry was offered land on a 10-year lease but negotiations ceased. They may be continuing now and, if they are, I wish that industry every success.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: We have done everything to help it.

Mr. HALL: The short-term lease would discourage this industry.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It just is not true.

Mr. HALL: I should like to hear the Minister give the real facts to the House.

Mr. Hurst: Why don't you find out before you say anything.

Mr. HALL: If we wish to encourage industries all aspects have to be considered and, obviously, an industry wants freehold land, and should have it.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: This was offered to the industry but it did not want it. It wanted land on a long-term basis.

Mr. HALL: I am pleased to know that the Minister is interested in this industry.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I know all about it. You should keep quiet.

Mr. HALL: I had to decide whether I should ask a question about it.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Ask a question tomorrow and I will tell you the story.

Mr. HALL: This was the story told to me and, apparently, it is circulating in Tailem Bend. If so, the Minister should correct it.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I have corrected it.

Mr. HALL: The Minister should correct it again, because it was told to me by more than one person.

Mr. Clark: After you have heard the true facts, will you retract your story?

Mr. HALL: I have explained the story.

Mr. Clark: Why not tell the truth?

Mr. HALL: This is only one facet of industrial promotion. I have explained the Opposition's policy on industrial promotion in South Australia, which needs a revitalized service modelled on the New South Wales department, with a director and an advisory corporation, although in South Australia we do not need the advisory corporation. Our needs would best be served by an advisory committee acting as an intelligence bureau for the director and the Minister. Industrial promotion in this State needs impetus and status. Industrial conditions are more buoyant in Victoria than they are in South Australia, a fact borne out by the June statistics which show that persons registered for employment in Victoria number only 15,791, compared with 8,373 in South Australia, although Victoria has three times the population of this State. The vacancies registered (and this is also a standard by which one can gauge the economic health of the community) were 12,246 in Victoria and 1,555 in South Australia. The comparison for this State is very poor, in that it had only about one-eighth of the registered vacancies that Victoria had. Regarding recipients of unemployment benefits, this State shows an even worse comparison. In Victoria on June 2, 1967, there were 3,701 recipients of unemployment benefits and in South Australia there were 3,529. These figures provide the best comparison between the two States, and this State has the doubtful privilege of having practically the same number receiving unemployment benefits as Victoria has. This State's unemployment figure is similar numerically to that of Victoria, which has a population three times greater than ours. This bears out the contention that under the Bolte-type of industrial promotion Victoria is progressing much faster than is South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: Victoria has 15,000 unemployed.

Mr. HALL: I am disappointed that the honourable member is unable to digest these figures. The figures I gave were of persons registered for employment (15,700-odd in Victoria and 8,300-odd in South Australia). The best comparison is between the numbers of recipients of unemployment benefits in the two States: these are 3,701 in Victoria and 3,529 in South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: It is worse in Victoria, isn't it?

Mr. HALL: About 180 more persons are receiving unemployment benefits in Victoria than in South Australia. If the honourable member would like to make something of that, he may, but I am not going to deal with that small technicality. This State, which has one-third of Victoria's population, has practically the same number of unemployed. This bears out the contention that this State is worse off than Victoria, the economy of which is buoyant compared with ours, which is one of recession. The figures are not conclusive, because many of our trained people have left the State and been absorbed in Victoria.

Mr. Broomhill: Can you establish that!

Mr. HALL: Of course. Apparently the honourable member does not talk to industrialists, but I am not frightened to talk to them. They will soon tell him where their men are going.

Mr. Broomhill: Who has told you that?

Mr. HALL: I can refer the honourable member to a person who will be happy to tell him.

Mr. Ryan: You learned that in two days in Victoria, did you?

Mr. HALL: No, I obtained figures, which are available in the Parliamentary Library. Things that emerged clearly from a short inspection of the economies of Victoria and New South Wales were their buoyancy and the vitality, their creed of getting on, their enterprise, and of their doing things by competitiveness. This brought home to us the need to retain a Sovereign Parliament in South Australia. If there is a need that overrides everything else in South Australia it is the need to retain the right of this Parliament to legislate for the State. In this regard, I wish to quote from an interview on the television programme *Four Corners*, when the new Premier spoke on his views and their relation to their future of the South Australian Parliament. The interviewer asked:

Is it only a matter of understanding, or is the problem insoluble?

This was a reference to State-Commonwealth relations.

Mr. Broomhill: Let's hear the full question.

Mr. HALL: I have gone back a fair way. In reference to the State-Commonwealth relationship, the Premier said:

I do not think the problem is insoluble. Eventually we are going to have to change the whole set-up of the Federation, but this will take time.

The interviewer asked:

What is the first step?

The Premier said:

Well, I think the first step is the development of regional planning authorities in Australia. Our State boundaries are quite illogical.

Mr. Jennings: So they are!

Mr. HALL: Thank you. The Premier went on to say:

They bear no sort of relationship to developing economic communities.

Which part of South Australia would the vocal members opposite give away first?

Mr. Jennings: A lot of rubbish!

Mr. HALL: Your Leader said that.

Mr. Jennings: Nothing like it.

Mr. HALL: He was asked:

Would you retain State Sovereignty at the same time?

The Premier replied:

Oh yes, over a period. Eventually I think Australia will have to face having one Sovereign National Parliament and a series of county Governments, subordinate legislatures. But the foundation for this is not here yet. It will take 20 to 25 years for it to develop.

The Premier was then asked:

In other words, you are saying Federation or the Federal system as such is on the way out.

He replied:

Oh, I think that this is eventually inevitable. At the moment the set-up of the Federation is inhibiting effective Government in Australia. That is a lengthy and fair quote, and gives a fair description of what the Premier said on *Four Corners*. He said, in effect, that, over a period of time less than the time in which Sir Thomas Playford was Premier, he would stand by or actively participate in destroying this Parliament.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: He hopes to preside over its disintegration.

Mr. HALL: It would be interesting to ask how long he hopes to be Premier. His ambitions run to the destruction of this Parliament. The buoyancy, enterprise and initiative that we found in the Eastern States show that they, by their activity, will over-run South Australia unless we retain such things as the Sovereign Parliament in South Australia and the Senate.

Mr. Ryan: What about Bolte's statement?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member would no doubt like to agree with his colleague's statement that State boundaries are illogical. Perhaps Sir Henry Bolte would agree with that in relation to the off-shore boundary between South Australia and Victoria. Perhaps the honourable member would like to give that away first. This is perhaps the most important matter that has arisen in public discussion in

South Australia during the last century. The Party now in Government, with a Leader who is a self-professed radical, is dedicated to the destruction of this Parliament and the handing over of the destiny of South Australia to the Eastern States. Obviously, the present Premier is the most dangerous man that has occupied the Premier's chair in perhaps the entire history of responsible Government in this State.

Mr. Jennings: He is certainly dangerous to your prospects.

Mr. HALL: On his own admission, he is to preside over this Parliament's dissolution. There is one final quote which is rather illuminating. The Premier said:

I have always believed that my job here is in the State. It is essential for effective Labor policies to be put into effect that we have State politicians and Federal politicians understanding one another, both in office, working the Constitution effectively to see to it that things are done for the people that we stand for.

The Liberal and Country League has always legislated for the whole of the South Australian community, and we intend to see to it that this is continued when we are in office. We will legislate not only for the people we stand for but for all the people throughout South Australia: employees and employers, both in commerce and in the home. All people under an L.C.L. Administration get due and proper consideration in the legislation we promote.

Mr. Burdon: Do you stand for 75 per cent of the people being denied a vote in a certain House?

Mr. HALL: I think that the first essential in South Australia is a restoration of confidence. We will restore confidence by getting to grips with the promotion of our State. I do not refer only to industrial promotion, because there are many other things, such as the tourist industry and the fishing industry and a number of other vital affairs, which today are being neglected. First, the overriding proposition is a restoration of confidence. This we will do best in the short term by getting on with industrial promotion with machinery that has already been demonstrated as being effective and enticing to oversea industry. Secondly, we have to make use of our natural resources, and we have to get on with the gas pipeline scheme in a sensible and proper manner which has due regard to decentralization. We have to build our Chowilla dam to safeguard the future water needs of South Australia. However, beyond all of this we need to retain in South Australia the rights of the South

Australian people and not give them to the Eastern States or to any other geographical sector of Australia. We need to retain in a properly regulated system of federation the Sovereign rights of the Parliament of South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Leader in what he has said on this motion. I, too, am sorry that the illness of the Governor prevented His Excellency from opening Parliament in person. While we were delighted (as we have been on many occasions before) to have Sir Mellis Napier as the Governor's Deputy to perform this task, I am sure we were all sorry that Sir Edric Bastyan was not able to open this session of Parliament in person, especially as it was his last opportunity to do this before his retirement from office.

The Speech refers also to the deaths of a member of Parliament and two former members, and I respectfully agree with what has been said about the services of those members to this State. There was one other death to which I should like to refer. Although this was not mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, it was in my view a very great loss to this State. I refer to the death some couple of months ago of Superintendent Clifton Leslie Brebner, a member of the South Australian Police Force. I had known Superintendent Brebner for some years. I knew him through my profession, because I came into contact with him then as a member of the Police Force, first I think at Echunga and latterly, of course, when he attained high rank at a young age here in Adelaide. I knew of his outstanding record during the Second World War, and of course I knew of him as the officer in charge of the Military Police in Central Command as a member of the Citizen Military Forces. Superintendent Brebner always displayed a breadth of outlook which was outstanding, in my view. He was not confined within the limits of the Police Force in any way, either in carrying out his police duties or in carrying out his other activities within the community. To have lost him when he was so young was a blow not only to the Police Force but, I believe, to this community.

Sir, I desire to refer to two other preliminary matters. For the first time in my experience there is a mistake in His Excellency's Speech as distributed to members, not a mistake in the expression of an opinion but a mistake of historical fact. I noticed this when it was read by His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, and I observed that some other members also

noticed it. Of course, the late Robert Stanley Richards was the Premier of this State not in 1935 but in 1933, as I should have thought almost any schoolchild would know. This, I am afraid, is merely an example of the careless errors we are likely to experience under the present Government. It is most unfortunate, but apparently the Speech was not checked at all before it was handed to His Excellency to be read, because even the most cursory glance would have shown that this was a mistake. Sir, I intend tomorrow to ask the Speaker what we can do respectfully to point out the error that occurred in this case, because it should not have occurred.

