

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 28, 1967.

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

QUESTIONS

TRANSPORT COMMISSION.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Social Welfare, as acting Leader of the Government in the absence of the Premier, say when it is expected that the Royal Commission on State Transport Services will present its report?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am unable to state a definite date. I understand that witnesses are still being called by the Commission. However, I shall try to find out from the Minister of Transport when it is likely to submit a report.

TAILEM BEND INDUSTRY.

Mr. BURDON: The Leader of the Opposition, during the Address in Reply debate yesterday, said that he had recently attended a meeting at Tailem Bend and had been asked a question by a person who was interested in decentralization. The Leader also said that he had been told that a certain industry had tried to establish a plant at Tailem Bend during the last 12 months but that the Highways Department would grant a lease for only 10 years, which was not a sufficient time. Has the Minister of Agriculture any comments on that matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I welcome the opportunity to speak about this matter, because I consider that yesterday the Leader of the Opposition did a great disservice not only to my district but to the State by referring to a remark allegedly made to him after a meeting he had attended on the previous evening. If the Leader had come to me, I could have told him of the position and thus avoided making this matter common knowledge. However, the matter having been raised in the House, I think I ought to say something about it, although I shall not reveal the identity of the firm concerned. The matter has nothing at all to do with the Highways Department: no letter was sent from that department. One of my constituents told me of the interest of an industry and, on approaching the firm, I was told that it was interested, but not at that moment. I understand that the firm wrote to the Lands Department and received a formal reply about how land could be made available to it.

This statement was circulated among people at Tailem Bend, because I heard it myself. I ascertained from the company what it had done, and informed its representatives that they should have spoken to me again. As negotiations have continued, and at present are at an advanced stage, it seems that this industry will be established at Tailem Bend. Beyond that I cannot say. I shall not divulge names for reasons best known to the company, because these details should not be revealed at present. I am concerned and amazed at what has been said here without the Leader trying to find out the true position.

STATE'S FINANCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, I asked the Treasurer whether, as the financial year was drawing to an end, as he was off to the Loan Council, and as the Budgetary Bills introduced had been assented to, he could say what items (and how much they comprised) had been transferred from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account to make the Budget look as though it had balanced. The honourable gentleman told me that a decision had been reached for the most part, I think he said, on this matter, but he was not then able to give the figures. In view of its great importance to the State and of the public interest in this matter, I have no doubt the honourable gentleman arranged for the figures to be available today for the information of members. They total, I think, about \$2,500,000. Can the acting Leader of the Government give the information as to the items and the amounts?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, I should have thought that this question, however important it might be, would have been reserved to await the return of the Treasurer, who is at present on an important mission concerning the affairs of this State. Also, senior officials of the Treasury Department have accompanied the Treasurer. If it had been left to me when I was Treasurer, my reply would have been that I would present these figures when I presented the Loan Estimates. Were I in that position today, that would still be my reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, a question. It follows the question I asked the acting Leader of the Government concerning sums that have been transferred from Revenue to Loan during the present financial year. You, Sir, will recall that I asked the Treasurer the same question yesterday. I did not receive an answer, but today the acting Leader of the Government

suggested that, if he were to make the decision, the information would be forthcoming during the Budget.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Loan!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Loan and the Budget, I think he said. These sums, however, are moneys disbursed during 1966-67, and have nothing to do with 1967-68. It has always been understood that the Auditor-General is an officer of Parliament and available to assist members. As Presiding Officer of this House and the guardian of members' rights and privileges, can you, Sir, say whether it is possible to apply to the Auditor-General for this information and, if it is, whether you can inform the House of the steps that need to be taken to apply to him?

The SPEAKER: I would need to examine the situation before giving an informed reply. I will do that, and let the honourable member have the answer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker, following your courteous and ready agreement to my request that you find out whether we can approach the Auditor-General on the question of the transfer from Revenue to Loan Account of moneys during this year. I point out that some question has been raised as to the propriety of what has been done and also that tomorrow will be the last sitting day of the House during the present financial year. In view of these important considerations, will you, Sir, do your best to let the House have a reply tomorrow?

The SPEAKER: I would appreciate it if members directing questions to the Speaker would give him notice. I know that that is the practice in other Parliaments. The Speaker is not expected to be an expert on law; nor does he have at his disposal information which comes within the ambit of Ministers. I am sure the honourable member will appreciate that. Also, I understand that any approach to the Auditor-General would be made through the Chief Secretary and not through the Speaker. As I promised the honourable member that I would have the matter examined, there will be no avoidable delay in replying.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. CASEY: The determination of the future of the railway line between Cockburn and Broken Hill is in the interests not only of Australia but of South Australia. It is a small section of line, about

30 to 40 miles, but its future should be finalized as soon as possible. Work on standardizing the section between Cockburn and Port Pirie is progressing satisfactorily, and the completed line is moving closer to Port Pirie every week. Unless the future of the line between Cockburn and Broken Hill is determined shortly, there will be a standard gauge line between Cockburn and Port Pirie and a 3ft. 6in. gauge line between Cockburn and Broken Hill, thus upsetting the transport system between the east and west of Australia. As I understand the Minister of Transport has been in touch with the authorities in other States that are connected with this project, will the acting Leader of the Government ascertain whether anything has been finalized on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: During my term as Premier I frequently took up this important matter with the Minister of Transport and top departmental officers. I have always considered a uniform gauge from east to west to be of the utmost importance. Unless the Commonwealth Government makes a decision soon, I foresee serious complications. I still hold my own views regarding a certain section of the line that has been in use for many years. Certain complications are associated with compensation, but at present I am not prepared to hazard a guess at the sum involved. I assure the honourable member that this Government has done everything in its power to present cases to the Commonwealth Government from time to time concerning this important project. I know that the Minister of Transport, who has made further representations to the Commonwealth Government, has not yet received a satisfactory answer. However, if any further information is available, I shall obtain a report from my colleague and let the honourable member have it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the acting Leader of the Government indicate what stage has been reached in negotiations between the Governments of the Commonwealth, South Australia, and New South Wales, and the Silverton Tramway Company concerning the completion of the standard gauge line from Port Pirie to Broken Hill? Has any final decision been reached about this important work, and in what manner are the negotiations being carried out?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Earlier, I indicated to the member for Frome the seriousness of this problem. This State has done everything possible in conference with

the Governments of New South Wales and the Commonwealth to solve it. Because of its importance, I made officers available from the Treasury Department to accompany the Minister of Transport and the Railways Commissioner. The Government is most anxious to solve the problem with the assistance of the Commonwealth Government. Certain offers have been made, and certain proposals about the railway services have been discussed in Broken Hill. The Commonwealth Government has to decide whether the old line should be retained or whether a line should be constructed on a new route, and I understand that a new route has been surveyed. However, because of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government we cannot obtain the desired unity, but when further information becomes available as a result of investigations it will be presented to Parliament.

UNDERGROUND RAILWAY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: There has recently been a reference in the press to an underground railway through the city of Adelaide. Can the acting Leader of the Government say whether this matter has been examined by the Minister of Transport or the Railways Department, and whether plans are being prepared?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not heard of any plans being prepared, but I am willing to ascertain from my colleague whether he has received information on this matter. In view of the way public transport is used today, it appears to me that more accommodation will be provided for the vehicles of motorists rather than an underground railway system. However, I will inquire for the honourable member.

SALISBURY SEWERAGE.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Social Welfare, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I asked last week regarding sewerage for the Salisbury Downs area?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has supplied the following report:

In February, 1967, the department examined the possibility of the laying of sewers in the more populous portion of Salisbury Downs. The scheme put forward would have provided for the western side of the Salisbury Highway, Kerry Street, Mayo Crescent, Foley Street, Down Crescent, Limerick Street, Kings Road from the Salisbury Highway to Leitrim Street, and Kildare Avenue.

It was found, however, that the return from rates was little over half of that which would be required for a scheme of this nature and in consequence it could not be recommended. The scheme would have provided for 75 existing or proposed houses and 108 vacant allotments. In view of the limited Loan funds available to the department, it is considered that the scheme should not be recommended until considerably more development occurs in the Salisbury Downs area. The District Council of Salisbury was informed of these findings earlier this year.

RIVERTON-SPALDING RAILWAY.

Mr. QUIRKE: As may be well known now, there is no rail passenger service between Riverton and Spalding. The service, discontinued because of the unsatisfactory condition of the track, was replaced with a bus service from Riverton to Jamestown. However, although that service is working well, the lack of a rail passenger service, coupled with the fact that the line is unable to carry heavy rail cars, acts somewhat to the detriment of Clare and the area beyond, extending to Spalding. When I raised the matter a long time ago I was told that there was no hope of laying new rails until the standardization of the line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie was undertaken, at which stage there might be sufficient rails available that would be suitable for use on the spur line to Spalding. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport ascertain whether any work has been undertaken on the railway line between Riverton and Spalding, in view of the statements made some years ago?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I could not agree more with the honourable member in regard to the time factor: indeed, I think he first raised this matter in about 1941. I shall be pleased to obtain from my colleague as much information as possible and will furnish a reply.

PORT PIRIE BERTH.

Mr. McKEE: Has the acting Leader of the Government a reply to the question I asked last week about the oil tanker berth at Port Pirie?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Director of Marine and Harbors has supplied the following information:

The essential work of providing an isolated oil berth at Port Pirie has been recommended by the Public Works Standing Committee at an estimated cost of \$1,938,000. However, the Loan allocation for harbour purposes for 1967-68 is insufficient to allow a start to be made on the project during the next financial year.

It is hoped that sufficient funds will be available in the year 1968-69 to enable the scheme to be started.

The retrenchment of the department's men engaged on the completion of the rebuilding of the smelters wharf is being done gradually and arrangements are being made as far as possible to have them absorbed by the Broken Hill Associated Smelters which is expanding its work force considerably in connection with the new slag treatment plant, etc.

BAKER'S RANGE DRAIN.

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question relates to the construction of the Baker's Range drain which is now progressing north of Drain M. Although the person who approached me may be a constituent of the Minister of Lands, I hope the Minister will understand that he approached me in my capacity as Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee that inquired into this work. The man in question, Mr. Harold McDonald, who owns section 4, hundred of Coles, has on his property a swamp of about 100 acres, known as Sheep Wash Swamp, from which Mr. McDonald irrigates 6,000 acres. At present, as the Baker's Range drain flows through Sheep Wash Swamp, he is able to take water from it whenever he chooses. He is most concerned about the proposed survey line of the new drain under construction. He has been unable to get any information from the South-Eastern Drainage Board as to precisely what it intends regarding Sheep Wash Swamp. The committee discussed with the Drainage Board the construction of a weir across the drain in order to enable Sheep Wash Swamp to be filled. Mr. McDonald seems to know nothing of this action. As this is a useful purpose to which surplus drainage waters can be put and as one of Mr. McDonald's neighbours (Mr. Rieger) is paying water rates in expectation of getting surplus water from Mr. McDonald, will the Minister of Lands take up immediately with the Drainage Board the whole question as to what it has in mind for the future of this area, because irrigation is an important use of drainage water and people in the area have substantial assets at stake?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do what the honourable member has requested. I entirely agree with him when he says that the water being drained off other areas should, if possible, be put to good use; that is perfectly sound. As the Land Settlement Committee evidently discussed with the Drainage Board ways and means of impounding this water, I shall be happy to have the matter investigated and to bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

SIREX WASP.

Mr. HURST: Can the Minister of Forests say what steps, if any, have been taken by his department to express the gratitude of the Government and the people of South Australia to members of the Waterside Workers Federation for their efficient detection of the Sirex wood wasp found in a cargo of timber, which detection permitted preventive measures to be taken to avoid the spread of the wasp into the pine timber industry of South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I noticed in a recent edition of the *Advertiser* that the Conservator of Forests had expressed his appreciation of the prompt action of the waterside worker who discovered the wasp in this timber. I thought it was only right that, as Minister of the department, I should write also (and I have written) to the Secretary of the Waterside Workers Federation, expressing the thanks of the Government for the prompt action of the waterside worker who discovered the wasp. It is wellknown, particularly in this House, that the Sirex wood wasp does much damage to pine plantations in the Eastern States (particularly Victoria and Tasmania), and that an extensive campaign is carried out to see that this wasp does not gain ground and, if possible, to reduce the ground it is now occupying. This Government contributes, I think, \$58,000 a year towards this eradication campaign or towards keeping the pest within certain limits. This campaign has been successful until now, but the possibility that the pest could cross the border has always been dreaded. If the pest had escaped through these channels, as it could have done, we would have had it right at our back door, which would have made the problem more difficult. Victoria and Tasmania, besides contributing their share of the campaign costs, spend much of their money in trying to preserve and protect their forests, so it can be appreciated that, if the pest came to South Australia, its eradication would be a severe hardship for the Woods and Forests Department and the Government. I consider that every honourable member would have praise for the waterside worker who made the observation. We often hear things not to their credit said about waterside workers, but this time I think we ought to offer our praise.

EGGS.

Mr. McANANEY: There has been misunderstanding about the hen levy and the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan

in connection with the payment of 5c in respect of the last six payments. I understand that that amount brings the levy to only \$1 a year. As we are about to commence another financial year, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the rate of levy for the coming year has been fixed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: There was concern and misunderstanding on the part of people who did not read correctly the letter from the Egg Board that stated that the levy would be 5c as from the start of the last six payments for this year. When that was explained, however, the people concerned realized that that amount brought the levy to \$1 over the 12 months. Recently it has been announced that as from July 1 the amount will be 4c for the present and that this amount will be reviewed later in the year.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister say when the next meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council will be held and what attitude he will take if the matter of the licensing of poultry keepers is discussed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Agricultural Council is to meet in Darwin on July 10 and 11. The attitude of the Government on licensing of poultry keepers will be determined after we hear any submissions placed before us.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say what levies are paid direct to the South Australian Egg Board by the producer at present?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will get that information for the honourable member.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The South Australian Egg Board is the collecting agent for the Commonwealth in this State in regard to the collection of levies under the Poultry Industry Levy Act. In this State, the levy applies in respect of hens in excess of 20 kept for commercial purposes. Can the Minister say whether all the other State egg boards base their C.E.M.A. levy collections on a minimum of 20 hens?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: To the best of my knowledge, that is so.

KESWICK INTERSECTION.

Mr. LANGLEY: On the Anzac Highway, which borders the Unley District, marked progress is being made with work on the new bridge. Traffic has been prevented from turning left from Greenhill Road and delays have resulted. This is because of action that is being taken to acquire land to enable traffic lights to be installed at the Goodwood Road

and Greenhill Road intersection. This is a busy intersection and, although the policeman who controls traffic each afternoon does an excellent job, the installation of traffic lights would make the intersection much safer. Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, say when traffic lights will be installed?

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

DRIVING LICENCE.

Mr. RODDA: One of my constituents (Mr. J. H. Holmes of Kalangadoo) conducts a mixed business. However, he suffered an attack of epilepsy on July 15 last and has been told by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles that his current driver's licence will not be renewed and, further, that he will not be able to obtain a licence for two years. I have a medical certificate from Dr. Dunn, of Penola, who says that he has been attending Mr. Holmes since he had this attack, and goes on to say:

I believe this to have been the only one in his life, that he has continued to take his anti-convulsive medication and has continued in good health since.

There were unusual circumstances associated with the fit, as Mr. Holmes had a fever and had been working unusually hard physically. He consulted Dr. R. H. C. Rischbieth, a neurophysician of Adelaide, who could find no signs pointing to likely continuation of the fits. Mr. Holmes includes in the reasons for the urgency of his obtaining a driver's licence the fact that, besides local carrying work to and from Mt. Gambier, he frequently has to make trips to Dimboola, in Victoria, with potatoes and to back load with produce. Mr. Holmes says that cancellation of his licence will affect his business and require him to have a relief driver. In all the circumstances, will the acting Leader of the Government take up the matter with the authorities in order to find out whether there is some way of overcoming the regulations that preclude this man from holding a licence for two years?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: During the period when I was Minister in charge of the Motor Vehicles Department, I always found the Registrar extremely considerate and on matters such as this, I think the Minister certainly would have been consulted by the Registrar before a decision was made. In addition, it has always been the practice to obtain assistance from the Commissioner of Police on such matters as this, if necessary.