We had another example of the same sort of thing today in the House. Last Thursday I asked the Premier (in office now for 27 days, I think) for an estimate of the cost of the extra recreation leave which he announced would be given to members of the Public Service, and he gave a figure. I felt that he was not very anxious to give the figure. I had to ask two questions before I got it out of him, so it was not a matter about which he was asked suddenly and without warning. Today we find that he has to retract and say that he made a mistake in the figure he gave to the House last Thursday.

Mr. Shannon: When it comes into operation it will perhaps have a final review.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is likely. I think it is a very poor show indeed that the Premier cannot get his facts right when he brings them to the House.

Mr. Jennings: How petty can you get?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think it is petty at all.

Mr. Jennings: It's absurd.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member thinks that an amount of \$850,000 a year (that is the difference between the estimate the Premier gave on Thursday and the one he has given today) is petty, I do not, and of course what the member for Enfield has just said is an example of the thinking of Government members: money does not matter to them. This is part of the trouble (and a big part of the trouble) that we face in South Australia at present. Apparently, it does not matter what figures a person gives out. Obviously, the most important thing that has occurred in South Australia since the opening of the last session of Parliament has been the change in leadership of the Government, and it is about this that I desire to say something and about its significance for the State. I guess I have known the present Premier longer than any

other member here has known him. My recollections of him go back to 1942 when he was, in fact, the assistant scout master in the senior school scouts at St. Peter's College. At that time, I was only in the preparatory school, but I can remember him taking the senior scouts to camp. He was a keen scout in those days.

Mr. Jennings: The difference is that at least he has grown up.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I seem to be getting some persecution today from the member for Enfield. Whether or not that honourable gentleman is winding himself up to make a constructive contribution to the debate, I do not know.

Mr. Jennings: I am, as a matter of fact.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should welcome it; we hear from him all too seldom nowadays, except by way of interjection. However, in the early 1940's the Premier's nickname was "Doo-da". "Doo-da Dunstan" was well known at school in those days. Members opposite may think that nickname implied some criticism of the honourable gentleman, but I do not think it did.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It is purely childish to talk about it; that's all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One of the disappointed candidates over the Premiership says it is childish: I suppose that reminiscing is normally for old men.

Mr. Langley: And this is from the candidate for Boothby!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think anyone was more disappointed than the member for Unley and his colleagues that I did not get that pre-selection. Of course, when I entered the senior school at Saints the Premier was one of the senior boys in the school. In those days he was both an outstanding debater—

Mr. Ryan: And still is!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and an outstanding actor, and those two attainments have stood him in good stead, and still stand him in good stead in this place. Later, I knew him when he went to St. Mark's College within the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: What were his politics?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Actually they changed between the time he was at school and the time when I knew him again at the university. I lost contact with him for a few years but I will say this (leaving politics aside for a moment): when we were both undergraduates at St. Mark's College the honourable gentleman did me one good turn, for which I shall ever be in his debt. I shall never forget the good

turn he did me on that occasion. Whatever our quarrels politically may be, I am (as I say, because of that one incident) personally forever within the Premier's debt. Later, he was the first member of either side of this Chamber to congratulate me on receiving the endorsement for Mitcham. As honourable members may realize from what I have said (and I do not intend to say any more about personalities) I am very much aware of the honourable gentleman's weaknesses; I admire many of his qualities; and I have always sought his friendship. But that is apart altogether from his politics; I have disliked his politics ever since at the university I found that they had changed from the politics that he espoused when he was a schoolboy.

It is indisputable, I suggest, that the Premier was the brains (such as they were) of the Walsh Government. I do not think anybody could deny that for a moment. One only has to look at the measures that have been introduced into this Parliament in the last two years to see that virtually all of the legislation of significance that has come into this place has been sponsored by the honourable gentleman. I think we have all heard the story (soon after the last election, actually) when the previous Premier was said to be away, and when someone asked, "Is Tom Playford still the Premier of South Australia?", the then Premier drew himself up to his full height and said, "Sir, I am the Premier of South Australia, and my name is Walsh, spelt D-u-n-s-t-a-n." I think that is a pretty fair reflection on the way in which things were going. That was a joke in fairly common currency a year or so ago.

Mr. Ryan: In the Liberal Party!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not at all; it was general throughout the community. Of course, an effort was made to keep the honourable gentleman out of office. I will not go into all that (it was notorious for some months beforehand), but I remember the picture that appeared in the *Advertiser*, I think on the day of the ballot for the leadership. It showed a number of Ministers, apparently during working hours, relaxing in their shirtsleeves at the home of the present Premier. I had always thought it was the job of Ministers to do some work in working hours but apparently those four gentlemen were able to take time off to have their photographs taken relaxing before the big vote.

Mr. Clark: At least they had their coats off.

Mr. Langley: They were in a working condition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is also common knowledge that the election of the present Premier to his high office caused much chagrin among some other members of his Party.

Mr. Casey: You ought to clean up your own house first!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, one of these was his predecessor (although I could not say why), who referred to him as "Mr. Dun Donstan" when introducing him to the people of South Australia. The real significance of the Premier's election to office is that the Government of this State has taken a turn to the left. Certainly, the honourable gentleman has carried a big load under the previous Government but he was not the Premier, and he did not have the control of Government policies, as he now has. The present Premier is a convinced, articulate and extreme Socialist and he is, of course, proud of that fact. The Leader of the Opposition has already referred to an interview on *Four Corners*, in which the honourable gentleman appeared, and he quoted several passages from it. There is one other I should like to make, at page 8:

There is a great deal of work to be done here in South Australia and I believe with a Labor Federal Government combined with the Labor State Government, we are going to be able to make this the pilot State for Labor policies and initiate an era in South Australia which will return us to our great radical heritage—whatever that may mean. Whatever "great radical heritage" may mean, what it means is that the plan which the honourable gentleman wants to put into effect is to make South Australia a pilot Socialist State, because the only aim of the Party opposite is socialization. The present Premier is proud of that fact. I have no doubt he will do his best to work towards it.

The great problem facing the Government of South Australia at present is the State's depression. As was said last week in this House, the previous Premier refused even to acknowledge the difficulties into which we have fallen, but at least the present Premier was prepared to acknowledge the difficulties in which we find ourselves. It is obvious from what he has said repeatedly since then that politics in this State between now and the next general election will be concerned primarily with the State's economy. That suits us all right on this side of the House. We are prepared to take on the Premier at any time on this issue because he has, as every Socialist has, one fundamental difficulty: our economy, I am glad to say, is still based on private enterprise and private industry. The Premier

is a Socialist whose aim is to pull down private enterprise and private industry. This is Socialism whether or not the Premier knows it and this is what he is tied to, because he signed the pledge just as much as any other member did.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He was converted to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and he is now tied to it. This is the aim of Socialism; there is no other aim for Socialism. It is to convert private enterprise into State enterprise. How can a Socialist with this avowed aim ever get the confidence and co-operation of private enterprise? Yet this must be done if the State's economy is to be revived. A Socialist can never work successfully with private enterprise. I said last week and I say again that Socialism and prosperity just don't mix. Ask any of those people in South Australia who are now out of work whether they think we are prosperous under a Socialist Government in this State. Go out to the district of the honourable member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) and ask some of her constituents whether they are happy with the state of the economy. They have heavy commitments to meet; they are out of employment. Is this prosperity for South Australia? Let the honourable member for Barossa, if she likes, get up and defend the present situation in South Australia and tell her people out there that we are a prosperous State.

This can be said of a number of honourable members opposite. Let the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) get up and say whether people at Elizabeth and Salisbury are content. Let the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) go to his district. During his speech he did not say how prosperous this State was now.

Mr. Nankivell: Perhaps he was happy with it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He may have been happy, but he did not say it was prosperous.

Mr. Langley: And we weren't prosperous under your Government in 1961, either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: While we are talking about 1961, let me ask the member for Unley (or, better still, the member for Barossa, because she has not yet spoken in this debate) how long our difficulties lasted in 1961 and whether the Government did anything about them. The answer is that they lasted a short time because of the effective action taken by the then Government to put things right.

Mr. Casey: How long?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The difference is that this depression in South Australia has been getting gradually worse for a period of two years and neither the present Government nor its predecessor has done anything effective to halt the drift in this State. That is the difference between 1961 and 1967, and let no member on either side of the House make any mistake about that. The crisis we face in South Australia, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, is through lack of an intangible—confidence. People just do not trust the Labor Government. They did not trust the previous Premier because he was completely ineffective. They do not trust the present Premier because he is an avowed and extreme Socialist. We cannot blame anyone in this State for feeling as they do at present. The previous Government (and the present Government is going the same way) greatly increased our costs to industry and throughout the community generally. We have lost, as a result of their actions in the last two years, the cost advantage which we had over other States and which we must have if we are to market our products successfully in competition with those of the other States.

Can anybody wonder that people feel as they do about the present Government? You, Sir, can probably remember the speeches made in this House by the present Premier when he advocated increased taxation in this State. One looks, as I was looking a little while ago, at his speech in 1960 when he was urging the then Government to increase the level of State taxation. He thought that was the remedy for the evils of that time. No other cure did he advance. It was not then the fault of the Commonwealth Government that things were going wrong in this State. He said we should increase the level of taxation, and in another speech he spoke at great length on extra taxation. He referred to Nicholas Kaldor and suggested we should impose an expenditure tax in South Australia. Since he has come into office, he has already antagonized industry and commerce in this State through his sneering references to a "milk bar economy". One wonders what the men who work at Chrysler, Holdens, Philips and other places thought when they heard the industries in which they are engaged described as "milk bar" industries, industries which apparently should not have been brought to this State. He blamed a previous Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) for the industries that have been established here.

Mr. Nankivell: He wants the sales tax reduced to promote these industries.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, now he wants a reduction to promote them. What does he think these industries have done for South Australia? Doesn't he realize the employment and prosperity they have brought to this State and that in times gone by before the present Government and its immediate predecessor were in office this was a prosperous State, with a high level of employment and plenty of overtime being worked?

Mr. Coumbe: And a shortage of skilled tradesmen.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. That is the opposite to the present situation, and there will not (I say this advisedly) be any improvement in the economy of this State until there is again an L.C.L. Government. I say that because, in contrast to the present Government, an L.C.L. Government would be sympathetic to industry and commerce. We realize that, in South Australia, we have always had to work hard for what we have; we realize that it is necessary for the finances of the Government of the State to be soundly based; and we realize that the greatest job that any State Government can do is to develop to the full the resources of the State. In all those things, the present Government and its immediate predecessors have failed.

Of course, the present Premier will not acknowledge any responsibility for the present situation in South Australia. According to him it is anybody's fault but that of the South Australian Government. He has tried to shift responsibility (as we said last week) either on to the Playford Government or on to the Commonwealth Government. Of course, any fool can blame somebody else for his ills. I intend to nail this and to keep on nailing it as long as the honourable gentleman makes these suggestions. I suppose it is just a coincidence that our troubles in this State began two years ago at the time the Labor Government came into office! According to the Premier this would be purely a coincidence. Of course, it is not a coincidence, nor will the people of this State swallow the suggestion that it is.

When he went out of office, Sir Thomas Playford left the finances of the State in a strong and healthy condition, and I commend honourable members to the speech that he made in this House last week. Of course, Sir Thomas would have encountered the same difficulties and conditions had he been in office instead of having gone out of office in 1965.

However, I make the point that Sir Thomas Playford had the ability and the experience to handle these things much better than they have been handled by the present Government. He had already shown this time and time again during the period of his Premiership. I have already said that the present Premier has blamed Sir Thomas Playford for attracting the wrong industries to South Australia. Should he have said "No" to them when they wanted to come here? Should he not have gone out looking for industry for this State? As that is what the Premier says now (that these industries should not have been established in South Australia), we are lucky that they were established here.

Let me ask the Premier (and I hope he will answer this question when he replies in this debate) how he intends to go about attracting what he has called specialized craft industries to South Australia? How does he intend to go about making this the centre for industrial design and research? Those are laudable aims, but what is he going to do to achieve them? This is something that is easy to say but much harder indeed to put into effect. I venture to say that the people of South Australia have not forgotten Sir Thomas Playford and that they remember more vividly every day the prosperity that we had during his term in office. If the present Premier thinks he can pull down Sir Thomas and spoil his image in the minds of South Australians, he has set himself an impossible task. The people in this State do not have short memories, nor are they the fools for which he apparently takes them.

His other line of attack has been against the Commonwealth Government, and he is not the first Premier of this State to criticize the Commonwealth Government. Sir Thomas Playford often criticized the Commonwealth Government during his term of office: he fought it when he thought that was necessary in the interests of this State. However, he was always able to keep things going in South Australia on an even keel whether or not he was successful in his passages of arms with the Commonwealth Government. That is the conspicuous difference between Sir Thomas Playford and the present Premier and his immediate predecessor.

Mr. Langley: Did Sir Thomas ever have deficits?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. Langley: I thought you said South Australia was always on an even keel.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it was. Let me remind the honourable member of one thing (and the honourable member was in the House

when the member for Gumeracha was Premier of this State): after 27 years as Premier of the State, Sir Thomas came out exactly square in his Budgets. I call that an even keel: I do not know what the member for Unley calls it.

Mr. Langley: After 27 years we shall be on an even keel, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Government will not be in for as long as that for us to find out.

Mr. Langley: You can't make any judgment over two years in office.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The people of Unley, Barossa, West Torrens, Gawler and every other district will, in fact, be making a judgment within the next few months. They will not have to wait 27 years to make a judgment on the present Government.

Mr. Langley: You'll be over on that side of the House just the same.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Unley will still not accept what I say, let me remind him that South Australia had a bad drought in 1959-60. Things in this State were bad indeed at that time and yet we ended that financial year with a deficit of only \$622,000. That was some achievement, as seasonal conditions then were a good deal worse than they have been since. Let the member for Unley and other honourable members read the Treasurer's Budget speech for 1960 and see what he did effectively to take care of the difficult situation in which he found himself.

I shall now deal with the criticisms that the present Premier makes of the Commonwealth Government. First, he says that in some way the policy of the Commonwealth Government has depressed the markets for South Australian goods in the Eastern States. That is not so: if it were so surely one would see signs of depression in those States, and yet there are no such signs at present. As I have said, the real problem is that the advantage that South Australian industry had has been destroyed by the additional imposts brought in by the Labor Government during the last two years. The Premier also complains that the Commonwealth Government has not given us enough by way of Commonwealth grants and other assistance, but I remind him (as he has already been reminded) that we get, per head of population, a higher sum than would be justified on our proportion of the total Australian population. He has also suggested that not enough expenditure is carried out in South Australia by the Commonwealth Government on buildings and other developmental works.

Mr. Hurst: This was answered last week and not satisfactorily.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought the figures I quoted showing the percentage spent in the last three years in South Australia were a fairly satisfactory refutation of what the Premier said. Now the Premier is on his way to Canberra to tell the Commonwealth Government how to put things right not only, one suspects, in South Australia but throughout the world. Who can doubt that this is the outlook of the honourable gentleman as he goes there?

Only someone who was either completely irresponsible or dishonest could take his criticisms to that point and no further. The answer, of course, is that the Commonwealth Government is not careless of the welfare of the people of this State or, indeed, of the people of any part of the Commonwealth. The people of Australia showed last November that they realize this only too well. The Commonwealth Government has its own difficulties; it must decide its priorities. Hasn't the honourable gentleman ever heard of the commitment which Australia has in Vietnam, a commitment which has led to the doubling of expenditure on defence by the Commonwealth Government over a period of four or five years? Let me quote very briefly from the Budget speech of the Right Hon. Mr. McMahon, the Commonwealth Treasurer, which he delivered in August last year. I am quoting from this speech in order to show that the Commonwealth Government is not completely careless of these things. Mr. McMahon stated:

This year the Government is providing \$1,000,000,000 for outlays on defence. This is \$252,000,000 or 34 per cent more than actual expenditure in 1965-66. . . . This fact of steeply increasing defence expenditure dominates our budgetary problem this year, as it did that of last year.

Mr. McMahon goes on further to state:

And yet with each successive rise in defence expenditure we have become increasingly conscious of a developing conflict between major national purposes—between the requirements of defence and those of growth. It is a real and substantial conflict for Australia, more than for most countries. Growth in its more fundamental forms is vital and of great urgency.

This is enough to show the difficulties in which the Commonwealth Government finds itself, and only somebody who was entirely shallow in his criticism, only somebody who did not want those who heard his criticism to look any further, could say, "It is all the fault of the Commonwealth Government." Yet that

apparently is what the present Premier proposes to say, whatever the situation may be in this State. We heard him say it again today on the question of social welfare.

In connection with my final point, I want to accept for the purpose of my argument what the Premier has said about the Commonwealth Government and its failure to provide this State with all that it should. If this is the case, and if, when the Premier is in Canberra this week, he fails to get any more money from the Commonwealth Government—and I venture that he will not come back with significantly more than his predecessors have—what then is to be the situation in this State?

It was a most irresponsible act for him to announce, as he did announce last week, that additional leave is to be granted to State public servants. As I hope I have made clear, no one begrudges anybody in this State extra benefits or rewards for their work, but we must be able to pay for what we give. If we are extravagant in this way we will all be worse off than we would have been if the benefits had not been given. It seems to me to be incredible folly that he should make this announcement a week before he goes to Canberra, having complained that he has not enough money and that he is going to squeeze more out of the Commonwealth Government. He does not say how he is going to load on to the economy of this State and on to the Government's expenses an extra impost which, of its nature, cannot bring in any return at all. We were told last week that this extra cost would be \$2,600,000 a year. Today the Premier has revised his estimate and brought it down to \$1,750,000 a year. Good gracious me! That is still a very heavy additional impost to put upon the people of this State at a time when the Premier himself is crying poverty. Of course, this is only the direct cost to the Government. The example that is being set is sure to spread over to private industry, and it will result in an extra impost for that sector. This extra leave is not something which was pressed for, as far as I can see, by the Public Service of this State. It is a most foolish and unwise move made with one object only: it is significant that the extra leave is not to start until next January, just a couple of months before the next election. This is a piece of blatant electioneering. I do not think that even the honourable gentleman himself would deny this,

and it has been announced at a time when the State's finances are in a parlous state; it is a most foolish and unwise move.

There are many other matters that I could deal with but that is all I propose to say; the other matters are only mentioned, without being expanded, in His Excellency's Speech, and the time will come for me to talk about all of them in due course during this session. I hope I have said enough to show my entire disapproval of the way in which the present Government is running this State's finances, and how this State's economy is being affected. If this is to be the battleground, as I believe it will be, between now and the next general election, I am very happy to join battle with the Premier and with his Ministry and with his supporters in the Labor Party. I am confident of the result at the next general election.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I was not sure whether I would be expected to speak at this time but it has been indicated that a speech from me would be welcomed. I want to join with other members in expressing loyalty to the Throne and in expressing the hope that His Excellency the Governor will soon be restored to full health. He is a personal friend of each member of this House, and there is no dispute that all of us wish him well.

I should like to congratulate the Ministers personally upon their being allotted portfolios in the new Government. Whilst I intend to criticize them and their actions at times, at least I think it can be said that members of this House wish them, as persons, well. I do not think anyone, certainly not I, would dispute that they work extremely hard and sincerely in carrying out their duties.

Mr. Hughes: Very fair comment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think it is fair comment. I do not think any Minister is not doing the best he can. Whilst I intend to criticize Ministers, I hope that they will accept what I have said as good wishes to them personally. We talked last week about industrial development at some length, and I should now like to raise this matter again. I hope that industrial development in this State will proceed in a satisfactory and vigorous manner. So far it has not been nearly as satisfactory as it ought to have been. I have been disappointed by statements by various Government members about the activities of the Playford Government in regard to industry. There is no question that historians will credit Sir Thomas Playford with having played a

vital part in the establishment of South Australia as an industrial community. He recognized how we could use some of our best mineral deposits and that South Australia could become a large manufacturer of motor vehicles. His actions played a large part in bringing two large motor manufacturing firms here and in negotiations that took place for the establishment of a steel industry at Whyalla. Of course, those are only examples and I shall not attempt to name all the industries, large and small, that he assisted or was the first to become interested in bringing here.

The first means by which he managed to do this was his vigour and far-sightedness and the most important means was his ability to instil confidence in those proposing to expand existing industry or to establish new industries here. Those who were operating industries here had a high regard for the work he had done in helping them to get established. This confidence cannot be instilled lightly or by a speech or two. It was instilled by the actions and experience of Sir Thomas and his Government. However, whether this Government will merit that same reputation is another matter. It has not been able to instil confidence up until the present time and whether it will be able to do so in future depends on its actions and statements.