If the honourable member gives me the documents he has and the relevant names and addresses, I shall place the matter before the Premier and his staff in order to find out whether the licence can be issued. The case will be considered in the best interests of all concerned.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Commonwealth Government's artificial limb-making section makes limbs for those requiring them as a result of service given to the Commonwealth, and this applies mostly to returned service personnel. The Commonwealth Government is prepared to make this facility available to civilians and, in addition, there are private limb makers in South Australia. Civilians in the unfortunate position of needing this service are grateful for the service available, but it is expensive, and they have to wait some time for limbs to be made. These aspects have been discussed previously with the appropriate Commonwealth Minister, and will be taken up again. I understood that artificial limbs were made for civilians at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but this practice had been discontinued. Will the Minister of Social Welfare obtain a report from the Minister of Health on this matter, and ascertain particularly why limb making was discontinued at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes. I understand that, before the limb-making section was transferred to the Repatriation Hospital at Daw Park, it had been located at the Repatriation Department in Pulteney Street, and that many civilians were treated at this centre. However, in view of this question I shall ask my colleague for a report.

STRATHMONT CENTRE.

Mr. COUMBE: Last session several questions were asked by Opposition members concerning the building of the Strathmont Rehabilitation Centre under the Mental Health Services of this State. The answers given indicated that this centre was being re-designed. Will the Minister of Social Welfare ask the Minister of Health what stage this project has reached, whether a new design is planned, and, if it is, whether this means that the matter will be referred to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, I will. This is a big project, the total estimated cost of which is about \$6,000,000, and I have every reason to believe that it will be

included in the 1967-68 works programme. However, I will obtain further information for the honourable member.

PESTICIDES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: My question concerns the use of pesticides which is reaching great proportions in all parts of the Commonwealth and in countries overseas. Some people have suggested that their use is becoming too widespread because they are being used to such an extent that the soil could be damaged. It is believed that pesticides residing in the soil become absorbed by plants and that this could endanger the health not only of animals but of human beings as well. Of course, this is a colossal study that requires much attention by experts in this field. Agriculture generally is faced with this problem and, unless pesticides are available, it is felt that maximum crops cannot be obtained. I refer particularly to D.D.T. It has been reliably reported to me that men in Antarctica have found seals with a residue of D.D.T. in their bodies, which would indicate its flow from the rivers of Australia, Africa or South America to the sea and thence to the South Pole. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any officers of the department have considered this problem and whether they have been in touch with the scientists of the Commonwealth Scientific and Research Organization concerning it? Further, does he think any inquiries should be made in this regard?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This question has been raised at every Agricultural Council meeting I have attended, and much discussion has always taken place on this subject. A committee, set up by the department and the C.S.I.R.O., brings down reports and recommendations from time to time, and I shall refer the honourable member's statement to the department for reference to that committee. I will endeavour to get a reply as quickly as possible.

GAS.

Mr. McANANEY: My question concerns the Gidgealpa gas pipeline. Legislation dealing with it was considered urgent in the March session and there was a rush to get the Bill through. However, I was perturbed to hear yesterday, during Question Time, that the date for the commencement of work could not be fixed until agreement had been reached between the company and the consumers. Will the acting Leader of the Government say

whether the Government is confident that the gas can be sold at an economic price and whether there is any reason why work on this pipeline should not proceed immediately, because it is so urgently needed by the State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I remind the honourable member that this House completely agreed that there should be no expenditure of public money on the installation of this pipeline until all matters having an economic bearing on the interests of this State had been investigated and made known to the Government. I have nothing to hide on this matter. Any further investigations into the route of this pipeline will be concerned with the finances of the State. It was considered that it would be more expensive if a single 18in. pipeline were constructed on the western route. If the use of the gas is to be economical for this State, as I expect it to be, we will have to duplicate the pipeline, and I am sure there will never be sufficient demand in the major industries on Eyre Peninsula for two 18in. gas pipelines to go on the western side of the ranges.

Two proposals have been submitted since the last conference I had at least a month ago with representatives of both the companies concerned: the Delhi organization and Santos. However, the headquarters of the Delhi organization are in Dallas (Texas)—far away. These people are examining proposals submitted regarding the economic value of this gas field. Undoubtedly, the information given yesterday is correct. I have never doubted the quantities of gas available. Although Parliament passed the legislation concerning the pipeline, the use of the gas would still depend on the economic values to this State. If we can produce electricity at a price lower than that of natural gas, surely I should not be asked to spend over \$40,000,000 on an uneconomic proposition. The proposals that have been submitted to the companies concerned are economical from South Australia's point of view, and they will give a return to the people who have invested their money in this project. We do not deny that, but we will not see them get rich overnight. Indeed, I do not think that they want that. However, the sooner gas is obtained, the sooner a return will be made; in other words, the sooner gas is delivered, the sooner industry will be able to use it and obtain a dividend. Until the propositions, which at present are confidential, are agreed to, we can do nothing but await word from the companies.

RENMARK SEEPAGE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday I asked a question of the Minister of Works concerning evaporation plans for the Upper Murray irrigation settlements. I believe that, in the absence of the Minister of Works, the appropriate Minister in regard to this matter is the Minister of Agriculture. I refer to the press report concerning the proposal to establish an evaporation pond on an island in the river which to me (without knowing the precise locality) indicates that the island is very near the river itself. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Mines Department will be asked for a report on the holding capacity of the ground concerned or whether, in fact, such a report has been obtained? I believe that much seepage would occur in the case of a pond on an island in the river itself. Will the Minister ascertain whether the Mines Department believes that such a pond would not result in seepage into the river (not necessarily breaking the banks), which would be just as disastrous to the lower settlements as though the pond actually broke (as was previously the case)?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be happy to take up this matter with the Minister of Mines. I point out that, as several Ministers are probably involved in some way in this issue, it would be a matter for discussion in Cabinet. Indeed, following the honourable member's remarks Cabinet will discuss it.

CADELL IRRIGATION.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last year the Minister of Irrigation was good enough to authorize certain rehabilitation work at the Cadell irrigation settlement. As the work is almost completed, will the Minister ascertain from his department the precise date of completion?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that. Indeed, I am pleased that the work is almost completed.

POTATOES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been approached by Mr. Noel Keen, who is the Manager of Taillem Fruit Supply (a company having a potato-washing licence), concerning the supplies that have been directed by the Potato Board to his company for washing. He complains that the supplies are insufficient and he believes they are not a fair proportion of the total supplies coming forward through the board. Will the Minister of Agriculture

investigate this matter with a view to ensuring that the distribution of potatoes for washing is fair and equitable to all holders of washing licences?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

TEACHERS' INSURANCE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Some time ago I was approached by an insurance company that specializes in a form of cover for school-teachers, making up, I understand, a gap in their entitlement under workmen's compensation. The company was anxious that the premiums payable under policies taken out by school-teachers should be deducted from the salary cheques of those concerned. Inquiries were made of the Minister's department, and it was found that this was physically possible: there was room on the computer (I think that is the phrase that has been mentioned to me) but permission had not been given. I understand that permission has to be given by the Government or Cabinet before this arrangement can be entered into, and it has not yet been given, although it has been requested. I have now been handed a letter from the South Australian Institute of Teachers supporting the scheme as well as the request. The short letter states:

Your letter of April 11 concerning your proposed insurance plan for teachers was discussed at our last executive meeting. I am directed to advise you that we can see no objection to the premiums being paid by fortnightly deductions from the Education Department providing you are able to obtain the necessary approval from the Chief Secretary's Department.

As this seems to be a most desirable form of insurance (in any case, for those who want to take it out), and as it would be of assistance to teachers if deductions could be made from their salary cheques, will the Minister of Education raise the matter with the Chief Secretary with a view to granting the necessary permission?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will do that. I cannot recollect having seen any correspondence on this matter. Therefore, if the honourable member has anything that could be of assistance in this direction, I should be pleased to receive it.

HOLDEN HILL SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: On August 5, 1966, in answer to a question in this House, the Minister of Works informed me that Graham Avenue, Malcolm Avenue, portion of The Parade and portion of Southern Terrace were

not included in the approved original sewerage scheme at Holden Hill because there was insufficient development in the area. At that time this applied to Graham Avenue and to the part of The Parade between Graham Avenue and the Parkway. The section of The Parade between Graham Avenue and Malcolm Avenue drains to Southern Terrace through a Housing Trust subdivision on section 2058, to Lyons Road. Apparently this area was also going to be considered when sufficient development had taken place, including building on the Housing Trust subdivision. As the Housing Trust has commenced building 63 houses on this subdivision, will the acting Leader of the Government ask the Minister of Works to request the Engineering and Water Supply Department to review the possibility of providing sewerage in these streets?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes. In view of the added information that now seems to be available, I have every reason to believe that a good case can be presented on this matter.

EAST END MARKET.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Legislation was passed last session to enable the Minister of Agriculture to fix the precincts of the East End Market and the time of commencement of the wholesale market. Can the Minister say whether he has been able to consider this legislation and whether it is intended to issue regulations in connection with it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, I have considered the matter. I have had discussions with members of the committee established at the East End Market (including some of the people who have stands in the market) and with the Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association. Also, I have had some further discussions on this matter with the Chief Horticulturist. In fact, tomorrow someone is coming to see me about an associated matter. I believe regulations will probably be brought down during July.

WINNS ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On several occasions I have asked the Minister of Roads, through the Minister of Lands, about the plans of the Highways Department regarding Winns Road at Blackwood. This a picturesque road, but it has been persistently rumoured that it is to be turned into some sort of main artery into the Coromandel Valley. Recently I have been calling from door to door in that road,

and have found that much perturbation still exists about the rumours even though, on the last application I made to the Minister, any definite plans were denied. Will the Minister be kind enough to take up this matter again with his colleague to see whether any definite decision has yet been made on the route that this road will eventually take?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know how definite we have to be for the honourable member, but we shall be as definite as possible with the next answer.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Giles Point Bulk Loading Facilities
(Report No. 2),
Murray Bridge to Hahndorf Pipeline.

Ordered that reports be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 27. Page 177.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the motion, and once again express my loyalty to the Queen and the Royal family. I trust and hope that Her Majesty's representative in South Australia will soon be restored to health and will be able to carry out his functions in his usual capable and efficient manner. I take this opportunity also to congratulate the retiring Premier on his two years in office. He always treated me, as a district member, courteously and replied efficiently to all the questions I asked.

I wish to examine a few of the things I said when I spoke in the Address in Reply debate after the Government first came into office. One thing I said was that it paid to advertise but that the goods had to be delivered. Already I believe the Government has failed to carry out fully its election promises, and it has not maintained the development in South Australia that it should have. On that previous occasion I also said that the barometer of a Government's success or failure was the employment rate, and we know that, from having equally the highest rate of employment in Australia, South Australia now has the second highest percentage of unemployed in Australia. In the two years the Government has been in office, the increase

in employment has been only 6,400 a year whereas, in the four years before that, the increase in employment was 11,000 a year.

Mr. Freebairn: How many of the unemployed have gone to other States?

Mr. McANANEY: I will come to that later. It is rather tragic to see what is happening to our population.

Mr. McKee: What age group would that be?

Mr. McANANEY: I will give some figures later for the edification of the member for Port Pirie. However, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will continue in my usual undisturbed way and try to convince members opposite of the merit of my remarks. I assure them that any figures I quote have been supplied by qualified statisticians, and I guarantee that they are correct. During the 1965 Address in Reply debate, I said I had travelled in Germany in 1934 when that country had a Minister of Propaganda. I further said that if the public relations officers appointed here performed certain functions they could be of benefit to South Australia as a whole, but that if they became sellers of a dubious Government policy their work would not be in the best interests of the State. The Government has tried to switch funds from one account to another and, as yet, I still do not understand whether that is legal. However, it is contrary to rudimentary book-keeping principles.

I promised the member for Millicent that I would tell him about the rash promises that I had said the Government had made. Perhaps the most rash statement was "Live better with Labor", because although the average weekly wage in South Australia in March, 1965, was \$50.10 the Australian average was \$52.20. Although the Australian average in December, 1966, was \$62.30, the South Australian average was \$57.80. Living better with Labor means having a deficiency of \$4.50 in regard to the average wage and having an additional 1 per cent of the population out of employment? The position is even worse than is revealed by the deterioration of \$2.40 in less than two years. The Government goes quietly about these things.

Mr. McKee: We cannot understand you.

Mr. McANANEY: I have found it hard to convince the Government of anything in the four years I have been a member. In addition to the wage disadvantage, we have additional service charges and increased taxation. The Premier said that, because of price control, it did not matter if this was

a low-wage State. However, the South Australian index of prices has gone up by 7.8, whereas the Australian average has gone up by only 7.7. Prices in South Australia have increased, and in the last six months of last year the cost of living increase of 80c has been exceeded only by Western Australia, which has a boom and will have difficulty if it does not control that boom.

Plumbing charges were recently increased and a representative of the Housewives Association said that the charges were too high. That was one of the association's biggest complaints, but the increase was approved by the price control authorities. The Secretary of the carpenters and joiners association said that building materials ought to be brought under price control because their cost was too high. However, these items were already under price control. Most of the complaints about prices are made in relation to items that are already controlled. The general protest of the community is really against the increasing cost level, which cannot be dealt with by price control. It is an inflationary trend caused by actions of the Government and arbitration courts.

Increased charges are warranted sometimes, but this Government increased harbour fees at a time when the then Harbors Board was making substantial profits. Such actions as that cause inflation. I have often spoken against price control, because I think it is an inefficient way of dealing with the problem. However, I should support legislation introduced on a State level to control certain restrictive trade practices. I believe in free enterprise but, if persons engaged in free enterprise band together to create a monopoly, progress cannot be made.

I objected when this Government wanted to hand power holus bolus to the Commonwealth when the Commonwealth Minister said that he had sufficient power to enable him to deal with the matter. However, we may be able to introduce legislation at the State level to control restrictive practices that are against Liberal principles. The Minister has said that the lower regions of the Murray River and the area around Lake Alexandrina are to be brought under control at the water's edge. I think that is a good move. Because South Australia is short of water, the quantity available should be used for the best purposes. I did not agree with the statement made by the Hon. Frank Walsh, when he was Premier, that he would not allow this water to be used for cattle or sheep. The

position may be different in 10 years or 20 years, when we need these other commodities, but our surplus production of butter and other commodities can be sold overseas only at substantial losses and I do not think substantial preference should apply when wool and meat can be sold overseas at a profit.

I am pleased that private enterprise is carrying out substantial drainage work at Wellington. I think 150 acres is comprised in one area and now a large area across the river in the district of the member for Murray is to be drained. Such development around the lake must be encouraged, because large areas of shallow water can be drained and made productive. The Jervois area contains some of the most productive land in the world. At present, sufficient water to irrigate the land is lost by evaporation. I hope that, when the Murray River to Hahndorf scheme comes into operation in the early 1970's, a water supply scheme will be provided for Hartley and Callington. These places, although close to water, are still without an adequate supply.

I support the statements by the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) about forests. He tried hard to make much of the Government's achievements and he battled to prove something that could not be proved. Much land in the South-East, in my district and in other areas could best be used for forestry. Recently, I visited the South-East and was impressed by the efficiency of the Government mill at Nangwarry and of the softwoods mill at Mount Gambier. Whether controlled by the Government or private enterprise, the forestry industry must be encouraged because of its future potential. I disagree with the opinion of the member for Mount Gambier about freeholding of land.

People without experience of farming do not appreciate the feeling of security of a person holding freehold land. Today, machinery must be used for farming, and economic production is possible only on a farm of reasonable size. It is impossible for an inexperienced person to determine the carrying capacity or the potential of a particular property. Members of the Land Settlement Committee are learned gentlemen, but they refused an application from a person in my district after a departmental officer had assessed the property's carrying capacity. The owner of that land today is carrying double the number of cows that was assessed by this officer. The member for Wallaroo spoke about the benefits to

producers from the actions of the Labor Government, but he did not say what actions had been taken.

Bulk handling of grain is controlled by an efficient board. The Government has guaranteed bank advances without which the board could not operate, but it is efficient because most of its members are primary producers. They may not be skilled administrators, but they make use of experts in their field, and few complaints have been made about this board. On boards with a conglomeration of merchant representatives, trade unionists, farmers, and others, a conflict between the various interests is always present. This kind of board becomes negative and is usually unsuccessful. The Potato Board is a good example of this mixture, although it has improved its methods in the last few years, and it may become a full marketing board in the future. Boards work efficiently if three of the members are administrators and not connected with the land. However, the abattoirs board is a mixed group with more functions than any similar board in Australia, so that its expenses are high. Last year abattoir charges were increased, and I have been told by wholesalers that they can buy sheep in South Australia at certain times, transport them to Melbourne, and bring back the carcasses, rather than have the animals killed here. Any decrease in the throughput at the Adelaide abattoirs will mean further losses.