Most of us in this House remember the move made by the Labor Opposition in 1956 to eliminate Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited from South Australia. One of the strongest advocates of that course of action was the present Minister of Education, who made a vehement speech during the debate. He received much support from other members of his Party, some of whom are probably now his Ministerial colleagues. That was, by any standards, strong action to take and must have been enlightening to the principals of that company. They would be guided by what was said here and nothing that was said during the debate has ever been denied or modified.

There are more recent examples of such action. I have heard Labor Party members criticizing B.H.P. severely. I think it was last year that the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) in a public speech advocated getting stuck into B.H.P. over royalties, or words to that effect. I think he said he would advocate "taking on" B.H.P. over royalties. In any case, it was a strong statement from a prominent back-bencher of the Government Party and, as far as I know, no-one has denied it or suggested that he modify it.

Again, last year the present Premier made a public denunciation of General Motors-Holden's over the standing down of some of the company's employees. The company was in a somewhat difficult position. Its chain of production had been dislocated by trouble in Victoria and, although I do not know the merits of the situation and am not in a position to say whether the company should have taken the action it took, no Minister should make a public statement such as was made by the Attorney-General on that occasion without first having tried to settle the matter amicably. Within a short time of the announcement by G.M.H. (and I understand that the company made special efforts to inform the Premier) the Attorney-General, in a broadcast speech, described the company's action as an irresponsible lock-out, and that statement has been allowed to stand.

Such actions shake industry rather than instil confidence in it, because industrialists realize how powerful Governments are and how important it is that Governments be sympathetic. This Government has to do much to improve its record in industry before we can attract industries in the way we were attracting them a few years ago. It has been said that Western Australia is in many respects taking the initiative from South Australia, which a few years ago was the State that was developing more quickly than any other.

I now wish to refer to the Constitution of Australia and the Government's attitude to it. I shall refer to one of the most important statements the Premier made in the last few weeks. He said the federal system of government in Australia was on the way out and he very clearly, of course, advocated the repeal of the Constitution of the Commonwealth Government. He also advocated that State boundaries be redrawn into regional boundaries and that State Parliaments be abolished as policy-making instruments in favour of one Parliament in Australia. He further advocated the abolition of the Senate. Years ago the Premier advocated abolishing all State Parliaments as policy-making bodies, and suggested a central Parliament for this purpose. That suggestion was not taken up by other members of the Labor Party, which has never been clear and frank in its aims.

Members of the Labor Party have not said much about what the Party intends to do, but we all know that its policy agrees with what the Premier recently enunciated: that a central Parliament consisting of one House should be created, and that the Senate and the State Parliaments should be abolished

as policy-making instruments. Few Labor members say this, but in his election speech the then Premier (Mr. Frank Walsh), when advocating a change in the franchise for the Legislative Council, used the words "pending its abolition". Surely we should be able to get a frank and clear statement of Labor policy at election time, when electors' minds are concentrating on the issues of the election. These policies should be made issues, because they are some of the most important matters to be considered. We should be arguing about these policies, but members of the Labor Party do not speak of them just prior to elections.

Recently, when in the United Kingdom, I spoke to a former South Australian Rhodes scholar, now a fairly elderly man and a senior at the Oxford University. A brilliant man, who had studied the Commonwealth Constitution as a young man and had continued to be interested in it, he said that he thought that it was one of the world's miracles. As a former South Australian he was extremely proud of the part the South Australian contingent had played in the formation of the Constitution, because when negotiations became difficult it was generally a suggestion of the South Australians that enabled the delegates to continue. Although the Constitution may not be faultless, it has certainly worked for the benefit of Australia for nearly 70 years, and we should be careful of people who want to destroy it. In effect, the Premier has said that he would like to destroy it and replace it with a central Parliament, and his Party agrees with him. I hope that Labor members will not be afraid to say that prior to the next election. I am sure that the people favour State Parliaments, and favour the Legislative Council. Members of the Labor Party, however, may not believe that.

Mr. Hurst: The people don't know that it exists.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A new South Wales Labor Government found that, when it tried to abolish the Legislative Council, the people decided that it should be retained.

Mr. Quirke: The Labor Councillors would not vote it out either!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When the New South Wales people had the opportunity they voted to retain the Council, and that is what people in South Australia will do if the Labor Party is rash enough to try the same thing here. Representatives from many Parlia-

ments of the Commonwealth attended the conference at which I was present in England. Some came from communities with a much smaller population than that of South Australia. Delegates represented every continent and several of the larger islands of the world, yet no delegate wanted a form of centralized Government where they merged with another community. I heard expressed a tremendous yearning for what they called "independence" in those communities. They wanted independence the same as South Australians would want it if we were governed by a central Parliament situated 1,000 miles from Adelaide. Communities, with no Parliament other than a central Parliament, are yearning for a form of local government that would be better than their present Government. Northern Ireland is relatively satisfied with the present position. It has a bicameral system with a Senate and a House of Commons; it also sends representatives to Westminster, but it has a Parliament that can deal with local matters. However, in Scotland the position is different.

Mr. Burdon: Does Northern Ireland have voting for members of both Houses?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not know what the franchise is in Northern Ireland, but that is an irrelevant aspect. The member for Mount Gambier should say something. He was expected to speak, but I had to do so because he was not ready. If he looks again at his notes, and listens carefully to me, he may have something to say when I sit down. One of the troubles with the Government back-benchers is that they too often try not only to talk without notes but without prior thought: the member for Semaphore is one of those. He makes more speeches by way of interjection than he makes from a standing position.

Mr. Hurst: That's rubbish!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The people of Northern Ireland are relatively satisfied, because that community, which is roughly the size and population of South Australia, has its own bicameral system; whereas in Scotland and Wales, which have no such local Parliament, the Nationalist Parties are finding a tremendous amount of sympathy at election time. I have not studied the platform of either Party, but I do not think the Parties are getting that support merely on account of their platforms: I think they are getting it because the people in those communities particularly want some better form of local government. There is no

doubt that the Scots would like a Parliament in Scotland and the Welsh would like a Parliament in Wales, but the Northern Irish have theirs.

If we ever do away with the Constitution in its present form, we will have a central Government in Canberra, too far away from South Australia to satisfy our needs. We will feel very small and lonely with a central Parliament in Canberra, with no South Australian Parliament here to look after our own business. We will feel that need very severely, and we shall be in the same position as that of the Scots and the Welsh at present.

Mr. Casey: Do you think we have the same traditions in Australia as the Scots and the Welsh have?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Most certainly we have not the history of hundreds and hundreds of years as an integrated community, although many of us have adopted the history of the country from which our forbears came, and that is perhaps the thing in which we are interested. We have a tradition of the local South Australian Parliament which has existed very much longer than has the central Commonwealth Parliament. In fact, we only agreed to a Commonwealth Parliament on certain conditions, one of which was that the Constitution would not be altered without the well-known processes through which we now have to go. That was a condition on which the States accepted the Constitution.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Recently, in discussing the Federal system with members of Parliament from all over the Commonwealth I pointed out that in no case could I find anybody urging a form of centralized Parliament, but that on the other hand everybody I talked to on the subject felt very deeply the importance of a system under which they had a local Parliament in their own community. The last instance of the value of the federal system of government that I wish to quote concerns the Northern Territory. Anyone who wants to do away with the federal system should have a look at the Northern Territory, and should ask the people there what they think. The only complaint the people there have is that they do not have enough local autonomy. There was at the conference I attended recently a member from the Northern Territory Legislature which, as all honourable members know, has very limited control of local affairs. That member, like all the other members from the Commonwealth with whom I dis-

cussed this subject, was most insistent that the people want local autonomy. If we abolish the federal system and adopt a central Parliament we will go the other way altogether: we will revert to the system that is already causing trouble in such old countries as Scotland and Wales, as I have said. I have already said that Northern Ireland is well set up with its own Legislature. Of course, we all know of the struggles of the people of Southern Ireland to rule their own country.

Summarizing, the federal set-up is a valuable one and one that we ought to be cherishing, not trying to destroy. The only reason I am grateful to the Premier for his recent statement is that he made the statement in public and committed himself to a course of action. He has done that before, but hardly anybody in the Labor Party has done it with him. I presume that Labor members sympathize with the Premier and that they support what he says. If they do not, they had better speak up quickly, otherwise they will be seriously misunderstood by the electors.

Mr. Hurst: But the electors know we stand for democracy, don't they?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The electors will be interested to know what is to be said about this matter prior to the election because, as I have pointed out, practically no reference is ever made to it by a Labor member of Parliament at an election. Here we have the Premier, after being in office for only a week or two, stating publicly that he favours destroying the federal system and replacing it with a one-house Parliament for the whole of Australia. The people will wish to know whether or not the Labor Party is behind the Premier. We can only assume that members of the Party are but if they are not, as I say, they had better say so quickly; otherwise, they may find themselves being misunderstood.

Mr. Hurst: That happens all the time with the Opposition.

Mr. Jennings: I am 100 per cent behind the Premier.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is a fair enough statement from the member for Enfield; at least we know where he stands, but we do not know about others, except that they would follow the lead their Premier gave them. However, it is remarkable that some members of the Labor Party, who have been in Parliament for 10 or 15 years, have never said this themselves.

Mr. Jennings: I've often said the same thing.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: But some members opposite have not. I am not happy about the way in which the Government is handling its public relations matters. Members may recall that last year I asked questions and complained about the type of publicity the State was receiving and the type of appointments that were being made. After the present Government came into office public relations officers were appointed, and I asked questions about the matter in July, 1966. The then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) stated at page 259 of *Hansard*, in the course of a long reply:

... if we continue to have an immigration policy, we must advertise the opportunities for investment in this country, whether they be in this State or in other States. Publicity will be given through the showing of a coloured documentary film, and in addition we will do anything we can that will help us to compete on a reasonable basis with other States of the Commonwealth. The appointment of the Public Relations Officer is considered to be temporary at present. If, in the future, there is further improvement and the Government is satisfied that the work performed by this officer is satisfactory and there is still a need for him, we will consider the question of again approaching the Public Service Commissioner through the normal channels.

In reply to the third question on the subject on July 12, 1966, at page 386 of *Hansard*, the former Premier quoted from a letter written to the Public Service Commissioner by the Secretary of the Premier's Department (Mr. White) in which the Secretary urged that a public relations officer be appointed. On that occasion the then Premier said:

I shall read a report from the Public Service Commissioner that led to this appointment, and I ask the honourable member to take note of it. The last paragraph of that report stated:

An application has been received for employment of this nature from Mr. G. D. Crease who seems to be well qualified by experience and is available for immediate appointment. I suggest that a temporary appointment be made initially for a period of about six months at the end of which the status of the position can be reviewed and the normal processes of permanent appointment under the Public Service Act (including the calling for applications) can be followed. Mr. Crease is aware of and is prepared to accept a temporary appointment on these conditions.

I did not mention the officer's name—the Premier did; and I do not know the officer personally. I am concerned simply about the method of appointment.

Since then the difference between publicity officers and press secretaries has been made clear. I understand that this officer has now been made a press secretary to the Premier

and that it is a Government appointment, not a Public Service appointment under the Act. In spite of what the former Premier said, it is an appointment by the Government itself. The Premier in announcing this said that this officer would be available to other Ministers. I want to make that clear. I thought (and all the information that has been given to us so far has shown) that the publicity officers in the Government were there to publicize the State, not the State Government. Some officers in the Public Service are doing a great job trying to publicize this State. As we know, the Public Service is a non-political organization: its members have never indulged in Party politics. If they are members of political Parties or if they like to support one Party or the other, no complaint is ever made about it; but they do not do it in the course of their work.

In this case there is a press secretary for the Premier available to the other Ministers. I take it he is there to help the Labor Party. That sort of publicity is the job of a Party, not of the State Government. I strongly disapprove of this sort of appointment. We all know that the Government from time to time puts its best foot forward industrially by the various means available to it; it should do it from the point of view of the State, not for the sake of the Government's own skin. I read a supplement in July 1966 entitled "South Australia reports to the nation", a survey by the *Australian*. I do not know whether the publicity officers merely helped in the preparation of that, whether the State Government paid for it, or what it was, but in any case they got information from the publicity officers.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think it was good?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It was good advocacy for South Australia. However, they were able to write a 14-page supplement, and in one line only do I notice the name "Playford" mentioned at all. There is a statement about the Labor Party and what it is doing. In fact, it is excellent Party advocacy. In passing, it also may help the State—I do not know.

Mr. Hurst: But, if it does, it is well worth while.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It depends which way we look at it, of course. A clear distinction should be made between publicity officers and press secretaries. I believe that the appointment of a press secretary by the Government was a direct contradiction of the type of publicity given by publicity

officers because, in the Premier's own words, this man has been appointed to help the Premier and other Ministers. If he has been appointed to help the Premier and other Ministers, then he is doing a Party job and not a State job. If it is a Party job then I believe the Party should organize it and not leave it to the State to organize it for the Party.

Mr. Curren: What about the press secretaries of Commonwealth Government Ministers? Are they political appointments?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Commonwealth Government has its own practices and runs its own affairs, and we are used to its doing so: it has a different job to do. In this State we should publicize South Australia and not the State Government. This press secretary was appointed by the Government and not under the Public Service Act by the Governor in Executive Council. His duties are not prescribed in any official document I have been able to see. I should like someone to set out the duties of this officer.

When I asked about this officer last year, when he was given the title of Publicity Officer, I was told that he was appointed as a temporary officer, that the Public Service provisions therefore did not apply, and that he could thus be appointed direct by the Government. His duties were to prepare films and so on, but we have not heard what he has done. The then Premier promised that eventually a normal Public Service appointment would be made and that the job would be advertised through normal Public Service channels. Since then this officer has become a press secretary. I should like to know what are his prescribed duties and why his appointment has been made purely by Cabinet and not in line with usual Public Service procedure. It appears to me that this is a cheap way of organizing Party publicity. I do not think that is what South Australia should have: we should have publicity for the State and not for members of the Government.

I now want to refer to legislation dealing with eggs, to egg sales, and to the attitude of the State Government towards this matter. Recently a meeting at Murray Bridge was organized by people protesting against the so-called Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia plan. I received an invitation to attend, as did the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister felt insulted that he should receive an invitation in the form in which he received it. Although I received a similar invitation, I

did not feel insulted, perhaps because I am not a Minister and need not be so sensitive. In any case, I went along to the meeting, although I took no part in it at all.

Mr. Hurst: Was the invitation addressed to you personally or was it just a circular?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It arrived in my mail in the form of a circular.

Mr. Hurst: Don't you think the Minister deserved something more than that?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think that the member for Semaphore is outdoing himself: he is getting a little excited. I suggest the honourable member is not helping himself, me, the Government, the Opposition or the people of this State. I do not know why he bothers to keep going, unless it is because he is excited. I suggest that he should just sit back a little. The honourable member will be the first to condemn Opposition members in a little while by saying that they talk too much, but our speeches are extended by interjections that are in the form of interruptions. I think it is reasonable to ask a question here or there, or perhaps to interject to some extent (I have done it myself once or twice), but when the interjections take the form of shouting down it is a silly attitude. If the honourable member simply got to work and prepared a speech for himself and stood up and delivered it, it would probably help us considerably.

I received an invitation to the meeting at Murray Bridge; the invitation was the same as that which the Minister received. I went to the meeting, but the Minister did not go. I was not asked to speak, and I did not speak. However, I paid attention during the meeting, which was very well attended. Many complaints were made about the operation of the C.E.M.A. plan. The Minister was criticized at the meeting; there is no question about that. However, I do not know about the way he expressed what happened—that they heaped abuse on him. I think he may have gained the wrong impression, but undoubtedly he was under criticism.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Justified or otherwise?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It will become clear to the Minister of Lands when I have finished that I think at least some criticism of his colleague was justified, and I shall make some criticism myself because, as members know, I was in the position that he is now in at the time when the C.E.M.A. plan was being worked out. I attended many conferences; I even attended conferences before

the plan received its present name. I attended meetings of Ministers to try to get a uniform approach to the problems of egg marketing.

When I left office I had not accepted the C.E.M.A. plan on behalf of this State because I had objections and reservations about it. I am saying neither that I oppose the plan and want to destroy it nor that I favour it: I am saying that at the time I had influence on these affairs I had considerable reservations about the plan, and still have them. Some of the questions that I then asked have still to be answered. There was a number of such questions, but I suppose that the one uppermost in my mind is (and has been) this: if the plan makes egg production favourable, will there not be a gross increase in egg production? I repeatedly asked that question of the authorities. I was well aware that South Australia was an exporter of eggs in the same way as it was an exporter of refrigerators, motor cars, wool and wheat, and I knew that we could survive as an industrial community only by being able to sell our export goods. The Egg Board was selling eggs in the other States. At that time the present Minister quickly accepted the C.E.M.A. plan and gave the House his reasons, which included the threat that, if he did not accept it, we would be flooded with eggs from the Eastern States in a deliberate attempt to crush South Australia as an egg-producing State and eggs would be reduced in price to 10c a dozen.

I have no doubt that that threat was made, because I know that the man who made it used similar tactics to crush the egg producers in the Australian Capital Territory and to bring them under the wing of New South Wales. That threat probably was not an idle one. The C.E.M.A. plan was accepted and proceeded, although there were acute protests. At all times I repeated the policy that my Government had followed in relation to primary producer marketing schemes. That was that a constitutional scheme should be brought in at the wish of the primary producers, who would basically control the scheme. Doubtless, the primary producers considered that they would receive a voice about whether they were to come into this plan, but they did not get that voice: the scheme was accepted on their behalf by the Minister. He took a big decision, and I sympathize with him in that regard. I had not taken the decision and intended not to do so until the reservations that I had were dispelled or the egg producers clearly said that they wanted the plan. However, we did not get satisfaction about it before

the plan was accepted by the present Minister and the voice of the primary producers about it was not heard. Is it any wonder that protests are being made already about this? Some of the forecasts about the plan have been fulfilled. Production has sky-rocketed. Another forecast was that the small man would be injured by the scheme. The small man has been steadily dropping out of the scheme and the big man has been getting bigger as a result of the plan.

That is all right if the production can be sold but, if it cannot, difficulties arise. When I first heard of the proposal about what we called a hen tax (it is now called a levy), the amount suggested was about 30c a bird, not an inconsiderable sum. The Commonwealth Minister introduced a Bill providing for an upper limit of \$1 a bird. If he had asked me (and he did not) I could have told him that \$1 was not enough, and that he should have fixed a higher limit. Production is still increasing with the big men producing more than ever, but the small man is dropping out. During my term of office I introduced a Bill, which was approved by all members, to provide for the election of producer members to the Egg Board. It was introduced in response to inquiries from primary producer organizations, which wanted a form of election for producer members on the board.

The election was held and later the C.E.M.A. plan was adopted but, within 12 months of the end of the three-year term, the present Minister of Agriculture introduced a Bill to extend the term of office of the producer members. He said that all members could be defeated at the same time, and that this would affect the plan. If that had happened, it would have been a serious indictment of the plan, but a proportion of the members of the Egg Board are not producer members and do not come up for election, and they could provide the continuity of experience in C.E.M.A. legislation. I moved an amendment to provide that the dates of election of producer members should be staggered by having one each year, subsequent to the following election, but that was not accepted because the Government wanted to postpone the coming election.

One producer member position on the board was filled at an election in March, 1967, when the sitting member was defeated, but the other two producer members have had their term of office arbitrarily extended. No wonder producers protested about the matter. It was well known that one producer member, whose term of office was extended, would be opposed, and rather than face this the Government extended his

term of office. This was obviously an unfair course: why will not Government members admit that it was unfair? The protest meetings have been well attended. There was much criticism, but not abuse, at those meetings. Whether the facts were right or not, I do not know. Some of the statements were obviously right. I understand that the Minister has corrected some of the statements given and proposes to have another meeting to put the matters straight. Today, I asked the Minister whether he was aware of any move to control the production of eggs by means of licensing. He replied that he was aware that a meeting had been held to discuss this matter. This leads me to wonder whether this is not the desperate position in which the C.E.M.A. authorities are finding themselves when, with their scheme producing a greater and greater number of eggs all the time, they are now coming to the position of controlling the production of eggs and compulsorily preventing the production of eggs by certain people.