I believe in orderly marketing schemes, but there must be improved administration by some of the boards. The Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan has some merit, but it is not a true stabilization scheme. As production increases, the hen tax increases and the grower receives less, so that ultimately the plan will defeat its own ends. Much thought has been given to improving this scheme for the benefit of producers and consumers. Agriculture was a feature of the Governor's Deputy's Speech, but substantial contributions by growers for research have been responsible for many developments. I do not want to run down the value of agricultural advisers, because they are of tremendous benefit to the community. However, it annoys me when somebody who has no knowledge on the subject says that this is the only way to increase development. I have had 30 years' experience on the land. I started off knowing nothing and although some members will probably say I know as little now, at least I have been able to run a farm successfully. Most

of the new ideas come from the farmers themselves. If they find out that machinery is not working properly or that things are not going well, they develop a new idea and tell the machinery companies what they want. True, machinery has made farming much easier. In fact, we would not have been able to carry on if we had not had machinery. Sometimes it is stated in our press headlines that the Agriculture Department has discovered a new method, whereas the farmers have practised it for 10 years. I am not running down the value to the community of the department, but it makes me hostile when people with no agricultural experience say that this other group has made most of the discoveries.

It has been stated that agriculture is the only section of the community that gets its service subsidized in some way, but much of the agricultural budget goes to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. Secondary industry is also subsidized through the university. All the engineers and trained men come from the universities, and people attending the university pay only 10 per cent of their fees, the State Government subsidizing the remaining 90 per cent. The Government also provides all this technical knowledge to secondary industry, and agriculture receives no favourable consideration in this direction. We continually hear about inefficiency in primary production, and lately the dairying industry has been singled out. However, an international survey shows that, in relation to the earning power of the average worker, the retail prices of butter and cheese in Australia are the lowest in the world, with the price of milk being fourth lowest. A comparison shows that Australia has the best figures in respect of butter and cheese production, and that it is fifth in milk production.

From these figures it can be seen that Australia's primary production is efficient. It is only these inflated internal costs that make it difficult for us to export on the world's market. The price of labour is increased by the court according to the gross national product, whereas, in fixing the price for primary production, if a producer becomes more efficient and produces more bushels of wheat to the acre, the price of the product is reduced. The same thing occurs in the Adelaide Hills when the output of the cow is increased substantially. However, despite rising costs, the price of milk has not been increased, because this increase in production cuts it out. I am not biased about agriculture, but we have to face up to these facts.

I congratulate Mr. Dunstan on his election as Premier of this State and wish him every success, but I believe that, in taking on as many portfolios as he has taken on, he will not be able to carry out all the duties attached thereto. It will not be possible for him to keep in close touch—

Mr. Hurst: But he has a greater capacity than you.

Mr. McANANEY: —with his departments. I have already heard it said that he will become a rubber stamp to the decisions of his department. This is a criticism of the present Government that we have heard for some time. If the Premier has not got enough confidence in his other Ministers to farm out some of his portfolios, then he should ask Parliament to appoint an additional Minister.

Since I have been in Parliament I have gained a greater admiration for our civil servants than I had before. Generally speaking, they are courteous, efficient and expert in many fields. However, an expert is not necessarily the best person when it comes to making a decision in the national interest. It needs somebody with great outside experience, and the Minister must finally make the decision after considering what is in the best interests of the State. If he has too many portfolios, however, he cannot do his work efficiently.

This Government is bogged down with the number of committees it has constituted. We continually see the appointment of committees and, although sometimes we get a report from one of them, generally nothing more is heard of that report: it just becomes a docket in a pigeonhole and we see no results from it. I was amazed to see that, although the Department of Social Welfare has been conducting an inquiry for the last 18 months, it has not yet given a decision. I think it was on the first night in May when the Premier was in office that he said the social service payments had been brought up to the level of interstate rates. Within a month, however, he said that they were far above those of other States and that the rates in other States were dreadful. Another time he told us that the rates had not been altered. Further, many of the committees have failed to come up with anything concrete. For instance, a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the fishing industry, but many of these decisions could have been made by the Minister pursuant to regulation, in which case we would have seen something effective now rather than let the committee go on for a long while.

The new Premier has tried to blame the Commonwealth Government for the State's present position. He mentioned the amount planned to be spent in this State by the Commonwealth Minister for Works and said it was only \$5,300,000 or 6 per cent of the Commonwealth expenditure of \$89,000,000. Yet, he entirely overlooked the fact that the Commonwealth Department of Supply was spending much money in South Australia. If there is any doubt about this information, I assure members that it was supplied by the Commonwealth Minister for Supply to the Hon. G. Whitlam, Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament. At least, he leads some of the factions; I do not think they are all with him. However, in the same year the Department of Supply spent \$45,000,000 in South Australia, or 25 per cent of the total. Even adding the figures together, \$50,000,000 (or over 18 per cent) of the total of \$270,000,000 has been spent in South Australia. Is that neglecting this State, when our population is only 9.3 per cent of the total? For the five years before the last census was taken South Australia's population was subjected to the second highest rate of growth in the Commonwealth. However, during the last six months we have been losing our population even faster than the Tasmanian Labor Government was losing it in that State.

Between January 31 and April 30 we lost 2,000 electors. In reply to the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), who asked whether those people comprised adults or younger people, I point out that as they are electors they must be at least 21 and that they probably represent some of our most experienced workers. The Premier goes to Canberra optimistically thinking that he will obtain more taxation reimbursement, but I point out that one of the factors determining that matter is the increase in population. Last year, because of a drop in population in South Australia, the former Premier recorded the second lowest increase of any of the States. This time I expect that we shall receive the lowest or at least the second lowest increase again.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: He should have taken you with him.

Mr. McANANEY: I have become so fed up with this Government's efforts over the last two years that I doubt whether even a financial genius (which I do not claim to be) could convince the Commonwealth otherwise.

Mr. Freebairn: Do you think the building workers will return to South Australia?

Mr. McANANEY: I think it will take some effort to swing the pendulum again. I read that during the Address in Reply debate last year the member for Port Pirie said he was going to get 200 or 300 more men in this industry and 100 more in that industry. However, I notice from the electoral figures that I have that, despite the fact that I have helped give the honourable member a totalizator agency board, and dog racing, etc., he has fewer electors than he had in the previous year. I am sure the honourable member must be a disappointed man. The Premier is going to try to have the Commonwealth Government agree to a reduction in sales tax on cars. The Minister of Education suggested that I ought to have gone with the Premier, but I would have to place my tongue in my cheek when increasing the stamp duty in respect of hire purchase agreements which would considerably affect motor car purchases, especially when the industry is not doing as well as it might be.

The Hon. J. D. Coreoran: How would you approach this problem if you were Premier?

Mr. McANANEY: In the first place, I would plan ahead and not get myself into a mess. I think I said only recently that South Australia was going along very well until the Government increased its first lot of taxes in the November or December of its first year of office which destroyed the people's confidence. The Government built up about \$5,000,000 credit in the Budget and took money out of circulation which started an upsurge in unemployment.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you know that our State taxation is the lowest per capita in the Commonwealth?

Mr. McANANEY: For two years we have been telling the Government that that was what made South Australia great: the fact that taxation was low made us the most progressive State. But how many times has the ex-Premier said that we have to raise taxation to the level of the other States in order to progress?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Give us the figures!

Mr. McANANEY: Members of the Government have said the figures are the lowest. The former Premier used to boast about how he was making us progress. "Increase taxation to the level of the other States!" It then comes out in the *Sunday Mail* the other day that we have to keep our costs down. I have been quoting statistics from a book, but the Minister of Education has now handed

me a letter that someone has written to the press. Who is this authority? The letter is signed by J. Ryan; is it our beloved colleague?

Mr. Hughes: Read it out!

Mr. Ryan: Yes, and I'll tell you whether I wrote it.

Mr. McAnaney: Does the honourable member live at Selth Street, Albert Park?

Mr. Ryan: That is in the District of Semaphore, and I reside in the district I represent—Port Adelaide.

Mr. McANANEY: The letter, which at least was written by a person with the same name as that of the member for Port Adelaide, states:

"Get Lost" (17/6/67), who complains that we in South Australia are more heavily burdened with taxes than other States, mentioned the increase in State land tax. Perhaps it is not convenient to remember the 1960-61 review, which was before the present Government came to power. This increase was in excess of 100 per cent.

Surely, members of the Government know the reasons for that; that was based on an assessment of the increased value of land, and the general business activity at that stage in South Australia was considerably better than it is at present. Assessments would have risen during that quinquennium, and more land tax would have been obtained. Although I was not a member of Parliament then, I believe there were one or two adjustments down in land tax rates at the time. However, the Labor Government increased the rate of tax twice in two years.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Read all of the letter!

Mr. McANANEY: We have apparently had a 100 per cent victory, judging by the silence of members on the other side. The letter continues:

I would like him to study the figures published in the *Advertiser* recently of the Federal tax for 1966.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The *Advertiser* must be right, you know.

Mr. McANANEY: I have never said that in the House. The letter stated further that Australians paid \$412.88, an increase of \$31 a head over the 1965 figure. The State taxes were: South Australia, \$36.68, New South Wales, \$50.86, and so on.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Read the rest.

Mr. McANANEY: Very well. They were as follows: Queensland, \$41.35, Victoria, \$52.96, and Western Australia, \$42.40. It is difficult to compare figures for the various States

because, in preparing Budgets, the States use different systems of bookkeeping, although the forms used in other States are fairly accurate and are not similar to the system of juggling that we have seen in South Australia in recent months. For example, in Victoria a board deals with waterworks, and its finances do not appear in the overall figures. Therefore, it is difficult to analyse figures for the different States. To make a comparison, I would have to really analyse my book of statistics.

Mr. Ryan: You could give us the figures in the Address in Reply debate next year.

Mr. McANANEY: On reading again what I have said in the past two years, I should think that I have said enough to convince members opposite about what they should do. However, apparently I have not convinced them as yet, and I will have to recapitulate.

There should be some electoral reform in South Australia. In 1965, the Labor Government introduced a Bill which provided for country and city areas and which, if passed, would have already resulted in a gerrymander. In the past two years, the number of electors in the so-called country area has increased by 19,000, which would mean an increase of 737 in the country quota. The increase in electors in the so-called city area has been only 9,260.

Mr. Broomhill: Where did you get those figures?

Mr. McANANEY: They are from the Electoral Office; I did not get them from the press.

Mr. Broomhill: What date are they?

Mr. McANANEY: They are for up to April 30 this year. The increase in the so-called city area would mean an increase in the quota of 309. In the two years, that would mean that the country quota had increased by 428 more than the city quota. Therefore, it would not have taken long for the country quota to exceed the city quota, and there would have been a real gerrymander. The Bill introduced by the Government also provided for 56 members for this House. The people of Australia recently indicated that they did not desire an increase in the numbers of members of Parliament. However, I believe we should have a small increase, although an increase to 56 members is entirely unnecessary. I do not believe the Bill introduced by the Government was a good Bill and it would certainly not be wise for the Government to fight an election on its provisions.

I now wish to deal with the announcement that four weeks' annual leave will be provided to public servants in this State. I should like to

have six months' holiday a year! When the essential needs of people have been satisfied, that is the time to introduce shorter hours. However, it is inopportune at present to increase annual leave for public servants because the Government has admitted it is broke; it is asking for an increase in tax reimbursement and for other money. A recent Gallup poll (the results of which were published in the *Advertiser*) shows what the people really want. In this poll the majority said they wanted more hospitals and medical services. These will not be obtained by giving people an extra week's holiday. The order of preference then went as follows: education, pensions, prices, Vietnam, housing, wages, unemployment, and, last of all, working hours. I believe the people of Australia are prepared to work to obtain additional necessities. Many people take on extra jobs over the weekend or during their holidays so that they can provide more of the necessities of life. Therefore, I believe the introduction of an extra week's leave is a retrograde step, introduced as a possible vote catcher. It is not in the interests of the community as a whole.

I believe that I have shown that the Government's record over the last two years has not been good. Recently I had a letter from one of my constituents in which he said that the progress in South Australia at the moment was backwards. South Australia is certainly not making progress. The Opposition has been criticized for running down South Australia when it has really been criticizing the Government. The Opposition holds the Government responsible and will offer constructive criticism in the hope of restoring confidence in South Australia so that the State can go forward and achieve goals such as were achieved in the 25 years of the Playford Administration.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I support the motion that has been so ably moved by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) and seconded by the member for Unley (Mr. Langley). I was most impressed by their addresses. I join other honourable members in wishing His Excellency a speedy return to good health and I associate myself with the expressions of sympathy contained in paragraph 3 of the Speech. I take this opportunity to congratulate the new Premier, who is indeed fortunate that so early in his term of occupancy of this position he can be associated with such a fine document as the Speech with which the Governor's Deputy opened this session of Parliament.

I have read other Speeches in *Hansard* and consider that this Speech is one of the best with which a Parliament has been opened. It clearly amplifies the activities of the Government. In addition, it shows that the amount of legislation proposed to be introduced is considerable and is generally of such a nature as to be in the best interests of this State. My district has received considerable attention from the present Government and, once again, I find pleasing references to it in the Speech.

Some of the many activities of the Engineering and Water Supply Department are referred to in detail. I should like to refer to the sewerage projects being undertaken. Honourable members would remember that in my maiden speech I paid particular attention to the sewerage scheme that at that stage was badly needed for parts of Henley Beach, Grange, Kidman Park, Fulham Gardens and other areas and I said that this was the most urgent problem facing the district. The area had been permitted to develop in a haphazard way, with no provision being made for sewerage facilities and the resulting hazards to health and the inconvenience were major problems.

However, I am pleased that this Government acted quickly to relieve the problems of the people in those areas and this year \$600,000 has been provided for work on the scheme. Work has already advanced to a considerable degree and I am hopeful that the reports that some areas will have sewerage connections completed by the end of this year are correct. The residents of West Torrens are extremely grateful to the Government for what has been done. For many years my predecessor, Mr. Fred Walsh, attempted to have the Liberal and Country League Government remedy the problems that confronted the people in regard to this matter.

Mr. McKee: It was fairly difficult.

Mr. BROOMHILL: As one of my colleagues reminds me, it was a fairly difficult matter. The L.C.L. Government referred to the difficulties associated with the nature of the land and to the costs involved. That Government obviously considered that only the cost, not the health of the people in those areas, should be considered. I assure Cabinet that its decision to have this work undertaken has met with the approval of the people. Paragraph 19 of His Excellency's Speech refers to some of the activities of the Housing Trust and it is pleasing that these activities have continued in the same manner as in the past. That paragraph states:

The South Australian Housing Trust expects to complete about 3,200 houses and flats during the current financial year, a number almost equal to last year when 3,250 were completed. The trust has continued to aid industrial expansion especially in the country—indeed, a record number of houses is expected to be completed in Whyalla, while more houses have been built than in previous years in towns such as Millicent, Murray Bridge and in the Upper Murray area. The first group of houses designed for handicapped people, particularly paraplegics, was completed at Mitchell Park in March of this year. The trust hopes to expand its rental programme in the country during the forthcoming financial year and considerable housing programmes will be carried out at Ingle Farm, Henley Beach, O'Sullivan Beach, Smithfield Plains and Parafield Gardens.

The area at Henley Beach referred to (it is known as Hughes Estate) has progressed satisfactorily. About 90 houses have been completed, 80 are in the course of construction and, upon the completion of the sewerage scheme to which I have referred, about 200 more houses will be built. I consider that the trust has taken proper steps by planning for two and a half acres to serve as reserve. Land for a hospital, church and swimming pool has also been reserved and the trust has been extremely active in this area, which is ideal for development.

Last year I said that most of the trust houses being built in my district were of brick-veneer construction. I am rather critical of the trust's attitude about building such houses in areas where solid construction houses could well be built, and Hughes Estate is one of these areas. When I consider the disadvantages of the brick-veneer house, such as lack of warmth in winter and of coolness in summer and the fact that the all-brick house is sound proof, I find the trust's attitude difficult to understand when the land is suitable for all-brick houses. I understand that the cost of both types of house is identical, and I hope that the trust will investigate my suggestion.