How will this affect the small man, who has already had a big knock? The C.E.M.A. plan has greatly enhanced the prospects of the big man, whereas it has adversely affected the position of the small man. What will be the position of the small man under a system of licensing control, and what will be the effects of the control of production? Only last week, a former Minister from Japan sat on the floor of the House. He said he was impressed with Australia, and that it could feed the whole of Asia. Mr. McArdle, a former officer of the Agriculture Department, is in India teaching the Indians how to get greater egg production from their own poultry. The last time I saw him he said, "I felt I had to go back to India and go on working there. They have so little, and we have so much." Now the poultry industry is talking of a scheme to control the production of eggs by licensing.

I would not try to destroy the C.E.M.A. plan if I had the chance, but I would try to make it work. I would try to find any inconsistencies in the plan, have them eliminated, and see what could be done to improve the plan. The principle of letting the producers decide their own future is an important one, and we should not have a bar of monopoly legislation in the egg industry. I think the Minister was wrong when he talked about having abuse heaped upon his head at a certain meeting. He was criticized, but he is in a position to be criticized for any decision he makes.

It was a well-conducted meeting; the statements were dignified; and there was nothing

of a Party political nature at the meeting. I received the same type of invitation as the Minister, and I attended the meeting. I said nothing at the meeting, nor was I asked to speak. I hope that in future discussions on the egg industry the producers' own opinions will be sought, and that the producers will once again be elected to their board and not arbitrarily have their terms extended in the undemocratic manner in which they were extended in the Bill last year.

The people in the country are anxious to see the Government's promises honoured. Many promises have been made in the last few years. I have heard the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) chide the former Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, on at least one occasion for not carrying out a promise.

Mr. Lawn: Did you say "on one occasion"?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On at least one occasion. I will not go into details. I have heard the honourable member saying that promises were not honoured, and that sort of thing. I might add that his accusations were disputed. I should like to remind honourable members of some of the headlines that have appeared in the press. These headlines do not necessarily present the actual words used, but if they are allowed to stand unrefuted then the person quoted must take some responsibility for them, particularly if they appear just before an election. One headline which received much publicity on Kangaroo Island and which was not refuted by the Government was: "Labor makes promise for island." That article dealt with abattoirs freight subsidies. After the election, not before it, the then Premier stated that he never said what was attributed to him.

Another headline, of words attributed to the Attorney-General, after the election, was: "Promise to cut Varsity fees will be honoured." Such an item was reported in two newspapers, but on being tackled about it later the Attorney said that he had been quoted incorrectly. Another headline, this time of words attributed to the Hon. Frank Walsh, was: "No Imperial honours would be recommended by the State Government." I am thankful to say that that has been reviewed and that one of our hardest working and most distinguished public servants (Mr. Seaman) has been honoured. Incidentally, I am sure every member of this House is happy to join in congratulating Mr. Seaman.

Mr. Lawn: Your Leader is always criticizing him.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: What about the Speaker?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am sure that we all congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on receiving your award. I am happy to support all the awards that have been made. I am merely saying what statements have appeared in the press. As I said, the Hon. Frank Walsh, when Premier, was reported as saying that no Imperial honours would be recommended by the State Government. Another report was as follows:

The Premier (Mr. Walsh) said last night he would like to see a referendum to determine hotel hours.

Mr. Lawn: I would like to see one to determine whether we should abolish the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Another headline stated: "£1,000,000 pipeline approved." The article went on to say:

Construction of a pipeline from Lock to Kimba on Eyre Peninsula at an estimated cost of £1,132,000 was approved yesterday by State Cabinet.

Another headline was: "Skyscraper Flat Plan Shelved." Incidentally, the headline about Kangaroo Island freight subsidies is interesting. In June, following the election, the following statement appeared in the local newspaper:

"The Government has not forgotten its promise to subsidize freight rates to Kangaroo Island," the Premier (Mr. Walsh) told Mr. Brookman in Parliament yesterday.

That was on June 24, 1965. On September 29, 1966, when naturally enough the people were beginning to get a bit interested, the following headline appeared: "No freight subsidy for island." The article went on to say:

The Kingscote District Council has been informed by the Premier (Mr. Walsh) that the Government is unable to provide a subsidy for Kangaroo Island.

That sort of thing is remembered by country people, who would like to see more action taken on promises that have been made. In fact, promises are still coming forward thick and fast. We have heard statements to the effect that the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, when Treasurer, over-committed the Loan Fund by making promises before finance was available. However, we now hear promises of schemes that are years away. Schemes for country sewerage, etc., which are being announced continually, are years from fruition. In 1962 the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) announced that his Government would subsidize an under-sea cable in order to enable the Electricity Trust to make extensions to Kangaroo Island at a normal cost to consumers

there. However, I received the following reply today from the Minister of Works:

The trust's programme for extensions on Kangaroo Island covers the various hundreds in the following order: Menzies, Dudley, MacGillivray-Haines, Cassini-Duncan, Seddon-Newlands, Gosse-Borda, and Ritchie-MacDonald. The work will extend over a number of years depending on the resources available to the trust and the programme of work in other parts of the State. Work will commence in the hundred of Menzies in the financial year 1967-68, but it is not possible at this stage to indicate a final completion date.

That having been first announced, I think, about five years ago, the towns have now been connected but not the country areas. I think it is time that more action was taken and fewer promises made. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): In rising to support the adoption of the Address in Reply, I point out that the Governor's Deputy, when opening the Parliamentary session on June 20, outlined a very comprehensive programme. The Speech gives a true picture of the situation in South Australia today, despite what the daily press tries to present to the public. As a result of distorted accounts appearing in the press, we now hear statements to the effect that the people are becoming used to that type of thing. Indeed, we frequently see statements made by the Opposition blown up into big headlines and Government statements appearing five or six pages back from the front page in print so small that one has difficulty in finding them. Even a recent announcement by the Premier that \$9,000,000 was coming into the State from one company received little prominence in one of our daily newspapers.

Mr. Curren: The morning paper!

Mr. BURDON: There is no need to mention its name, because members know what I am talking about. I congratulate the Premier on his election as our leader, following the Hon. Frank Walsh's retirement from that office. During the former Premier's term of office South Australia saw the Government implement many reforms that were denied the people of the State for many years. Most of those reforms originated from promises made at the last election campaign. In two years of office we have seen practically all the promises made by the Walsh Government come to fruition. During this debate on the Address in Reply, several Opposition speakers have dealt with the State's finances, with what the Government has and has not done. It is the duty and responsibility of the Opposition to criticize.

I do not deny it that, nor does any member of the Government deny it that right; but one thing we have not heard yet is any concrete proposal of just what members opposite would do if they were in a similar situation.

When I say that, I should like some members opposite to cast their minds back to two years ago when the former Treasurer introduced his first Budget and spoke on the State's finances. We do not have to go very far, because the new Treasurer the other day laid on the line fairly clearly what the position was in this State. The capital works programme approved by the Playford Government ran into many millions of dollars. We have only to go to the Treasury figures to see these things. These figures are produced by Treasury officers, employees of the State. It is not ethical for members of the Opposition to decry these figures presented by officers of the State.

Mr. Quirke: You have got it all wrong. They are not responsible for them—the Government is.

Mr. BURDON: Who prepares the Treasury figures and who decries them when they are prepared by these officers?

Mr. Quirke: The Government is responsible for the figures.

Mr. BURDON: I am well aware of that. The final responsibility is with the Government, but the responsibility is also there for the action of the Playford Government. If what I am saying is rubbish, let the honourable member come up with some sound, common-sense proposals to remedy the situation. No constructive proposals from the Opposition benches have so far come out of this debate. We are not blaming the officers of any Government department: all we are doing is saying that these officers were appointed not by the present Government but by previous Governments. This Government is proud to be associated with them.

Another matter on which I should like a few words is the Premier's Department, in which the Labor Government has created the Industries Assistance Branch. This branch has been most active. I personally have had discussions with its officers on several matters which I hope will eventually benefit the district of Mount Gambier, which I am proud to represent. In addition to these discussions, officers from the Industries Assistance Branch have paid many visits to small industries in my electoral district during the past 12 months with the sole object of assisting management with technical matters, overcoming production problems, laying out production lines and solving building problems.

May I state that all these services provided by the Industries Assistance Branch, whether they be in Mount Gambier, Peterborough or Port Lincoln, are provided free, with the sole object of assisting and encouraging industry to establish in country areas. The Premier has stated that it is intended to expand the Industries Development Branch. I commend the Premier for this. I point out that this branch was established by the previous Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) and was a big step forward from what had functioned previously under the Liberal Government. I do not intend to go into what existed in the past.

Mr. Lawn: The Premier and two typistes.

Mr. BURDON: I believe enough about this has already been printed in *Hansard*, and I do not intend to go over it again. Much has been said about what the Industries Development Branch has and has not done. During the past two years it has been associated with 21 new enterprises in South Australia. In addition, more than 60 firms in the State have engaged in expansion programmes costing over \$100,000; some multi-million dollar expansions have taken place. The major new industries and the expansions with which the Industries Development Branch has been associated include the Australian Ceramics Industries Ltd., Cresco Fertilizers Ltd., Chrysler Australia Ltd. (the Premier announced recently the \$9,000,000 project associated with this company), and Dehy Fodders (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.

Mr. McKee: It is strange that no mention has been made of this by members opposite.

Mr. BURDON: In the four or five speeches I have heard from members opposite, no reference has been made to these industries. Other industries with which the Industries Development Branch has been associated include Hill's Enterprises, Philips Electrical Pty. Ltd., Taubman's (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., Tolley, Scott & Tolley Ltd., and Woollana Industries Ltd. This branch has engineers and draughtsmen who provide technical assistance and advice to firms already established in South Australia or to firms considering establishing here. Also, significantly most of the efforts of the branch at present are devoted towards research in an endeavour to find suitable small industries for country areas.

Mr. Hughes: Some officers of the branch have gone out to assist industries in expanding.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, well over 20 visits have been made to small factories in my district.

Mr. McKee: No members opposite have asked for industries in their districts: that might upset their gerrymander.

Mr. BURDON: A significant feature of the Speech of the Governor's Deputy was the attention devoted by the Government to agriculture. In this connection, I wish to pay a tribute to the Minister of Agriculture for the work he has carried out in this State.

Mr. Coumbe: You'll get on!

Mr. BURDON: Never mind about that: I assure the honourable member that the Government will get on through the efforts of its Ministers. Wherever one goes one hears praise for the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Hughes: That applies also to the Minister of Education.