I have mentioned that in Hughes Estate, as in other areas developed by the trust, land has been set aside for reserves and playing areas. Unfortunately, where there is new building development and land for reserves is provided, the councils are not able to develop the reserves immediately. By the time they are in a position to grass the reserves and place other facilities on them, those who have grown from childhood in the area have become too old to enjoy the benefits of the reserves. The trust ought to consider levelling land left for reserves and grassing it before leaving

sites and then leaving the councils with the responsibility of maintaining the areas. Such action may be an example to others developing other areas. Part of paragraph 21 of His Excellency's Speech states:

The Industrial Commission was established on July 1 last and has dealt with almost double the number of claims that were made to the Industrial Court during the previous year. Despite the large number of claims there was, for the second year in succession, a decrease in the number of industrial disputes in the State. The Government has encouraged the settlement of claims by conciliation and acknowledges the responsible attitude generally shown by trade unions and employers. Despite the difficult economic conditions resulting from the prolonged drought and other factors beyond the control of the Government, there was during the last year an increase in the number of persons in civilian employment and the number of factories in the State.

It is pleasing to know that the establishment of the Industrial Commission has been a major factor in reducing industrial disputes for the second successive year. In addition to the effect of the Industrial Commission, I consider that responsible trade union leadership has also had a bearing on our industrial peace. It is regretted that some irresponsible statements made by representatives of the Chamber of Manufactures have offset the good employer-employee relationship existing in this State. References were made in His Excellency's Speech to industrial matters, but because of insufficient space it was not possible to refer to some of the many achievements that have been undertaken by this Government.

The first two years of Labor Administration (1965 and 1966) will be looked upon in South Australia's future as the time South Australia's industrial standards and procedures were lifted to a basis equal to, and in some cases better than, those in other Australian States. But the Labor Government is not complacent about its achievements: much more modernization and rehabilitation of existing procedures is necessary, and the Government is planning to introduce more industrial legislation in the current Parliamentary session. Before the Labor Government came to office there were many injustices in the conditions of South Australian male and female working people, compared with their counterparts in other States. People travelling to and from work were not covered by workmen's compensation; superannuation conditions of State public servants were below those in all other States; and wage rates of all Government workers were far below acceptable levels.

I refer to some of the more important industrial legislation that has been passed by the Labor Government during the past two years. Before introducing an equal pay Bill into Parliament, the Government decided to recognize female Government employees doing work equal in value to that of males by awarding women equivalent salaries. It was decided in 1966 that this provision should apply to all Government employees over a five-year period on the same basis as that for teachers in the Education Department. The Labor Government has now authorized the President of the Industrial Commission or the Public Service Board to determine equal rates for all female employees of the Government. Female employees of the Government who are subject to Commonwealth awards and agreements can now have the President of the Industrial Commission act as arbitrator to decide which of these women employees are entitled to equal pay.

Training of apprentices in South Australia is now being carried out on a sounder basis than ever before. Amendments have been made to the Apprentices Act that have substantially altered this law relating to apprentices. An Apprenticeship Commission has been formed with a full-time Chairman, replacing the former part-time Apprentices Board, and consists of representatives of both employer and employee organizations, and a nominee of the Minister of Education. The commission is empowered to determine apprenticeship matters, including the suitability or otherwise of employers to train apprentices. The commission also has power to set pre-requisite educational standards for entry to trades under indentures, and the transfer or cancellation of indentures.

The Labor Government amended regulations under the Country Factories Act to bring some working conditions into line with those in the metropolitan area. The Government intends to improve further the conditions of country workers by its proposed amendments to the Industrial Code. Injuries caused during travel to and from an employee's place of work have been covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act since the Labor Government took office. Early in its term of office the Government decided to review this Act, which stated that compensation was payable in respect of injury arising only "out of and in the course of employment". The maximum compensation benefits were also increased from \$6,500 for death and \$7,000 for incapacity and "table" injuries to \$12,000

for each of these two causes. Recurrences of injuries attributable to the same accident are also covered at current rates of compensation. Last year another amendment was made covering waterside workers with compensation benefits when they travel to and from pickup points.

Safety laws for workers on building sites were found to be inadequate when the Labor Government took office. Immediate steps were taken to remedy this situation and a completely new Bill, the Construction Safety Act, was drafted to replace the old-fashioned Scaffolding Act. The new Bill is designed to meet safety requirements needed with modern building and construction techniques. It also provides for safety provisions for men working in trenches. This provision is entirely new, and will help to eradicate recurrence of trench accidents, which have been prevalent in South Australia in recent years.

Apprentices and juniors in State Government departments are now entitled to the first increment of \$1 as soon as they attain adult pay rates. The Labor Government decided that this was a fairer method of payment than forcing apprentices and juniors to complete their time, then serve another year before becoming entitled to service pay. This now applies to all apprentices and juniors who have completed at least one year of employment with the Government. Those who have not completed one year of service by the time they reach the adult pay rate are entitled to service pay immediately on completion of 12 months' employment.

This is an extension to the Government grant in 1965 to all Government employees of \$1 a week after one year's service, \$1.75 after two years, and \$2.50 after 3 years. This grant particularly will help to stabilize the Government work force and stop the drift away of craftsmen from Government departments which up until 1965 had reached serious proportions.

I remind Opposition members, who have criticized the Government's decision to increase by one week the annual leave of Government employees, that prior to the present Government's coming into office it had been difficult to retain employees in the Government service. For many years State Government employees had enjoyed long service leave, a week's additional recreation leave, and higher sick leave provisions, all of which had not been the entitlement of the normal employee. Because of these considerations the Government could attract employees of a high standard. However, when normal award provisions of employees

became equal to those enjoyed by Government employees, it was difficult to retain employees in the Government service. Also, persons outside the Government service are in a better position to obtain over-award payments and overtime. It is important that the Government should assist its employees to return to the position they held in the past, in the interests of the State and of employing the best possible type of person in the Government service.

Approval has been granted by the Labor Government for all Government employees on weekly wages to get compassionate leave on the death of a wife, husband, father, mother, child, step-child, brother or sister. This had previously only applied to wages staff in one department. Any National Serviceman who is a weekly-paid employee of the State Government and is sent to a combat area has his superannuation contribution now paid by the State Government. Adult male employees of the Government who are not covered by State or Commonwealth awards or agreements are now protected by a minimum wage rule instituted by the Labor Government. This now puts these employees on an equal salary basis with other employees who are covered by awards and agreements which had been amended as a result of the Commonwealth decision in the metal trades case. The general public and other workmen have been protected from dangers in electrical work by the licensing of electrical workers and contractors. This decision of the Labor Government is intended to safeguard against death and injury caused by faulty work of unqualified electricians. Members will appreciate that all these things could have been included in His Excellency's Speech, and I think they should have been because their inclusion would establish once again the considerable legislation that has been undertaken in the interests of the State by this Government during its short period of office.

I am grateful to the Minister of Education for the assistance he has provided for my district in relation to teaching, new schools, and additions and other building work that have been carried out in my district. Other members have commended the Minister for the way he has conducted his department and, although I realize that this applies to all Government Ministers, I stress that the Minister of Education has shown great interest in the well-being of all our schools and has taken the trouble to visit many country schools. In visiting country areas, he has been accepted readily. His efforts have been greatly appreciated by the people in those areas.

I did reserve some time to reply to remarks made by members of the Opposition because I understood that during the Address in Reply debate it was the Opposition's duty to criticize the Government's policies and proposals contained in the Speech. However, I have been considerably disappointed in this respect because very little has been put forward. I listened with great interest to the address made by the Leader of the Opposition. I felt that, if there were to be any criticisms of a general nature, they would emanate from him in his speech.

Mr. Jennings: I sneezed and missed all of it!

Mr. BROOMHILL: However, all that could be put forward by the Leader was a reference to this State and comparisons with Victoria. He talked about unemployment here and freely admitted that there were more people unemployed in Victoria than in South Australia. In addition, he spent some time attempting to blame the State Labor Government for the present unemployment in this State. If the Leader thinks he can convince the public of this State that this Government is in any way to blame for unemployment, I am afraid he is in for a rude awakening. The people of this State know full well that the Commonwealth Liberal and Country League Government is responsible for the difficult position applying in South Australia at present. The Government has imposed financial cuts here and has reduced its construction expenditure from \$26,000,000 in 1959-60 to \$4,000,000 this year. Commonwealth spending in South Australia is barely four per cent of the Commonwealth total. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks that, by highlighting unemployment here, he will in some way damage the State Labor Party, he has another think coming because the people in this State will properly adopt the attitude during the next State election that if they are foolish enough to vote for an L.C.L. State Government they may find themselves with the deficiencies that exist with the Commonwealth L.C.L. Government.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I rise to support the motion before the House. I regret that on this occasion His Excellency the Governor was unable to open the proceedings by delivering his Speech in another place. I trust that His Excellency will recover from his indisposition and be able to fulfil his usual duties in the interests of the State. May I, Sir, with other members who have already spoken, express my sympathy at the demise

of Robert Stanley Richards, Rufus Sanders Goldney and Charles Caleb Dudley Octoman, three members of Parliament who gave long service to the State and to this Parliament. I also congratulate you, Sir, upon the high honour bestowed upon you by Her Majesty the Queen. We realize that you have over many years given distinguished service to this State as a member of Parliament and as a member of local government, particularly as Mayor of Port Augusta. You have also served here as Speaker for over two years and I think all members of this Chamber appreciate the honour conferred upon you.

I should like to refer next to the Premier, who is absent from the Chamber today attending a conference in Canberra. Although I congratulate him upon succeeding to the office of Premier of this State, I realize (as has been mentioned by one or two members on this side) that in having four portfolios to administer (that of Premier, Treasurer, Attorney-General and Minister of Housing) he is overburdening himself with duties, and I consider, Sir, that he should relinquish at least one of them so that full justice can be done to the others. The four portfolios mentioned would be too much for any Minister of the Crown to handle effectively and efficiently.

Although congratulating him, I bear in mind, too, that only recently (earlier this month, I believe) the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. Whitlam) passed through South Australia and was met at the airport by our new Premier. He was congratulated by Mr. Whitlam, who is reported to have said to the Premier, "Your Government has achieved more in the past two years than any other mainland State has achieved in the past 20 years." I am unable to comprehend his making that statement, unless he was referring to what had been achieved by the Labor Government in this State: the advent of unemployment. I say that advisedly, despite what has been said by the honourable member who just resumed his seat. If we look, when making comparisons, at the position when the Playford Government relinquished office in this State in 1965, we have to see what the position was when that Government assumed office in 1938-39. In the latter year 43,371 employees were working in factories in South Australia, and in the year in which the Playford Government relinquished office that number had increased to 116,206, an increase of 167.9 per

cent. That was the highest increase over that period of any State in the Commonwealth. In New South Wales the increase over that period was 122.4 per cent; Victoria, 114.1 per cent; Queensland, 114.8 per cent; Western Australia, 150.6 per cent; and in Tasmania, 136.1 per cent. Therefore, the increase of 167.9 per cent in South Australia was an outstanding tribute to what was accomplished by the Playford Government.

In addition, the value of factory production in South Australia increased over that period from \$26,000,000 to \$498,000,000. I think it is the duty and the function of a Government to ensure that its people are satisfied and in employment and, if sufficient employment exists and money is coming into the home, the population of the State should indeed be satisfied. However, that has not been the position since the Labor Government assumed office in 1965. In fact, the position has deteriorated progressively. The number of persons registered for employment in South Australia in June this year is 8,373; in June last year it was 7,357; and in June, 1965, 3,533. Compared with the other States, the percentage of the work force unemployed in South Australia is 1.9; New South Wales, 1.3;

Victoria, 1.2; Queensland, 2.1 Western Australia, 1.1; and Tasmania, 1.4. That indicates that South Australia has not been progressing as favourably as it should have been over the past two and a half years.

In June, 1966, the number of persons registered for employment in South Australia was 108.3 per cent higher than the figure for June, 1965. By April, 1967, that percentage had risen to 132.8. We find a similar position concerning the number of persons receiving unemployment benefits in South Australia; in June, 1966, the percentage was 243.7 higher than in June, 1965. By April, 1967, the percentage was 338.4 higher than in June, 1966. In June, 1966, there was a decrease of 65.6 per cent over the number of job vacancies in June, 1965; and in April, 1967, there was a decrease of 61.4 per cent over the June, 1965, figure. I also have the percentages of increase or decrease (as the case may be) in respect of all of the other States during the period to which I have just referred. Not wishing to weary the House with those percentages, I ask leave to have the table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

Percentage increase/decrease, June, 1966, and April, 1967, compared with June, 1965.

	Persons Registered for Employment.		Recipients Unemployment Benefits.		Job Vacancies Registered.	
	June 1966.	April 1967.	June 1966.	April 1967.	June 1966.	April 1967.
N.S.W.	55.6 increase	55.6 increase	62.4 increase	44.6 increase	31.4 decrease	29.0 decrease
Vic.	59.9 increase	49.6 increase	85.3 increase	62.2 increase	23.2 decrease	15.0 decrease
Qld.	16.4 increase	75.2 increase	33.9 increase	112.2 increase	14.1 decrease	28.7 decrease
S.A.	108.3 increase	132.8 increase	243.7 increase	338.4 increase	65.6 decrease	61.4 decrease
W.A.	5.8 decrease	3.1 decrease	35.5 decrease	49.7 decrease	22.3 increase	37.4 increase
Tas.	24.2 decrease	21.3 decrease	51.4 decrease	66.7 decrease	28.9 increase	101.4 increase

Persons Registered for Employment in S.A.

June 1965.	June 1966.	June 1967.
3,533	7,357	8,373

2/6/67 % Work Force Unemployed.

	%
N.S.W.	1.3
Vic.	1.2
Qld.	2.1
S.A.	1.9
W.A.	1.1
Tas.	1.4

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Those figures forcibly illustrate that the position in South Australia has deteriorated progressively and rapidly over the past two and half years. However, not only has the general employment position in South Australia deteriorated: the building trade has been most severely hit. I know from approaches made to me by building contractors in my own district that the position in some country towns is becoming desperate. These contractors have to contend at present with the competitive prices of contractors in the metropolitan area who, two or three years ago, were not so interested in work in the country because they were busily engaged in the metropolitan area. However, some country contractors have recently had to face competition from city contractors because of the recession in the building trade in the metropolitan area. Indeed, I know that several building teams in my district have had to disband to some extent because there was not enough building activity to keep them going.

At March 31, 1965, when the Playford Government went out of office, 11,223 wage earners were engaged in the building industry in South Australia; by March 31, 1966, that number had decreased to 10,032; and at March 31 last the number had dwindled to 8,881. In respect of the same dates, the number of bricklayers decreased from 2,722 to 2,360, and then (as at March 31 last) to 2,028. The number of carpenters decreased from 3,941 to 3,767, and then (as at March 31, 1967) to 3,393. The total number of employees in the building trade at March 31, 1965 (15,568) dropped to 14,086 (as at March 31, 1966, and then to 12,432 at March 31, 1967. It is unfortunate that this slackness in the building industry has taken place because, as I have pointed out, the number of people engaged in the building industry has dropped by over 3,000 in the period to which I have referred, and probably most of these people would be skilled workmen.

I know that, because of the inability of these skilled workmen to obtain employment in the metropolitan area, some have had to sell or quit their houses. One case was brought to my notice where a skilled tradesman had a house in the metropolitan area. As he was unable to find a buyer for it, he let it and left for Broken Hill where he obtained a job. I understand that is the position with many skilled tradesmen, who are leaving South Australia for other States or even going farther afield for employment. The tragedy is that many of these men will never return to South

Australia once they are assured of permanent employment elsewhere. Should industry resurge again at some time in the future, the difficulty may be to obtain skilled labour when it is wanted.

According to the *Advertiser* of June 5, 1967, the following figures for house approvals were provided by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics: in the March quarter, 1,691 houses were started, 406 fewer than in the December quarter and 477 fewer than in the March quarter of 1966. In the three months to March 31, 1,941 houses were completed, 525 fewer than in the previous quarter and 311 fewer than in the March quarter of last year. The number of 281 flats started was 19 fewer than in the preceding quarter and 162 fewer than in the March quarter of 1966. That shows the desperate situation in which the State finds itself. The member for Unley (Mr. Langley) said yesterday that he found things all right in his district, where the people were satisfied and had no worries at all about the situation. He said he felt quite happy. Surely that cannot be said in all sincerity. Everywhere there are signs that "something is rotten in the State of Denmark".