Mr. BURDON: It applies to all Ministers. Reference was also made in the Speech to the dairying industry, which is most important in my district. In fact, it is a significant contributor to the economics and prosperity of Mount Gambier. It has always been a vigorous industry; there are many cheese and butter factories in the district. The work of the Northfield research centre will ultimately benefit the dairying industry greatly. The improved laboratory facilities at Northfield and the resultant improved research techniques and research programmes will bring about improvements in calf husbandry. Also, there will be improvements in the quality of feed for dairy cattle and other measures to improve the quality of dairy herds. The dairying industry plays a big part in the prosperity of my district.

The number of students at the Roseworthy Agricultural College is 112, which I believe to be a record. The Government has vigorously carried out a programme of expansion at the college; science laboratories, a lecture room and a plant breeding centre are being built and will be ready for occupation in March, 1968.

Another matter of importance to country districts is the Government's decision to add a fourth year to the Roseworthy Diploma of

Agriculture course in 1968. Students will still be able to do the present three-year course, but those doing the fourth year will be awarded a new diploma—the Roseworthy Diploma of Agricultural Technology. This new diploma will provide training for those joining the extension services of the Agriculture Department and for those who plan to work as consultants to farm management advisory services. These services have made quite an impact on country people. The Government's decision will be accepted and appreciated by primary producers.

I was also pleased to hear references in His Excellency's Speech to afforestation in South Australia, and particularly to afforestation in the district with which I am proud to be associated. During the last planting season the Government planted about 6,300 acres, and over 10,000 acres is being planted annually in the South-East by the Government and private enterprise; these are record acreages. Since assuming office the Government has also purchased about 9,000 acres of new forest lands in various parts of the State, mostly in the South-East.

I take this opportunity to give some statistics of the radiata pine industry within a radius of 50 miles of the city of Mount Gambier. This area presents a concentration and integration unique in Australia, and it is an important and stable State economic asset. Employment is assured to many thousands and it is an ideal decentralization envied by other States. Government and private investment has produced large and expanding assets in forests and production plants not seen anywhere else in Australia. This situation is unlikely to be paralleled for many years. Some idea of the extent of these developments can be obtained from the following industry statistics:

<i>Item.</i>	<i>Particulars.</i>
Plantation area	200,000 acres.
Annual forest increment	more than 550,000,000 super feet (the trees are growing at the rate of about 150 tons an hour).
Planting programme	at least 10,000 acres a year.
Annual production of seedlings	12,000,000.
Forest land value	more than \$90,000,000.
Annual pulp log usage	80,000,000 super feet.
Annual sawmill log usage	250,000,000 super feet.
Value of plant, buildings, logging and fire equipment	\$57,000,000.
Annual production value	\$35,000,000.
Annual wages, salaries, etc.	\$12,000,000.
Total employment	about 6,000.
Annual paper output	more than 35,000 tons (this will increase substantially in the near future).
Annual production, moulded products	40,000,000 super feet.
Annual supply of wood fuel to the three regional power stations	90,000 tons.

I should be remiss if, in my brief remarks about the forestry industry, I did not mention that two of the most important aspects of the future must be the continuing programme of research from the soil to the finished product and of promotion of all the products, I could add (although I do not consider it necessary) that I hope that the officers of the department will continue their research and provide new techniques in the sawmilling industry each year and that there will be no lag in getting the latest equipment and no lag in promotion.

The industry depends on mass production of this type of machinery to run at an economic and properous production rate, because much timber is coming to this country from overseas and is being sold cheaply. I have been told that some wharves in Eastern States are stacked with imported timber. This State alone cannot overcome such a problem: it is a matter for the Commonwealth Government. Trade between various countries must be carried on. We know that there are at present differences about tariff protection in relation to certain items and that those differences are causing disruption in the present Commonwealth Government. I consider that the timber industry of this State, in both the Government and private sections, is as efficient as it is possible to get it. This is due to those engaged in both private industry and the Government service because many people have played a part in the major development of the timber industry in South-Eastern centres since the first major sawmill was established at Mount Burr in 1931. Although the first softwood mill was established at Moorak near Mount Gambier in 1904, in May, 1931, at Mount Burr, the first major step was begun to use South-Eastern softwoods.

In 1934 a young man, 34 years of age, arrived at Mount Burr to join the staff of the Woods and Forests Department; he retired in 1965, but continued in an advisory capacity to the industry until a few weeks ago. I refer to Keith Wallace Ingram, O.B.E., who dedicated his life to the development of the sawmilling side of the radiata pine industry; a man with foresight and ingenuity, who insisted on quality products; a man with a mission who realized the value of radiata pine in the early years. He was a firm but just administrator who can look back on 33 years of service to South Australia, and is a man of whom South Australia can be proud and to whom we owe our gratitude. His life was one of self-sacrifice to the industry he loved. Keith Ingram would be the first to acknowledge that he was assisted

M

in his work by many men who played a significant part in the history of the sawmilling industry and of the Woods and Forests Department. However, few would deny his inspiration. I served under him for 28 years, and echo the sentiments of many people who wish Mr. and Mrs Ingram a long and happy retirement.

Commonwealth taxation and probate are matters that will ultimately have a bearing on the future expansion of the softwoods industry in the South-East. It will be appreciated that returns are not obtained from forests on a yearly basis. After planting, commencing from the tenth year, four or five crops are harvested in the next 30 years. Recently, I spoke to a tree farmer from New Zealand who said that the legislation in that country greatly assisted tree-planting projects. Perhaps people are fortunate in that country, because there is one House of Parliament only. I am sorry that the member for Alexandra is not here, but I shall comment on that point later. Here the Commonwealth Government is a taxation authority as well as the State Government. I ask the Minister of Forests that every effort and opportunity is made and taken to create a situation that will encourage and enable people with land more suitable for tree farming than other agricultural pursuits to use it for that purpose for the benefit of the South-East, South Australia, and Australia generally, in view of the undoubted shortage of timber that will occur in this country in the next 20 or 30 years. I believe that the future of the South-East is linked with continued development and with the research ingenuity of individuals which we have had in the past so that this valuable product, a heritage of the people of the South-East and of the State, can be used to the full.

The figures I have given show that 90,000 tons of wood fuel is used in regional power stations in the South-East. I believe that ultimately much of this will be converted to chipped material, which will ultimately be converted into paper pulp. The Mount Burr sawmill is already proceeding with this scheme, and I have been informed that a private mill will soon be installing debarking equipment, and that one or two other major developments will be taking place in the South-East. As a result of the extension of working hours, not only will more houses be needed but more employment will be created. This is something we can confidently look forward to.

Since the Labor Government took office two years ago much attention has been paid to education in this State. Demands for higher

standards of education in this affluent 20th century have placed more responsibilities on the processes and methods of the Education Department than ever before, and they will continue to place heavy demands on the education systems of this country in the years to come. I see the member for Burra is shaking his head, but I say that that is the case.

Mr. Quirke: I was shaking my head to get rid of a fly, or possibly a Sirex wood wasp.

Mr. BURDON: I am glad the honourable member supports me in this, as he does in many other matters. Now that he has mentioned the Sirex wasp, I should say that it was only because of the vigilance of an employee on the wharves at Port Adelaide that half a dozen Sirex wasps were found. I hope they were destroyed, as it would be a tragedy to the State's forest economy if the wasps were to get into our forests. The free textbooks scheme for primary schoolchildren of the State, promised by the Labor Government when it came into office in 1965 and, earlier, in the policy speech, was put into effect this year. I have heard many complimentary remarks on the way in which the scheme was introduced, and I have also been informed by more than one head master that several days were saved because the books were on hand on the first day of the school year. Not only were the books distributed to Government primary schools, but also to the non-Government schools. I am happy to be associated with this scheme, which has also been extended to secondary students who are not financially able to buy books. I know that this move has been greatly appreciated by the vast majority of parents in this State. I am pleased to be associated with a Government that has introduced this plan.

Another matter in relation to schoolteachers concerns equal pay for equal work for women teachers. The first step in the Government's policy of equal pay to be spread over five years has been implemented. A combined promotion list for male and female employees has been established, in line with the wishes of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and in future any position open to both men and women will be offered to the person whose name first appears on the promotion list, irrespective of sex.

Another matter I want to briefly touch on concerns subsidies. About 12 months or so ago we heard severe criticism from many quarters, particularly from members of the Opposition, of the Government's policy in relation to subsidies. These subsidies were increased by 9.7

per cent in 1965-66 compared with 1.8 per cent in 1963-64 (the year before the Labor Government came to office) and 1.4 per cent for 1964-65. This year's estimate provides for \$499,000, plus \$100,000 of Loan money for capital projects, and this is an unprecedented increase of 20 per cent. The "fair allocation" scheme for subsidies introduced by the Government has been described by Mr. King, of the South Australian Public Schools Committees Association, as the best subsidy scheme operating among all the States in Australia. We also know the moves of the Government in relation to canteens. Canteens or canteen shells will be included in all future school buildings. There is also the subsidy in relation to swimming pools. These figures have been given by previous speakers, and there is no need for me to go into them.

I should like to say one or two things regarding education in Mount Gambier. I was very pleased to receive an intimation from the Minister of Education the other day that it was intended to proceed soon with work on the Mount Gambier High School. This school will be built for a total enrolment of 1,000 students, and its estimated cost is \$1,100,000. Not only that, but the Minister has also indicated that tenders will be called at about the same time for a school which I believe will cost about \$350,000. I believe that when these two schools are established my district will have a set-up of the best and most up-to-date schools in the State, and I think this is something of which Mount Gambier can be proud. I hope that these schemes come to fruition within the next 12 to 18 months.

We all know that when the present Government came to office it appointed a ninth Minister, whose duties ultimately were the control of the Lands Department. The control of this department and the Woods and Forests Department was for several months in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Bywaters), and I consider it was the effort put in by that Minister during those strenuous months that laid the foundations for the policy that has been pursued by this Government in the last two years. The principal measures taken by the State Government since March, 1965, include amendments to the Crown Lands Act in 1965 and in 1966. The objectives were to simplify the issue of titles where land was acquired by the Commonwealth and to ease the limitation on unimproved values. Following the amendment to the Crown Lands Act, no person may hold perpetual leasehold land of an area over 4,000 acres or of an unimproved value over

\$36,000. The acreage limitation will stimulate primary production by preventing the aggregation of large areas of land which, in many cases, is not properly utilized, and more Crown leasehold land will become available to smaller landholders and other people wishing to invest in land development.