Let me draw the attention of honourable members to another important indicator of the actual position. I refer to the state of shares, with respect to the building industry in particular. Between March 1, 1965, and June 26, 1967, the value of Adelaide Cement Company Limited shares (that is the buying price) fell by 36.6 per cent. The value of Brighton Cement shares fell by 50 per cent, City Bricks Limited shares by 61.6 per cent, Cowell Brothers and Company Limited shares by 38.1 per cent, Harris Scarfe Limited shares by 32.7 per cent, and Lloyds Holdings Limited shares by 24.6 per cent. It is interesting to note that one branch of Lloyds is to commence activities in New South Wales soon, no doubt realizing that that is the place to be in view of the more satisfactory position in that State. The value of Reid Brothers Limited shares has decreased by 53.2 per cent, and Thompson and Harvey Limited shares by 30.7 per cent.

I totally agree with what the member for Mitcham said yesterday when he attributed this down-trend in South Australia to a lack of confidence by the public, and in particular by captains of industry, in the Government of the State. Until the confidence of the public and of the leaders of industry can be re-instated, I fear that the State will continue to decline instead of progressing in the right direction. I consider it is necessary to revitalize the economy

and to go further than is suggested in the Governor's Deputy's Speech, which states:

The Premier's Department has actively pursued its policy of industrial promotion and has had successes in the establishment of industry as well as increased inquiries for the expansion of industry in the State.

We have not had many announcements of the establishment of large new industries in South Australia. One or two announcements of the expansion of industries have been made, but they relate to industries that were firmly established in South Australia during the regime of the Playford Government. Industries were being established here rapidly, particularly during the last 10 years of the Playford Government. The Governor's Deputy's Speech also states:

The accommodation in the Agent-General's Office in London has been greatly improved and the staff has been re-organized so that a trade officer is solely engaged to assist in the promotion of trade and the attraction of industrial investment to the State.

I congratulate the Government for seeing to it that a trade officer has been fully engaged in that particular department overseas. I believe I said last year, when speaking in the Address in Reply debate, that I had spent some time at the Agent-General's Office in 1964 when I was in London, and it was patent to me, from my discussions with the then Agent-General (Mr. Pearce), that an additional officer was required to be appointed so that full consideration could be given to the promotion of industry from England and the Continent. Mr. Pearce, on his return from London last year, made this statement to the press:

The Australian States are competing keenly overseas for new industries, and some have established separate departments in London with the sole function of attracting industry. Considerable money is being spent in these campaigns, perhaps not all of it wisely, but if South Australia wants to keep pace with the other States the Government will have to review the amounts allocated for industrial promotion. Considerable interest is being shown in Germany, where big industries are looking for new fields of investment in Australia.

I could bear out what Mr. Pearce said. When I was in Europe for about a fortnight, at Mr. Pearce's suggestion I interviewed an industrialist. Mr. Pearce had suggested that I call on him because I understood the German language. It was clear to me that this man was interested in the establishment of an industry here. Some negotiations had taken place, but Mr. Pearce pointed out that it was

impossible for an Agent-General, with the staff he had, to keep up contact with some of the captains of industry in Europe. I say advisedly that, although the Government has appointed to the Agent-General's Office a Trade Officer, who will be engaged solely in the promotion of industry, that is not the entire solution: the area to be covered is too large. I consider it necessary to have in Europe an officer with a similar role. I think there is much scope in Europe, particularly in West Germany, where Mr. Pearce says there is interest in the establishment of industry in Australia.

If we in South Australia do not appoint an officer to Europe, the other States, which are vying with us for industry, will secure industries that we would otherwise have secured. I agree with a suggestion made recently by the Deputy Chairman of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Mr. Henry). It has much merit. He said that there was a need for South Australia to consolidate all organizations interested in export into one group to speak for the whole State; in other words, to speak *una voce* and *magna voce* (with one voice and a loud voice). Secondly, he said that there ought to be a partnership of industry, commerce, trade unions and Government. His third point was that there should be organized oversea trade visits, led by a State Minister.

Perhaps we would be wise to follow Western Australia and appoint a separate Minister for Industrial Development. I think it is generally recognized that that appointment was extremely successful. The particular Minister is very active and, because of contacts he has been able to make, many industries have been attracted to that State. However, we are missing out in this regard. A Minister is able to meet people at the highest level. He commands more attention than a departmental officer, has greater authority to make decisions and doubtless would be able to offer incentives on the spot when negotiating about industry.

The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) said much about industry in South Australia and decentralization. He suggested that members on this side were not interested in decentralization. However, I refute that suggestion. We have, during the years, advocated decentralization of industry but I say without reservation that it is necessary first to decentralize within Australia, and that has been accomplished to a large extent during

the Playford era. Industries had been becoming concentrated in the more populous Eastern States near the main markets but during the Playford era, particularly in the last 10 years, because of the actions of Sir Thomas Playford and the two typistes (as the Premier put it) many industries were attracted to South Australia. If it had not been for that activity, those industries would have been established in the Eastern States.

If we can decentralize within Australia by getting industry to South Australia, we achieve something in the interests of the State and are then able to go further and decentralize within the State. We must not insist on industry being located in a particular part of the State. We must offer incentives to coax industry. When I was in Queensland in 1952, the Minister for Labour and Industry in the Labor Government at that time referred to the inability of his Government to attract secondary industry to Queensland and this statement by him appeared in the press:

Under uniform taxation Queensland has had no more success in attracting competitive secondary industry than it had when the States levied their own taxes. Manufacturers tended to go where they found the biggest markets and greatest pool of labour and where other industry was situated. We cannot take an industry by the scruff of the neck and plant it down where we want it.

Industry must decide its own location.

In His Excellency's Speech there is no mention of migrants. Government members have suggested that the flow of migrants into Australia should be considerably reduced. The 1961 Commonwealth census indicated that 100,000 post-war migrants were self-employed or employers of labour. This trend should be encouraged because migrant employers not only employ other migrants but also Australians, and often introduce valuable new techniques. In one winery in the Barossa Valley a former Yugoslav National is in charge of the wine-making section; in others, a former West German National and a former Austrian National have responsible positions.

These people have brought valuable knowledge and techniques to South Australia. Of all British-born male workers who have come to Australia 12 per cent have become employers of labour and of all other migrants born overseas, 15 per cent have become employers of labour. We should not discourage the influx of these migrants, particularly those who bring new skills and techniques.

I am pleased that the Government dealt effectively with the recent outbreak of fruit fly. This means much to those engaged in fruit production in the Barossa Valley and the Murray River areas, and this policy should continue. The member for Wallaroo said that the Nuriootpa Viticultural Station and laboratory had been opened in May, 1965, by the Labor Government, but this laboratory was provided for by finance from the Playford Government. It had been almost completed when that Government went out of office in 1965, but it was opened by the new Minister of Agriculture in the Labor Government. I was pleased to be present even though I did not receive an invitation to the function.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't mean to say you weren't asked?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I received no invitation. It was opened in May, 1965, and a few days before that my wife saw an article in the *Advertiser* stating that the Minister would open it. I thought it was my duty to be present.

Mr. Millhouse: Did the Minister apologize for not inviting you?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I drove back to Adelaide with the Minister and during the drive he discovered that the laboratory was in my district. Mr. Loder has been active as a research officer in the laboratory since 1963. He is a migrant, and the knowledge of the viticultural industry that he brought to this State is of considerable importance. The station at Nuriootpa comprises 50 acres of which 30 are planted with vines. Mr. Loder has been doing extensive research work on the dying arm disease in vines. Gummosis is a disease that strikes quickly and overnight the limb of an apricot tree wilts. However, it takes about 20 years before the vine affected by dying arm disease is killed.

The research station at Nuriootpa has a five-acre experimental vineyard with vines about 25 years old which have been used for research into this disease. It has been discovered that about 35 per cent of these vines are slowly dying from the virulence of this disease. The extent of the disease in a vine depends on the age and variety of the vine, and it has been discovered that vines not affected by this disease give a return of 3.1 tons of grapes to the acre, whereas those affected by the disease return only 1.7 tons an acre. It will be seen that, if a breakthrough could be made with this disease, there could be a considerable increase in the tonnage of grapes not only in the Barossa Valley but throughout

the viticultural areas, because it has been discovered that vines in other parts of South Australia are also affected by this disease.

Samples of vines affected have come to the research laboratories from Renmark, Clare, Coonawarra and Langhorne Creek, and they have shown the need for further research to find the cause of this disease and an effective cure for it. I understand that mites are responsible for the vine dying, and that up to 3,000 mites a bud have been counted on grapevines. The plea I make to the Government is this: it is expected that it may not be very long before there will be a breakthrough in discovering an effective cure for this malady, and such a breakthrough can be made more quickly if additional research work can be done. At present all the research work is being done by Mr. Loder. He is assisted by casual labour, there being one lady who helps occasionally in the laboratory.

I also want to refer to another project that is operating in the Barossa Valley. The Barossa Grapegrowers Association has commenced a vine bud selection programme. It is taking cuttings from the best Rhine riesling vines as selected last February, the idea being to propagate these particular cuttings with a view to establishing in due course vineyards from the outstanding type of cuttings selected. It is thought that as a result of embarking on this programme the yield of grapes could be considerably increased, particularly in the Rhine riesling varieties for which there is a great demand in South Australia. When we bear in mind that in the Barossa Valley and its neighbourhood we have 18,000 acres of vines, we see that an increase of only half a ton an acre would mean an increase of 9,000 tons of grapes. I think there is an area of over 1,000 acres of Rhine riesling vines, so an increase of half a ton an acre there would mean an increase of 900 tons in that particular variety, and there is a great demand for the Rhine riesling variety of grapes.

Mr. FROCBAIN: Is the Clare riesling grape a better quality grape?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I think it is recognized that the Rhine riesling is a better quality grape. I understand it is a different type from the Clare riesling, and it is in greater demand. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) will no doubt be able to give some more authentic information on that. Another variety, cabernet sauvignon, which is the grape from this particular type of vine, is the best type of grape for the manufacture of claret, but again the production per acre is

very low in the Barossa Valley, probably three-quarters of a ton to one ton an acre, whereas I understand that in the non-irrigated areas of France five to six tons an acre can be obtained with the cabernet sauvignon variety of grapes. Here, too, a breakthrough in combating the "dying arm" disease, coupled with the bud selection programme of the Barossa Grapegrowers Association, could be very helpful and very effective.

I ask the Government to make the necessary finance available to enable an additional officer to be stationed at the research station at Nuriootpa. Such an officer would be able to help these two programmes to which I have referred. I want to say that there is situated on the viticultural block a house which belongs to the department and which is occupied not by any officer of the department but by a complete stranger, who is a tenant. If an officer is appointed, the house is there for him, for I think it should be occupied by a departmental officer doing research work or a field officer at the viticultural station.

Finally, I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he would also give sympathetic consideration to stationing a district horticultural officer at Nuriootpa. For a long time the district was favoured with the presence of such an officer in Mr. Spurling, but some time ago he was taken from the district and there has been a vacancy since then. I know that horticulturists in the district look forward with great expectancy to the time soon, I hope, when that office will be filled. I hope the Minister will give that request his sympathetic consideration.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): It is with the greatest of pleasure that I support the motion. First, I join with other members in offering sympathy to the relatives of two former members of this House in the Hon. R. S. Richards and Mr. Rufus Goldney. I knew Bob Richards for many years before I became a member of this House, although I was not in the House at the time he was here. However, I was here during the time Mr. Goldney was here. I offer my sympathy to the relatives of both those gentlemen. I also join with other members in expressing the hope that His Excellency the Governor will soon be restored to the best of health.

Mr. Speaker, there are occasions when we wait a long time for something to happen and then we are greatly disappointed. I lived in the city when I was a boy, and whenever the circus came to town I wanted to

go to it so that I could see the boneless wonder. Unfortunately, however, my parents were too poor to give me the fare to go to the circus, and I have waited just over 50 years to see the boneless wonder. When I heard him in the House yesterday I must admit I was greatly disappointed. People can be bored to tears; others can be bored to death. Indeed, I was bored to death here yesterday afternoon. As has been previously stated, members opposite have had an excellent opportunity during this debate to tell the people to "live better with the Liberal and Country League", or whatever they wish to tell the people. They have had plenty of opportunity to tell the people that they have not been "living better with Labor".

Mr. Ryan: They haven't anything to say.

Mr. LAWN: They have nothing to tell the people along those lines. However, I have a great story to tell the people when I say, "Live better with Labor." The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) dealt with the Government's achievements in respect of agriculture; the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon), among other things, dealt with the Government's achievements in respect of its land policy; and the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), among other things, dealt with the Government's achievements industrially. I intend to refer to other achievements of the Government.

Mr. Ryan: There are many of them.

Mr. LAWN: The story could not be told even in three or four hours, although I do not intend to be that long. Listening to the Leader of the Opposition, followed by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), I must say they both were harrowing, exruciating and disappointing. Indeed, I studied their colleagues as the two gentlemen spoke, because this is the last session before the elections; this was the Leader's opportunity after nearly 12 months' experience to say something.

Mr. McKee: All they did was to clap their hands about unemployment.

Mr. LAWN: When the Leader rose to speak, one Opposition member went outside and brought in those who were not in the House; indeed, quite a file of Opposition members came in to listen to their Leader. Members opposite all had their eyes glued on their Leader; there was a look of expectancy and hopefulness on their faces, as though they were waiting for him to drop the bucket on the Government. However, after 15 or 20 minutes one could see them beginning to change their expressions. First, they began to fidget. Then there was

disappointment, then despondency, and, finally, disillusionment. Referring to the gas pipeline, the Leader said:

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.

The member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner), who preceded me in this debate, does not desire to see the pipeline in the proposed locality, because he does not wish to see industry decentralized to Angaston. Indeed, that was the Leader's theme. The Leader says: "The Government has already got Whyalla, Stuart, Port Pirie and Wallaroo; let it have them. Let them concentrate on industry in those places; bring the pipeline down along the western side of the ranges, but don't let it come down the centre of the State past Peterborough, Angaston and Burra. Let the Government have its industries over on the western side."

Mr. Ryan: The Opposition is not concerned with the economics of it.

Mr. LAWN: This Government is concerned with decentralization. People in the districts on the western side of the ranges have been assured that, after the pipeline has been brought to Adelaide, Wallaroo will receive first priority (that is, if Mr. Bridges is prepared to proceed with his scheme). The pipeline will be brought to the city first not only by the shortest route to save costs: it will be available in country areas, thus making greater decentralization possible. Obviously members opposite do not desire decentralization.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I would welcome it.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member was not too happy about the proposed route just now. We can see tomorrow what he said, but my understanding of his remarks (and I made a note of them at the time) was that—

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I didn't mention the gas pipeline.

Mr. LAWN: But the honourable member referred to decentralization, and he does not want it in his district.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I do!

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member said something to the effect, "We must decentralize Australia first." He said nothing about decentralization around Angaston, and he does not want that. Indeed, if the honourable member desires the pipeline and the subsequent establishment of industries at Angaston, this was his opportunity to say so, but he said nothing. If I misunderstood him, I am sorry,

but I am sure that we shall see when we read his remarks tomorrow that he side-stepped the issue. The Government will be only too happy to see industry established at Peterborough to the south, and northwards to Gidgealpa.

The Leader of the Opposition also said:

I have been reliably informed that for the first five months of this year no substantially new reference was made to that committee—referring to the Industries Development Committee—

I do not know whether that fact is correct or not . . .

He makes statements without knowing whether he is right or wrong. In fact, he went along to a meeting the other day (knowing that the Minister of Roads would not be present), armed with many prepared figures about expenditure on roads. He was indeed surprised when he found departmental officers present; "I didn't know you chaps were coming"! He was in the predicament of not being able to alter his prepared speech, which has since been criticized publicly by the Royal Automobile Association and other responsible bodies.

The Leader says anything that he thinks will go over well politically, whether it is right or wrong. One of his colleagues told members on this side only last week, on the first day of this session, that from now on it would be all in, boots and all. Those tactics might have been successful 40 years ago. I know the type of political meeting that used to be held in the 1920's. These things seemed to go over fairly well then, but they died out. These days, that sort of tactic will not go over with the electorate. The people want a clean election, and the truth. As a matter of fact, I am still hearing much criticism in the metropolitan area of the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition of the former Premier about his son getting a job with the Totalizer Agency Board and of other questions of a personal nature asked in this House. When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier he would not have a bar of that sort of thing. I say that the Opposition is slipping back considerably. I continue reading these remarks:

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.

Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition does not know that this committee was not set up to promote, encourage and establish new industries in the State.

Mr. Ryan: He wouldn't know that.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but he should. He is offering himself to the people as an alternative Premier, and he does not know the function of the Industries Development Committee.

Mr. Hughes: He has never taken the trouble to read the Act.

Mr. LAWN: If he has, he does not understand it. This committee was set up to investigate certain applications coming before it from industries wanting financial assistance from the Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Is this committee active?

Mr. LAWN: Of course it is. The honourable member's Party is represented on it. Whether or not it is active I am not so much concerned about. The honourable member for Stirling should realize what this committee deals with, but he is another one who does not know. He has had his go. His speech contained many platitudes, nearly all those known to the human race, except one—"Please do up your dress before leaving." That is about the only thing he didn't say. The honourable member does not know the function of this committee, which is to investigate any industry wishing to establish or, more often, expand but being in need of financial assistance from the Government. The committee then recommends whether or not the Government should give assistance or guarantees. To establish industry on the scale we are speaking of, Mr. Bridges would not want to go before this committee.

Mr. Hughes: Of course he wouldn't; it would be a laugh.

Mr. LAWN: Of course it would: he has millions. Industry in the terms we are speaking of and hope to get comes through the Premier's Department. That is the department that promotes, encourages or advises new industry. Members opposite claimed that Sir Thomas Playford and two typistes used to do this work. Sir Thomas Playford said that himself, and a speaker this afternoon said the same. That is totally different from the functions of the Industries Development Committee. We do not get large industries appearing before that committee; we get only small ones needing financial assistance from the Government.

Mr. Hughes: I am interested in knowing who divulged this information to the Leader of the Opposition. He said he was reliably informed!

Mr. LAWN: His Party has a representative on the committee. I take it he was informed by a member of the committee.

Mr. Hughes: Yes, but proceedings before the committee are supposed to be confidential. That is why I am concerned.

Mr. LAWN: Referring to the present Premier, the Leader of the Opposition also said, "I do not know how long he is going to remain." What a *faux pas* that was! Is that a proper thing to say? The Leader of the Opposition, the alternative Premier to the present Premier, is going before the people next February, March, or April, or even sooner.

Mr. McAnaney: Make it tomorrow!

Mr. LAWN: He will tell them, "I do not know how long the present Premier will be there." He is not too confident, is he, of leading his Party to success at the next general election? If he were, he would not have made such a stupid statement as that.

Mr. Burdon: After a few years he will find out.

Mr. LAWN: I have been in this House for many years; I do not expect to spend many more here. But for the gerrymander I would not have come here; I came here in 1950 only so that I could see another Labor Government in my time before I passed on. I have had the pleasure of not only seeing such a Government but of telling the people after two years what good things it has done. I shall make some comparisons between what this Government has done and what the Liberal Government refused to do. I say only one thing to the Premier: "Do not let the same thing happen to you as happened to John Gunn, who was a brilliant Premier of this State—far more so than the Leader of the Liberal Party could ever be." I can go back to Barwell's time, but I say that John Gunn was outstandingly the most brilliant of them all, including Sir Thomas Playford. What happened? During his first term as Premier he was bought out by the Party opposite. The Commonwealth Government offered him an appointment, which, unfortunately for the Labor movement and the people of South Australia, John Gunn accepted. When the present Leader of the Opposition said, "I do not know how long he will remain", I thought of what happened in the 1920's. I do not mind saying it is quite on the cards that a directorship in the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. Ltd. or in some other industry will be offered to Sir Thomas Playford when he retires, but that will not happen to the present Leader of the Opposition. The Leader referred to the juggling of finance. I notice that, whenever he talks about finance, he always looks over his right or his left shoulder to his shadow behind him, the member for Gumeracha.

Mr. Freebairn: Don't you mean the member for Stirling?

Mr. LAWN: No, I would not include the member for Stirling with the member for Gumeracha. Since the appointment of the present Leader, members on this side have noticed that when he talks about financial matters he looks to Sir Thomas for a nod of approval or a frown of displeasure. When the Leader spoke about the present Premier's juggling the State's finances, I noticed Sir Thomas smile to himself and I thought I could read his mind: I believe he was thinking of the many times he juggled the State finances when he was Premier. However, no member could say that either the present Premier or Sir Thomas Playford would do that dishonestly. They are both men of integrity.

Mr. Ryan: The Premier was told to instruct the Auditor-General.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. A certain member of this House, shortly after he was married, said some years ago that his family consisted of himself, his wife, and a little dog called Susie, and he said that Susie was the most intelligent member of the family. I have come to believe that, because the honourable member asks more questions seeking information than does any other member of the House. The member for Mitcham recently suggested to the Premier that he should tell the Auditor-General to do something. I remember some years ago Sir Thomas Playford, when he was Premier, telling the House that no approach should be made, in any circumstances, by the Government to the Auditor-General, who was above Government level: he reported to Parliament and should be left entirely free to carry out in his own fashion any work he wished to do. Yet the member for Mitcham suggested that the Premier should suggest to the Auditor-General what he should do. The Auditor-General is free to make any investigation he wishes to make in any way he desires, and he tables his report direct to Parliament, not to the Government. The sooner Opposition members realize that the Government will not attempt to influence the Auditor-General in any way the better it will be for the State generally.

The Premier is at present in Canberra attending a meeting of the Loan Council. I thought the Leader might have had a suggestion to make about the Commonwealth Government's present method of financing loans and the results of that method. The meeting in Canberra this week will determine that a certain sum of money will be raised this year, and distributed to the States as Loan money to be used on Loan works. The Commonwealth Government will

raise about half that sum (or more or less) by way of taxation, and the remainder will be raised by loan. The two sums will be pooled and allocated to the States, which will pay interest on the whole sum they receive. Therefore, money that the people have subscribed by taxation will be debited again as a loan upon which they will have to pay interest. This is called orthodox finance. I cannot follow it, and I do not know where the money paid in interest, on money already paid in taxation, goes. I think the Leader could have made some suggestion about this.

Members opposite have criticized the Government, but I do not mind their doing so because, when we were in Opposition, we indulged in criticizing the Government of the day. However, the difference between the present Opposition and the Labor Party, when it was in Opposition, is that our criticism was constructive, whereas not one constructive criticism was made by the Leader or by the members for Mitcham, Alexandra or Angas, whose speeches I have heard (I did not hear all that the member for Stirling had to say). It must be obvious to the people of South Australia, as it is to us, that the present Leader is no Don Athaldo. We have known this for many years.

Mr. McAnaney: Who is Don Athaldo?

Mr. LAWN: For the edification of the member for Stirling I will tell him that Don Athaldo was a strong man who used to bend things, people and minds. The Opposition had a Don Athaldo but he made way for somebody who will never be a Don Athaldo.

I am glad the honourable member for Mitcham has returned to the Chamber. Government members have a story to tell about the Government's achievements. We do not say that we have no future with our Party and we do not desert the Party as a rat deserts a sinking ship. However, the member for Mitcham tried to get out from under last year when he could see no future for his Party or for himself. I must admit that, if I had to pick a committee of members from the other side. I do not think I would even consider the member for Mitcham for membership. However, last year he decided that there was no future for his Party or for him in South Australia and that he should seek pastures new. Apparently he looked for appointment to the Commonwealth Liberal Party. To my surprise, he could not even do what the member for Unley has done twice—beat Mr. John McLeay, Jr., the present member for Boothby in the

Commonwealth Parliament and an ex-mayor of Unley. The member for Unley has the pleasure of being able to say that he beat Mr. McLeay easily twice, whereas the member for Mitcham cannot even say that he beat Mr. McLeay once. Since his defeat last year, I notice that the member for Mitcham has been seeking information from the member for Unley (he has asked a couple of questions of the honourable member), apparently trying to learn something from him. I have no doubt that the member for Unley, who has always possessed a generous and genial nature, will help the member for Mitcham in any way he can.

Yesterday, the member for Mitcham said that the Premier had a nickname when he went to school. I suppose many of us have had nicknames at one time or another over the years. However, the member for Mitcham did not tell the House his present nickname. We all know that he is referred to as "Goose Millhouse, still seeking her propaganda (proper-gander)", and that he often sticks his neck out and quite often gets the axe.

Abraham Lincoln was one of the greatest democrats of all time; his example was set before me when I went to school, and it was he who stated that democracy was government of the people by the people for the people. However, we cannot have government by the people unless we give them the right to vote. The Walsh Government submitted a Bill providing for adult franchise and for alterations to the provisions concerning deadlocks between the two Houses. We talk about the Legislative Council being a House of Review, but Legislative Councillors say that their House is not a House of Review; they say that they have rights equal to those of members of this House. Legislative Councillors differ from members of this House in two respects: in one respect they have greater rights than we have as individual members, and in another respect they have lesser rights than we have.

Money Bills cannot be introduced in the Legislative Council but, when a money Bill comes before the Council, members of that Chamber have greater rights than individual members here. The Legislative Council is the only House that I know of where this rule prevails. A member of the Lower House cannot move an amendment to a money Bill unless the purpose of the amendment is to reduce the amount of money: that is, in effect, a motion of no confidence in the Government. However, Legislative Councillors

may make suggested amendments to money Bills, so in that respect they have greater rights than we have.

Yesterday a member, either during a speech or by interjection, referred to a family of seven adults living in one house, yet only one member of that household had the right to vote in Legislative Council elections. When I had four adult daughters living with my wife and myself, my wife and I had the right to vote for the Legislative Council because we owned our house jointly, but the four girls (who lived under the laws of this State, passed by the Legislative Council) had no vote for the membership of that Council. However, the moment two of them went with their husbands to Victoria they gained the right to vote for the Upper House there.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: They have full adult franchise.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and only one roll, whereas in South Australia two of my daughters, one of whom is married and the other single and living in my house, do not have the right to vote in Legislative Council elections. Can anyone honestly tell me why?

Mr. McKee: The member for Rocky River may be able to explain that to you.

Mr. LAWN: He may be able to tell me why red cows that eat green grass give white milk, but I do not know whether he can tell me why my daughters gain the right to vote in elections for both Houses of Parliament if they go to Western Australia or Victoria but do not have such a right here. In Western Australia adult franchise was given to the people by a Liberal Government, and in Victoria it was given by a Country Party Government, supported by the Labor Party. So it is not just a matter of a contest between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party.

In the Commonwealth sphere every adult has the right to vote for both Houses of Parliament and the Opposition Party in this House participated in the conferences that preceded Federation when this right was agreed to and included in the Commonwealth Constitution, which was approved by the people. However, when a Bill for full adult franchise in respect of both Houses of Parliament in this State was submitted to the Legislative Council, it was thrown out.

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

Mr. LAWN: Upon the adjournment, the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) interjected and said, "Where is this getting us?"

Mr. Millhouse: I asked what your point was. You had not made any point while I had been here.

Mr. LAWN: At the time I was dealing with adult franchise. However, the honourable member's remark shows how interested he is in giving people the right to vote in Legislative Council elections.

Mr. Millhouse: You had not made clear the point that you were coming to.

Mr. Clark: It was clear to everyone else.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think so.

Mr. LAWN: Another achievement of this Government has been the removal of the shortcoming of the Playford Government about the enrolment of people eligible to vote at Legislative Council elections. For many years the Playford Government sent out enrolment cards to persons who had purchased property but did not send invitations to enrol to people who returned from the armed services or persons who rented houses or flats. However, this Government invites all who are qualified for enrolment to enrol.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you sure the cards are being sent to all?

Mr. LAWN: I did not claim that any machine was perfect. The cards are being sent as I have said, subject to the imperfection of the computer.

Mr. Millhouse: Only inhabitant occupiers are receiving them, aren't they?

Mr. Langley: No.

Mr. LAWN: Possibly some people who are not eligible for enrolment are receiving cards and some who are eligible are not receiving them. However, subject to the imperfection of the machine, everyone eligible for enrolment is being invited.

Mr. Heaslip: That is making it compulsory rather than voluntary, isn't it?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member ought to restrict himself to green pastures. That is about the limit of his knowledge. Regarding the effectiveness of the Legislative Council and the good it does for the community, I suggest that at the opening at 2.15 p.m. this prayer be read in the Legislative Council:

O Lord, grant that this day we may come to no decision nor run into any kind of responsibility, but that all our doings may be of short duration and that we may adjourn at 3.00 p.m. for ever and ever. Amen.

I also suggest that at the closure of the day's sitting this hymn and the benediction that follows be sung:

Hymn:

O Thou, who seest all things below,
Grant that Thy servants may go slow,
That our privilege will comply
With laws and regulations till we die.
Teach us, O Lord, to reverence
Committees more than commonsense,
Impress our minds to help us plan,
To keep our privilege as long as we can.
And when the tempter seeks to give
Us a feeling of initiative,
Or foolishly attempt to go too far,
Chase us with a circular.
Mid war and tumult, fire and storms,
Strengthen us, we pray, with laws
Then will thy servants ever be
A flock of perfect sheep to Thee.

Benediction:

Thy peace of privilege which passeth all understanding, preserve your mind in lethargy, your body in inertia, and your soul in coma, now and ever more. Amen.

Mr. Millhouse: That is getting fairly close to blasphemy.

Mr. LAWN: "Live better with Labor". I should like to say what some of the people in our community think of this Government—this is not biased politics. Volume 4 No. 3 of *Public Service*, dated April, 1967, states:

More has been done in superannuation in this State in the past two years than in the previous 10 years, and for this the association expresses its thanks to the Premier.

Mr. McKee: The Walsh Government honours its promises! A lot has been printed in that journal about what it has done.

Mr. LAWN: I could quote extensively from this journal as to what the Public Service thinks of the Walsh Government, but I have restricted my quote to one paragraph, which speaks for itself. As the honourable member for Port Pirie has said, quite a lot has been printed in that journal about the efforts of the Walsh Government to give the public servants a superannuation scheme equivalent to schemes in other States—a 70-30 scheme.

Mr. Heaslip: What about equal pay?

Mr. LAWN: I am talking about superannuation. If members opposite think they are going to confuse me with their interjections, I invite them to go to the Parliamentary Library and read the Bible at Jeremiah 7: 19—"Do they not provoke themselves to the confusion of their own faces?" They do not confuse me. They should look in the mirror if they do not believe me. We can see the faces opposite, but, unfortunately for themselves, they cannot see themselves. If they look in a mirror, they will see that is true. Regarding housing, by legislation the Walsh Government has now

made it the duty of any vendor of a substandard property to show a purchaser the declaration if the property is substandard. That did not prevail under the previous Government. There is now a prohibition on landlords requiring tenants to effect repairs. Honourable members will remember the complaints made by constituents. In addition to paying rent, the contract of hire has provided that they effect so much in repairs, which has cost more than their rent.

Mr. Ryan: Water and light was once cut off.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The tenants have been protected against these things under the Walsh Government—"Live better with Labor", of course. Provision has been made that where sale and purchase agreements are shown to be burdensome on purchasers they can be voided by the courts. Honourable members cannot object to this being referred to the courts, because they say they believe in the courts, which are impartial.

Mr. Heaslip: Do you believe in the courts?

Mr. LAWN: Yes; this is where we are in agreement. It was the Labor Party, of which I have the honour to be a member, that was responsible for setting up the Arbitration Court, and it was the Liberal and Country League that went to the people in 1929 seeking its abolition.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LAWN: The courts can also declare void any contracts involving substandard housing. If I dampen the spirits of members opposite, as I evidently have judging by the expressions on their faces, and they wish to revive their spirits, I suggest that the Leader of the Party take a walk with his colleagues through the graveyard at midnight, singing the old song, "I will never be as good a ghost as you". Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make a speech but I am being subject to these continual interruptions. We are giving the staff upstairs a tough time.

The SPEAKER: I take the honourable member's point. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that we should have more decorum.

Mr. LAWN: The courts can declare void any contracts involving substandard housing where the sale of such substandard housing has been promoted without the substandard declaration being disclosed. Rents have been stabilized in depressed areas, and between April 1, 1963, and March 31, 1965, 6,072 houses were built at a cost of \$37,646,000. Between April

1, 1965, and March 31, 1967, 6,606 houses were built at a cost of \$44,902,000. These facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Boekelberg: How many houses are empty?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member's head may be empty. In accordance with its election promises on social legislation the Labor Government gave the people of South Australia the opportunity to express their views on whether there would be a State lottery. I remind the honourable member for Alexandra about this, because he complained yesterday that the Government was not keeping its election promises. We heard a squeal from Opposition members yesterday and today about keeping our election promises concerning the four weeks' annual leave for Government employees. What does the Opposition want? Do members opposite want the Government to break its promises like they did when they were in Government? The Opposition complained and said we were breaking our promises, and now they complain if we keep them.

Mr. Hughes: I told them that the other day.

Mr. LAWN: Apparently, it is a sore point that this Government is keeping its promises, and can confidently look forward to receiving a mandate next year to continue keeping its promises. As a result of the resounding "Yes" vote in the 1965 referendum, legislation was passed to establish a lottery in South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: Poison in the hands of children!

Mr. LAWN: As a result of this referendum we have established a lottery, and next Friday the tenth lottery will be drawn: 10 in five weeks! In 1965 I wrote an article for the *News* and gave a statement to Channel 7 in which I said that I expected one lottery to be drawn each month. I knew that the people of this State wanted a lottery so that money would be kept in this State instead of it being sent to other States. However, not in my wildest dreams did I think that we could have two lotteries a week and, in addition, in August it is expected that a super lottery will be introduced.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The success of the lotteries indicates how many thousands of dollars have gone out of this State in previous years.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. People in this State have been sending money away to assist other States, when it should have remained here. Yet, we were told that this was placing poison in the hands of children.

Mr. McAnaney: You would not have got it without our support: we crossed the floor to help you.

Mr. LAWN: I am not complaining about the member for Stirling: I am saying that when his Party was on the Treasury benches it refused to give the people of this State a lottery. In 1965 the Labor Party promised the people that if it were elected it would give the people the opportunity to decide whether they wanted a lottery. With the exception of the Angas District every electoral district favoured a lottery.

Mr. McKee: Even the District of Gumeracha!

Mr. LAWN: Yes, despite the fact that its own member said that the lottery would be putting poison into the hands of children. The people in his own district told him what they thought about it: they still wanted their own State lottery.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You are not condemning the electors of Angas, are you?

Mr. LAWN: No, I am trying to make my point that for years the people of South Australia wanted a State lottery. I did not realize that they wanted it as badly as they showed they did. After only five weeks of operation, the Lotteries Commission is now planning to float larger lotteries. This is social legislation of which the people of South Australia were starved by the Playford Government. As a result of a Bill introduced by the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh), the Totalizator Agency Board has been established in South Australia, and each week (with one exception) the investments have been increasing. They started off at round about \$50,000 or \$60,000; they reached \$101,000 and then \$103,000; they came back to \$102,000, but last week they rose again to \$116,000. This shows that many people who in the past have been betting illegally are now investing their money legally. Many people who wanted to place a small wager and then go off to cricket or football are now able to do that, and they are happy about it. A person I know told me that instead of having to go to the racecourse of a Saturday afternoon he can now go down to Port Adelaide and take his boat out for the weekend. Previously, if he wanted to bet he had to go to the racecourse, because he refused to bet illegally. Now he can place his bets on a Saturday morning and go boating on Saturday afternoon and Sunday.

Mr. Boekelberg: Do you know what the small businessman thinks about the lottery?

Mr. LAWN: Is it my concern how a person spends his money? Is it the honourable member's concern how I spend mine! Some persons might want to spend all their money in a hotel, and others might want to spend theirs on women. Some might want to have a wager on the races or take a ticket in the lottery, while others might not want to gamble, smoke, drink or do anything at all. That is their own business. I have no quarrel with the teetotallers or the people who do not want to gamble.

Mr. Heaslip: What about the promise regarding the amalgamation of the two banks; has that been filled?

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, the amalgamation of the Savings Bank and the State Bank.

Mr. LAWN: I do not know whether honourable members are really clowning, but if they look at the records of this present Parliament they will find that this House has sat for more days and for longer hours than it did during the Playford Government's term of office.

Mr. Heaslip: Are you going to introduce legislation regarding the amalgamation of the two banks?

Mr. LAWN: We have tons of legislation to introduce yet.

Mr. Millhouse: Is it coming this session?

Mr. LAWN: I am not the Government. The legislation to be introduced will depend on the time available. We on this side have not forgotten that members opposite held up legislation on more than one occasion over the past two sessions. With some of the Bills (I admit not all of them) they just stonewalled and stalled. The State Lotteries Bill was one example.

Mr. Millhouse: You are prevaricating now.

Mr. LAWN: Because of considerable criticism of the licensing laws, the Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into all aspects of licensing in South Australia. Although the Government was not responsible for legislation on dog racing, that is another thing on which we have been out of step with all the States of Australia and with countries overseas, so we are told, although I have not had the pleasure of visiting oversea countries. One of my daughters who was living in Melbourne when 10 o'clock closing was introduced wrote me a letter about it. She does not drink or go to hotels, but she told me how successful the new licensing hours were. She made an assessment of the volume of traffic between 6 and 6.30 p.m., and she told me that all this

exodus of motor cars from hotels following the 6 o'clock swill that we have here does not take place in Melbourne.

There was a demand for our licensing laws to be reviewed. The old antiquated law about taking a ballot of people in a certain area on whether or not a hotel licence should be granted was dispensed with years and years ago in other States and overseas. Here is an instance where the Playford Government did not believe in the Licensing Court; it ignored repeated requests we made when we were in Opposition.

Mr. Heaslip: What about the promises in regard to mental health?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member will be free to avail himself of the facilities we have provided. I know of no other member of the House who needs more information on every subject than he needs it, apart possibly from information concerning how red cows give white milk from green pastures. Following our Party's promise of free textbooks for primary schools, if elected, this Government established a precedent throughout Australia when it distributed \$577,000 worth of free textbooks to State and independent primary schools. Although the Opposition, including the D.L.P. (the disguised Liberal Party), told the electors at the same time that we would not give books to children attending independent schools, I am proud to say that free textbooks have been provided for all schoolchildren. All books were delivered to the schools before the end of 1966 to facilitate distribution.

When I visited one of the schools in my district last year the headmaster, referring to free textbooks, said, "We didn't think it was going to work; we were very worried about it. However, I am pleased to say that it has worked perfectly; it has far exceeded our expectations. We haven't a complaint to make." I point out that he was speaking collectively and not referring only to himself. Headmasters had obviously discussed the scheme before and after it was implemented; they may have wanted some other scheme, possibly financial grants, but I do not know about that. I have not heard many questions or complaints about the scheme during this session. The Government also supplied free textbooks, materials and stationery to secondary schoolchildren whose parents were in needy circumstances.

Mr. Jennings: For the first time!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The previous Government, led by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, used to give free school books in primary schools to the children of parents who could not afford to buy them, but that never applied in secondary schools. This Government has extended it to secondary schools.

Mr. Hughes: The member for Albert disputed that fact last Thursday.

Mr. LAWN: I welcome a challenge from the Opposition on this matter. I say that the Opposition Party would never have given free textbooks to schoolchildren.

Mr. Millhouse: Never?

Mr. LAWN: It is totally opposed to it.

Mr. Bockelberg: It is only taking it out of one pocket and putting it into the other.

Mr. LAWN: If they pay for their own school books, they are not doing that. I challenge members opposite and they do not accept the challenge; they do not deny the fact that they are opposed to the giving of free school books.

Mr. Heaslip: You have not told me about mental health yet.

Mr. LAWN: Now I will tell the honourable member something about his own Party, about George and Mildred.

Mr. Millhouse: You cannot answer that one.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Rocky River is certainly in need of mental health. I will give him some more information later about it, for I am genuinely sorry for him. The Liberal and Country League (as it calls itself today, but at the next election in February or March it will be called the Liberal and Country Party) issued a statement in the *Advertiser* of February 4, 1967, under the heading "Political Commentary". I think it is a gem.

Mr. Clark: Do you know who writes that?

Mr. LAWN: I do not, but I thought it might be the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) or the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele). I do not know. This is a story about George and Mildred supplied by the L.C.L. It is as follows:

My name is Mildred. My husband's name is George. He is a nice man, really, though not as generous as a lot of my friends' husbands. I am a member of the local branch of the Liberal and Country League and sometimes attend meetings, and once was asked to second a vote of thanks.

Mr. Ryan: That's progress!

Mr. LAWN: The article continues:

I am also a member of a bridge club, at which we quite often discuss politics. And quite intelligently too, I might say.

Mr. Speaker, I am genuine about this. If you look at the *Advertiser* of February 4 last, you will see that this is right. This is supposed to

be getting news value out to the constituents, telling them what the L.C.L. believes in and what it is doing. I am not joking when I read this, although I enjoy a good laugh. The article continues:

Some are supporters of the Labor Party I think, but none of us are nasty about our politics, and we really do try to be fair to both sides. The other day at bridge there were a lot of comments about free school books. When this was first suggested by the State Government, a lot of us with children at school were glad about it, though as a member of the L.C.L. I felt that I shouldn't say so. But now we are not so sure. Some of the group said that, since this decision was made, there was no money to subsidize the school amplifying equipment for which we mothers had been working so hard.

The Minister of Education has answered all questions from the other side of the House about lower subsidies and has confounded members opposite on every occasion they have raised these rumours.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Confusion worse confounded!

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member should read Jeremiah, chapter 7. The article continues:

One of the group said, in rather a nasty way, that she wouldn't mind paying for school books if she could be sure that there would be a place at the university for her son when he finished school. Some of the mothers felt that a sound education system had to be paid for by someone, and that those who used it should pay, directly, some of the costs. Others said that it should be paid for by increasing income tax. So you can see that we do not waste our time in gossip. We discuss important things like this. But are we being fair, that's what I want to know, I asked George, but he only grunted and went on reading his paper.

I shall read all that is in the article because I do not want to be accused of leaving anything out. It continues:

How men can think they are better at governing the country than us ladies (and George really feels this) and won't listen to intelligent comment, I just cannot understand. Sometimes I get quite cross with George.

This is a political commentary on behalf of the Party opposite, which hopes to win the confidence of the electorate next March! I have more chance of winning the State lottery than have members opposite of winning the next election.

The first step has been implemented of the Government's policy of equal pay to that of male teachers being paid for work of equal value performed by South Australian women teachers. Regarding subsidies, they have been increased by 9.7 per cent in 1965-66, as

compared with 1.8 per cent for 1963-64, and 1.4 per cent for 1964-65. This year's Estimates provide for \$499,000 plus \$100,000 of Loan money for capital projects, an unprecedented increase of 20 per cent. That is what the Government is doing in the education field. Yet the commentary to which I just referred is what the Opposition is using to try to belittle the Government's efforts regarding education. 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. This is not what I have to say about living better with Labor: I have quoted the *Public Service*, and the remarks of Mr. King, who is the President of the S.A.P.S.C.A. I shall quote further sources, too.

The Government has increased swimming pool subsidies from a \$1 for \$7 to a \$1 for \$1 basis. Canteen shells are now included as an integral part of all new school buildings, and school committees meet the cost of fittings, a more efficient arrangement that is more acceptable to school committees. Before this system was introduced, school committees were required to meet the total cost of canteens on a subsidy basis. The Government is now providing a canteen shell free and is subsidizing the purchase of equipment on a \$1 for \$1 basis.

Mr. Heaslip: Are they happy?

Mr. LAWN: I will now deal with something that concerns the member for Rocky River. I hope he will not begrudge my discussing matters affecting children before discussing matters concerning him. I refer now to special care for handicapped children.

Mr. Heaslip: You have been asked which schools are unhappy about subsidies?

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The honourable member has every opportunity at Question Time to ask the Minister whether any school is unhappy. One of the biggest responsibilities of a Government is to ensure handicapped children are given the same educational opportunities as are all other schoolchildren. This facet of the State education system has been given special consideration by the State Labor Government. Boarding allowances are now being paid to severely handicapped secondary schoolchildren who must attend special classes because of their loss of hearing.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Does that include blind children?

Mr. LAWN: I refer that question to the Minister.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Yes, it does.

Mr. LAWN: I expected "Yes"; otherwise I would not have asked the Minister.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: The other week I asked the Minister this question and he could not inform me.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member is a lawyer and he knows that, in cases like this, one does not take chances: one briefs his witnesses first. On this occasion, however, with perfect trust in the Minister I took a chance and asked him. This boarding allowance is the same as that paid to secondary school pupils in country areas who must live away from home to attend school. A new speech and hearing centre has been established at the Klemzig Primary School to meet an urgent need because of the increasing number of partially deaf children in the Klemzig area. This centre has relieved pressure on existing centres at Woodville and North Adelaide.

Two South Australian teachers were sent to the University of Birmingham during 1965 to make special studies on advances in teaching blind children. At Brighton Primary School and Underdale High School improved facilities have been provided to educate children with impaired hearing.

In regard to trainee teachers' pay rises, increased payments to trainee teachers have been a major step forward in attracting more people to the teaching profession to help overcome the constant shortage of teachers. How many times did we tell the Playford Government that they could get many more trainee teachers by increasing their allowances? One of the first things this Government did was to provide \$480,000 (in a full year) to increase allowances to these trainee teachers. Under the previous State Government allowances for trainee teachers had remained unaltered for 10 years. These are some of the things that the Leader of the Opposition has to live down at the next general election.

Now, student teachers do not have to sign an agreement until they have completed the first six months of their course. This enables them and the department to gauge better their suitability for the teaching profession. In connection with student teachers' scholarships, in pursuit of the Government's policy of securing a more adequate supply of teachers of quality, 100 unbonded teachers' scholarships worth \$200 a year to students entering college and 100 of equal value to students who have completed the first year in college are now awarded annually.

Regarding improvements in university education, to ensure a good working relationship between the Flinders University and the Bedford Park Teachers College, provision has been made for the Professor of Education at Flinders University to hold also the position of Principal at Bedford Park Teachers College. Special assistance has been given to students attending university or the South Australian Institute of Technology who face hardships or disabilities, particularly those students who are from families with low incomes and who do not have Commonwealth scholarships. In 1966 the Labor Government allocated \$70,000 for this purpose, in comparison with the \$34,000 granted by the Playford Administration for 1965. In 1967 the State Labor Government allocated \$75,000 for student aid.

Mr. Ryan: That is a record on education of which any Government would be proud.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, the people have every reason to be proud of the action they took on March 6, 1965. Regarding the Institute of Technology, a committee was appointed to inquire into the best methods of implementing the recommendation of the Martin report on tertiary education with reference to the formation of a S.A. Institute of Colleges. The Government has acquired 182 acres at The Levels for a major development of the Institute of Technology and has declared its firm support for this development. Greatly increased grants have been provided in this and other avenues of tertiary education.

In connection with the provision of better teaching incentives, teachers who join the Education Department after leaving teaching positions in the Commonwealth or other States now retain continuity of service and long service leave entitlements. This rule, instituted by the State Labor Government, has made vacancies in the Education Department much more attractive to qualified teachers from other parts of Australia.

In addition, all members of the teaching profession in South Australia have received salary increases due to equalization of pay for women, basic wage increases and teachers awards, which, with the margins increases that are to be paid, will amount to nearly \$4 million in a full year. Women teachers are no longer forced to resign after marriage. This has given them the right to retain long service, superannuation and sick leave rights without a break in their employment.

Mr. Ryan: Teachers had been going to other States, where conditions were more lucrative.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and women teachers had to resign on marriage. All school students have now been granted concessional fares on privately-owned as well as Government transport since this Government has been in office. I understand that, under the previous Government, concession fares applied to travel only with the Municipal Tramways Trust and on the railways. However, one of the first actions of this Government was to extend concession travel to children using private transport.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: The Government increased railways fares and freights.

Mr. Langley: Didn't you ever increase taxes?

Mr. LAWN: Is the member for Angas implying that, as costs, wages and salaries continue to increase, charges are not to be increased? The honourable member's colleague, the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford), who was Treasurer for about 26½ years, increased charges on occasion. It cannot be said that these charges will never be increased.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Someone has to pay for benefits.