The Government decided, soon after taking office, that it would not in future approve the granting of Crown land in this State as freehold, and that it would not permit the surrender of perpetual leases for grants in fee simple. Because of the increasing difficulty in administering Crown leaseholds, as a result of the limitations imposed by the Crown Lands Act, the Government decided to prohibit the transfer of perpetual leases, miscellaneous leases and agreements on agricultural lands to private companies.

In regard to the Pastoral Act, more security has been provided to occupiers of land, which was previously let on annual licences. That was implemented by the State Labor Government as a result of amending the Act. Leases have now been issued to cover certain lands in pastoral areas, which were previously let on annual licences, and for which no other form of tenure was available under the Act. It was recently announced by the Minister of Lands that the Government would open up certain large tracts of land adjacent to the Victorian border, extending as far north as Lameroo and Pinnaroo and as far south as Keith and Bordertown.

Mr. Nankivell: That's not a very good description; that area contains some developed land.

Mr. BURDON: That may be so; nevertheless, certain difficulties exist in relation to this land.

Mr. Nankivell: You can say that again!

Mr. BURDON: I hope this matter is proceeded with cautiously.

Mr. McKee: There's a fair demand for the land, I understand, despite what members have to say against it.

Mr. BURDON: Safely developed, the land will accommodate more people. I know that it will not be a cheap proposition, and that applicants for land will have to be screened thoroughly in relation to their suitability to work this type of country. However, credit must at least go to the Minister of Lands and departmental officers as a result of surveys and research projects, which have been undertaken, and which have led to the belief that the land can be brought into production. I hope that the scheme will eventually come to fruition and that

any doubts that may have been expressed about this matter will be resolved. The Government has undertaken projects concerning irrigation as well as a programme of research in relation to the vinegrowing areas of the State which could greatly benefit those areas, particularly the Barossa Valley.

I commend the Government also for establishing many wild life reserves in the State. It is necessary that the State reserve areas where the natural fauna and flora may be preserved for posterity, because, if some steps are not taken now, we may find in a year's time it is too late. This is happening all over the country: wherever we go we see the country being denuded. I compliment the Government on its action in preserving some natural fauna and flora and creating wildlife reserves. Otherwise, much of it would become extinct.

Much has been done by the Minister of Lands and all those associated with the problem of irrigation. There are valuable wine grape and citrus growing areas on the Murray River. The member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) will no doubt well and truly deal with this subject and the Government's programme. The people of Chaffey greatly appreciate what the Government has done for those areas and what it will continue to do in the years to come. I now turn to housing in my area. The Government has taken positive steps to provide more Housing Trust houses in the city of Mount Gambier. I thank the Government for the two contracts it has recently let for the building of houses in that area. More houses are being built there at present than have been built for several years.

Mr. Quirke: How many Housing Trust houses have you in Mount Gambier now?

Mr. BURDON: Approaching 1,500 or 1,600.

Mr. Quirke: I would be content with 12.

Mr. BURDON: This shows the development going on at Mount Gambier. Although we have these houses, there is still a fairly long waiting list of applicants coming into the district. The Housing Trust is doing its best to overcome the problems. I only hope it can see its way clear to increase its building programme in Mount Gambier still further, because housing is vital for the development of industry. Some private industry in the Mount Gambier area is interested in the provision of housing, because it is necessary and vital for a technician or a man taking a managerial position to have a house available, virtually on the spot. It is not possible in all cases, and there are difficulties with private firms, and even with the Government, in holding

specialized technical men who may be an asset to the industry in that area. I ask the Government whether it is possible to increase the number of houses being built in the Mount Gambier area. I am thankful for what is being done but should like a little more, if possible. In the last 12 months there has been a significant increase in housing in country areas. Last year, I believe the Government built about 1,100 houses in country areas. This year, that number has been increased substantially to about 1,700 houses. It is significant that the Government, through the Housing Trust, has provided this large number of extra houses in country areas. I know that these houses have been needed and that more are needed.

Over the years, many representations have been made to Parliament about the South-East railway service. On Saturday, July 1, a new time table will operate for the day service to the South-East between Adelaide and Mount Gambier and between Mount Gambier and Adelaide. I hope the people in country areas will appreciate the new times. The train will leave Mount Gambier at 7.50 a.m., arriving in Adelaide at 4.50 p.m., with a similar time table for the Adelaide to Mount Gambier service. This will enable people to arrive in either Adelaide or Mount Gambier in daylight, whereas before they arrived at 8 p.m. or 9 p.m. with the attendant disadvantages.

Strong representations have also been made to the Government regarding the provision of buffet facilities on the day train. I realize that on his recent trip overseas the Railways Commissioner examined the matter of buffet facilities on trains. I believe such facilities could be provided on the day train to Mount Gambier because similar facilities are now provided on New South Wales country services. This would be a worthy innovation for this State's country rail services. With a population of 17,000, Mount Gambier is second only to Whyalla as the largest country city in the State, and is a significant tourist centre. By providing buffet facilities on the day train, the Government would be doing a service to the South-East and to my district in particular.

I should also like to see more modern sleeping facilities on the South-East train. The present facilities are not the best. However, recently I travelled by train through Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia, and I slept just as well on the Adelaide to Mount Gambier train as I did on the famous Southern Aurora. Regarding tourism and rail services, I point out that Mount Gambier is the south-eastern gateway to South Australia. Modern

highways to the north, east, south and west of Mount Gambier will soon be completed. This will enhance the approach to other areas of South Australia through Mount Gambier from Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, and will be equally attractive to oversea visitors travelling through the States. I should like the Government, wherever possible, to grant subsidies to Government instrumentalities which are endeavouring to assist in the provision of more tourist amenities. For a considerable time the local corporation together with other interested bodies in Mount Gambier, has been promoting tourism and tree-planting schemes to enhance the beauty of the area, and I appeal to the Government to subsidize these measures generously.

There was one other matter on which I wanted to speak. I regret that the member for Alexandra, the former Minister of Agriculture is not present, because I want to finish up on a subject that is dear to him and me. Before the dinner adjournment we heard the honourable member talking about the Parliamentary system in Northern Ireland. Early in my speech I said that New Zealand was fortunate in having only one House of Parliament. I want to say to the member for Burra and to other members that the Legislative Council of this State has equal power to that of this House on all except financial matters. The Legislative Council cannot introduce financial matters but it can throw them out.

I could, if members wanted me to do so, easily describe what financial measures the Legislative Council has thrown out. I go on record—and others have also done this—as saying that the Legislative Council in this State is the last bastion of minority privilege remaining in a so-called democratic country. Few will deny this. The member for Alexandra refused to answer an interjection tonight as to whether he agreed that every person in this State should have the right to vote for members of the Legislative Council. He was non-committal; he did not answer.

Mr. Quirke: Do you think they should have the right to vote?

Mr. BURDON: I believe they should. Why shouldn't they have it? Do you agree with me?

Mr. Quirke: I just asked. There are many matters on which I do not agree with you.

Mr. BURDON: If it is democratic for members of the Opposition or members on this side or anyone in this country to vote in elections for the two Houses of Commonwealth Parliament and to be on one roll for Commonwealth

elections, why do members opposite deny the people of South Australia the privilege of being on one roll for elections for both Houses here?

Mr. Quirke: What is the document from which the honourable member is quoting?

Mr. BURDON: I cannot get any answers on these questions. The honourable member is not going to get anything from me, because he denies two-thirds of the people of this State a free vote at Legislative Council elections by the system that his Party has fostered in this State for many years. Why does his Party not let the people have the right to vote at Legislative Council elections if they are enrolled on the House of Assembly roll?

Mr. Nankivell: They have their democratic rights.

Mr. BURDON: The policy of the Opposition Party is to force the people to vote for the Senate, the House of Representatives and the House of Assembly but to refuse many of them the right to vote at Legislative Council elections. The House of Commons, the people's Parliament in Great Britain, was for many years dominated by the House of Lords. However, what power has the House of Lords today? It has more power than that to which it is entitled, but it can delay legislation for only 12 months. If it has been right for the mother of Parliaments to adopt this system, surely it is time the people of South Australia were given the democratic right to vote for Legislative Council elections by the use of one roll for both Houses.

Mr. Quirke: Compulsorily?

Mr. BURDON: Compulsorily. I know that the honourable member does not believe in compulsory voting for any election.

Mr. Quirke: Would you abolish the Legislative Council?

Mr. Clark: We would do that first if we could.

Mr. BURDON: New Zealand, all the States of Canada except one, and Queensland have only one House of Parliament.

Mr. Quirke: In the United States they threw out the Senate but brought it back.

Mr. BURDON: I am interested not in the abolition of the Legislative Council but in giving the people of South Australia their democratic right to vote. The House of Assembly roll, for which the people are enrolled, should be used for elections to both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Quirke: Do you believe in the abolition of the Legislative Council?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BURDON: The system in operation in this State denies about 66 per cent of the people a vote for Legislative Council elections.

Mr. Quirke: Do you believe in abolition of the Council? Of course you do.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members that the member for Mount Gambier is addressing the House.

Mr. BURDON: I saved my remarks about the Legislative Council in the hope that the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) might return, but it has not been possible to delay them for any longer. I believe that the Labor Government during its two years of office has carried out most of the promises made to the people of South Australia at the last election. The Government is often criticized for not doing this or that. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticize, but it is also its duty to be constructive. The Labor Government does not object to constructive criticism, because this can benefit the State. However, we have heard what seems to be a concerted effort from Opposition members to do their best in more ways than one to damage the image of South Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: Bunkum!

Mr. BURDON: It is the Opposition's policy to write down South Australia wherever and whenever it can. I have heard statements in my district concerning a \$20,000,000 deficit; I heard again that the deficit could be \$14,000,000 or \$15,000,000; I have heard figures about the Government's spending on the Railways Department and what the Commonwealth Government provided to this State to build roads.

Mr. Clark: Were these statements made by members of Parliament?

Mr. BURDON: Yes, by the Leader of the Opposition with relation to roads, and he was taken to task by the Royal Automobile Association. These remarks have been made and have been published throughout Australia. They have been made for political purposes, as the Opposition is doing what it can to damage the image of South Australia in the eyes of the people. However, a rebound is starting and will continue, because of these remarks, and it will react in favour of the Government. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 28, at 2 p.m.