Mr. LAWN: Immediately this Government took office, an announcement was made, as a result of inquiries commenced by the Playford Government, that Housing Trust rents were to be increased by \$1 a week for each of the years 1965, 1966 and 1967. This Government told the Housing Trust to limit increases to 50c a week. Any increase that had been set at, say, 35c a week was to stand at that amount and any increase of 50c a week was to stand, but there were to be no further increases in 1966 or 1967. That position applies today. I do not say that the rents will never be increased but the maximum increase under this Government was 50c a week, instead of the \$3 a week that had been proposed by the previous Government. The Government has established a first-class inservice training centre at Raywood, Arbury Park, to meet the needs of teachers in studying new methods and in raising professional standards. This Government changed it from an offshoot of the National Gallery so as to use it in the educational system of the State. The establishment has been described by qualified observers as the best of its kind in Australia. I recall repeatedly criticizing the Playford Government and saying that this State was always dragging behind the other States. As the honourable member for West Torrens has pointed out, we have caught up with other States on workmen's compensation. This

Government is giving the lead on Aboriginal affairs and other matters, and it is leading the Commonwealth Government.

The regulations covering age of entry of children into our primary and infant schools have been amended, the effect being that more children are able to start school in the first term, with a reduction of a mid-year intake. This benefits all concerned. I recall the complaints I have had over the years, even concerning members of my own family: we could not put our children into school at the beginning of the year, but we had to wait until the middle of the year.

Regarding industry, a subject amply dealt with by the member for West Torrens, who referred to the achievements of this Government, I wish to make a couple of observations on the improvements that this Government **achieved in regard to industrial legislation**, compared with the history of the Party sitting opposite. This Government has intervened in the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration in support of the trade union movement for **increased wages**, and it has passed legislation dealing with factory safety. However, what did the previous Government do? It used to intervene, upon the application of the employers, not only for lower wages but for reductions in wages. I do not make these statements without authority just for political reasons. I remember sitting on the other side in 1960 and speaking at some length about the actions of the Playford Government. The then Premier told me in no uncertain terms from this side that whoever appeared on behalf of the State of South Australia would carry out his instructions. That appears in a 1960 volume of *Hansard*. The person who appeared on behalf of the State of South Australia was Mr. W. A. N. Wells (counsel) and Mr. C. P. Tucker, for Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of South Australia.

The application in question was made by the Federated Enginedrivers and Firemen's Association to abolish the differential wage rate in South Australia and for an increase in the basic wage. The instructions of Mr. Wells were to ask the court to award a basic wage in South Australia of 90 per cent of the Sydney basic wage. At that time this State was enjoying a basic wage of between 95 and 96 per cent of the Sydney basic wage, and the court was asked, on the instructions of the Liberal Party Premier, to reduce it to 90 per cent of the Sydney basic wage.

At that time wages in the country areas of South Australia were 3s. below those in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Heaslip: We had full employment.

Mr. LAWN: We did not have full employment, and the application of the Playford Government was for 12s. less in the country areas of South Australia than in the metropolitan area of the State.

Mr. McKee: They said it was cheaper to live in the country and get free firewood from the farmers.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and kill a few rabbits. Whereas our Government has done all it could to build up the living standards of the people, the Playford Government wanted a 5 per cent to 6 per cent reduction in the basic wage in the metropolitan area of Adelaide compared with the wage in Sydney, and a 12s. lower wage for country areas in South Australia; but it was disappointed to find out that this was prior to the Frome by-election.

Mr. McKee: That put the skids under them.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Hoping to win the Frome seat, 12 months later the Playford Government sold the houses and got rid of the people from Radium Hill so that they would be off the roll. Sir Thomas Playford, the Premier in 1960, was going to spend about \$18,000,000 on gauge standardization if his Party's candidate (Mr. Hams) was elected at the Frome by-election. I am pleased that the present member for Frome won that by-election, but he is still waiting for the millions of dollars to be spent in Peterborough as was promised in 1960 if Mr. Hams won the by-election. After this incident, the Liberal Party considered that it would have to win the Frome seat at the 1962 general election or it would be out of office, so, in 1961, the Government instructed its departments to get rid of Radium Hill and to remove the people who normally voted there. Despite these moves, however, the member for Frome increased his majority.

Mr. Heaslip: And now we have full unemployment.

Mr. Clark: He didn't hear you.

Mr. LAWN: Many galahs and parrots fly around my house and the noise from Opposition members is similar to the noise made by these birds, so I am not worried by it. The member for West Torrens said that the Labor Government had improved the Workmen's Compensation Act by providing compensation for a workman if he were injured going to and from his employment. When we were in Opposition, the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) introduced workmen's compensation legislation and said

that members must accept it with no amendments. When the report was received from the committee, he told the Parliamentary Draftsman to put it into the form of a Bill, saying that he had not looked at it to see what the report contained. When he said that the Opposition, therefore, was not to move amendments to the Bill, I interjected and asked him would he have done the same if the committee had recommended workmen's compensation for a workman travelling to and from his place of employment, but in reply he said that in no circumstances would he have that provision included.

When Opposition members knock on the door of heaven and St. Peter answers them, they will have to answer for these things. Men have been killed when travelling to or from their place of employment, leaving widows and children. Under the Playford Government such families received no compensation. Although the compensation provided by this Government's provisions cannot bring a husband and father back, I am pleased to see that the legislation has been improved. When honourable members opposite were in Government they plucked the body of workmen's compensation like vultures, giving the toe-nails to the workers and the carcass to the employers. The present Government is giving a bit of the carcass to the employees, for a change.

Mr. Heaslip: And giving them unemployment.

Mr. LAWN: Then members opposite wonder why the people are saying, "Live better with Labor". The people could not get workmen's compensation cover while travelling to and from employment, but they got it from the present Government. The Playford Government asked the court for a lower basic wage, but it did not succeed in its application. However, this Government has been going to the court and asking for a higher basic wage for the workers, and they now have a higher basic wage. Do members opposite think the people are going to say that the slogan "Live better with Labor" is not right? It is Socialism, and they believe in it, for Socialism means "the best that life can give for all the days that they may live". Don't we all want to live better? Honourable members want something better for themselves but not for the people who work for them. This Socialist Labor Government wants to make life on this earth a stairway to heaven. We all hope to make heaven one day.

Mr. Heaslip: You won't get there!

Mr. LAWN: The member for Rocky River is my senior by many years. Probably he will retire from this House before me, but I know that I will pass on before him, because I have been given only a short time to live—10 years from 1963. I do not say that I have never sinned or that I have never made mistakes, but I have asked for pardon and I believe it has been granted. I believe that when I pass on I will go up to heaven and that, later, when the honourable member comes up and knocks on the gate, St. Peter will open it and will say to the honourable member, "No; down, down, down, down!" I believe that the honourable member will then look over St. Peter's left shoulder and see the present member for Adelaide surrounded by angels in white flowing gowns and in his hand a long glass of icy cold Berri orange juice. The honourable member will say to St. Peter, "You won't admit me, but I see the honourable member for Adelaide in there, and if he can get in surely I can." Then St. Peter is going to tell him some of the things I have been telling honourable members here this evening. I believe that he will also remind the honourable member of the days when he supported the Playford Government when it knocked down the homes of poor people to build banks, warehouses, and petrol stations, which were then three ha'pence a dozen, throwing people out into the street, pulling the roofs off houses while families were living in them, leaving fatherless children and widows without workmen's compensation—

Mr. Heaslip: I will take my chance.

Mr. LAWN: —and, where a husband had an accident going to or from work and did not die, leaving families without any compensation. Such families had to exist, God knows how. The honourable member, when he meets St. Peter, will find it hard to justify his actions.

Mr. McKee: I do not think he will get up that far.

Mr. LAWN: There is one thing I would like to commend to the Government regarding claims for workmen's compensation. Whilst I have not received any workmen's compensation for some years—

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You deserve it after tonight!

Mr. LAWN: I am getting compensation in my heart, because I have had the pleasure of seeing certain things come about. As I have said, I only became a member of this House in 1950 hoping, because of the gerrymander, that before I died I would see another Labor Government. I have had that pleasure, and I

now have the pleasure, in the last session of this Parliament, of comparing the Government's actions with those of its predecessor, the Playford Government. I am indebted to the Minister of Agriculture, who has handed me the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, which gives the following meaning of the word "socialism":

State distribution of produce, free education and feeding of children, and abolition of inheritance; attempt to apply Christian precepts in ordinary life resulting in some approximation to the aims of socialism.

We apply Christian principles to every aspect of everyday life. Indeed, that is why St. Peter will admit me: I was a Socialist. I now refer to workmen's compensation, or "compo" as we call it. Although I naturally did not receive workmen's compensation when I recently met with an accident, I supplied certificates to the insurance companies and received the necessary forms. One insurance company representative visited me with an assessment in respect of which I had to answer no end of questions. The accident happened quite simply; it happened in a second, but I had to explain at length how, early one morning, I had taken the teapot outside to empty it (I get up on a Sunday morning to make a cup of tea for my wife); washing the teapot in the sink, I was caught up with the dog on its chain. The dog took off and I shot up into the air, finishing up with my slipper off and my ankle dislocated.

Although I tried to explain what happened, it was no end of a mix-up. That reminded me of an accident that I met with some years ago when, as a builder's labourer, I applied for workmen's compensation. I made a short draft of what happened to me when filling out the form for "compo". Entitled "Compo ups and downs", the summary states:

Those of you who have ever enjoyed the benefits of workers' compensation (compo to you) will remember the claim form. It has 10,000,000 questions, one of which is, "How did the accident occur?" To this question a bricklayer recently supplied the following answer:

I was repairing a chimney and had rigged up a beam with the pulley at the top of the building to hoist up bricks and mortar. When the job was finished there were a lot of bricks left over, still in the barrel in which they had been hoisted up, with the rope nicely secured on the ground floor. In order to get those bricks down again for further use on a different job, I went down and undid the rope. Unfortunately, the barrel of bricks was heavier than I was and, before I knew what was happening, the barrel started down, jerking me off my feet. I decided to hang on and half way up I

met the barrel coming down, and received a severe blow on the shoulder. I then continued to the top, where my head collided with the beam and at the same time my fingers got jammed in the pulley. In the meantime the barrel hit the ground and burst its bottom, allowing all the bricks to fall out. Now, suddenly I was heavier than the barrel and, at high speed, started down again. Half way down I met the barrel coming up and received severe injuries on my side. When I hit the ground, I landed on the bricks, receiving many painful cuts from the sharp edges of same, but still hanging on to the rope. At this point I must have become confused, let go of the rope and, as I did so, the barrel suddenly heavier than the rope came down again at even greater speed, landed on my head and the next thing I knew was that I found myself in hospital.

That is how it happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about public health. More than \$2,000,000 over the 1965-66 figures was spent on health and hospitals by the State Labor Government during 1966-67. In the previous year a total of \$9,850,157 was spent compared with \$12,051,588 in 1966-67. During the term of the previous Playford Administration the expenditure per person in South Australia for health, hospital and child welfare was the lowest in all States of Australia. It is now well ahead of Victoria and New South Wales, 1c lower than Queensland and 33c above the all States average. I have comparative lists of per capita expenditure under the Playford Government in 1962-63 and the Labor Government since 1965. I ask that I have leave to have a table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

STATE COMPARISONS.

State.	Per Capita Expenditure.	
	1962-63.	Now.
	\$	\$
South Australia	16.78	21.40
Victoria	18.02	19.16
New South Wales	18.54	20.88
Tasmania	20.78	24.65
Queensland	22.29	21.41
Western Australia	23.14	26.91
All States average	19.17	21.07

Mr. LAWN: A contract has been let at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Elizabeth Vale, for the erection of casualty and pathological sections. The State Labor Government plans to build a 500-bed hospital at Modbury. It will be a non-teaching hospital built in stages. The first stage will provide for 100 beds. Plans are also under way to build a new hospital at Bedford Park to serve the south-western district. The Labor Government has decided that this should

be a teaching hospital to increase facilities available for the training of medical undergraduates. Strathmont Training Centre for retarded children has been proposed by the State Labor Government and will be built at Northfield later this year. The centre will be the first of its kind in South Australia. Accommodation will be provided for 544 trainees and there will be 20 infirmary beds. The centre will be a training school for nurses from both Strathmont and Hillcrest Hospitals.

A 24-hour service in the treatment of cases of accidental poisoning has been established since the Government has been in office. A Principal Poisons Information Centre has been established at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and subsidiary centres have been set up at other major Government hospitals. A revised plan for a new Government hospital at Port Augusta has been prepared by architects of the Public Buildings Department and has been recommended by the Public Works Committee.

Regarding school dental services, the Government has decided to train and use school dental nurses on lines similar to those operating in New Zealand. A school for these nurses was opened in February this year. A new clinic recently opened at Enfield Hospital provides up-to-date facilities for psychiatric outpatients from both Enfield and Hillcrest hospitals. Doctors from both hospitals conduct regular outpatient sessions in this building. The Government has purchased the Drapers Hall property on East Terrace, for use as a headquarters for mental health services.

Now the member for Rocky River is missing. Regarding electricity, the record expenditure in 1965-66 was \$28,698,000, and the target for 1966-67 is \$35,000,000. These figures compare with an average expenditure of \$18,100,000 for the previous three years under the Playford Government. The Government has undertaken a number of law reform projects to make justice speedy, cheaper and more effective. Changes in the set-up of the Supreme Court have, under Labor, reduced the waiting time for the hearing of cases from two years, after setting down a case for trial, to two months. The Government has pioneered the British-speaking world in introducing a new system of interim assessment of damages. Those people who have been seriously injured no longer have to wait years until their permanent disabilities can be assessed before getting their damages and out-of-pocket expenses.

Under the previous Government, there was no companies' investigation staff and South Australia had become a happy hunting ground

for those who used joint stock companies as a means of defrauding the public. Under Labor, a team of inspectors, overseen by a solicitor, has been appointed. Investigations have been undertaken into complaints concerning 176 companies and prosecutions are now under way to see that the public is protected. This Government has also passed a Planning and Development Act.

Regarding social welfare, sick, deserted, poor, incapacitated and elderly people and Aborigines have been given more thought and consideration since the Government has been in office than for many years under previous L.C.L. Administrations. When this Government took office from the Playford Administration, welfare services in South Australia were far below accepted Australian standards. This Government has given the lead to the rest of Australia in Aboriginal welfare and advancement. Aborigines have been given equality of legal status with all other members of the community.

The Government has taken early steps towards giving Aborigines land rights for the first time in Australia. This has been recognised by law for many years in America, which covers its indigenous Indians. Legislation has been passed which has outlawed discrimination against any person, on grounds of race, in employment, housing or services. Another badly-needed social reform instituted by the Labor Government has been the relaxation of the means test on public relief. Television sets, washing machines, refrigerators and other consumer goods have been exempt from the assessment in determining public relief. I remember raising in this place a case where a husband had passed away leaving a widow with young children. The widow's brother purchased a television set, giving it to his sister for the use of the young children. They were unable to enjoy outings, as they had when their father was alive, and had to spend more time indoors because insufficient money was available to enable them to go out. Their uncle purchased a television set for them, but the mother was deprived of the relief she was receiving from the Children's Welfare Department. I raised this matter in this House and the then Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, said that under no circumstances would people with radios or television sets be given relief; they had to get rid of them first. This was a Christian action by the uncle who bought the set himself for his nephew and nieces and sister, and the Government said, "Get rid of it. We won't give you any relief." The Walsh Government has

changed that. Provision and enforcement of maintenance orders for deserted wives and children has been greatly facilitated and the Minister of Social Welfare has been given greater control over State wards. Pensioners now receive concessional travel on railways and tramways regardless of whether they are residents of the country or metropolitan area. Under the Playford Administration two tickets a year were given to country people; now, the number of journeys does not matter.

The Walsh Government referred the whole question of public relief payments in South Australia to the Social Welfare Advisory Council. In the meantime, it has refused to reduce public relief payments when Commonwealth pensions have increased—in complete contrast to the course followed by the Playford Government. We remember how, during the Playford Administration, each time the Commonwealth Government increased the pension by 50c. or \$1 the amount of the increase was set off by the Children's Welfare Department; the Labor Government is disregarding any increases in pensions made by the Commonwealth Government.

Regarding youth activities, pilot projects have been undertaken in the Kensington and Norwood districts to test new recreational activities for youth. A co-ordinating committee on indoor youth recreation facilities has been set up, representative of local government, the State Government and youth bodies throughout South Australia. The committee is currently working to prepare an overall plan for the development of indoor youth recreation facilities. Major construction work at the Magill Reformatory has been completed and opened.

The State Labor Government has implemented an indenture that now assures Aborigines full royalties from mineral finds on their lands. The Walsh Government made it an offence to engage in overt practices of discrimination because of a person's race, colour of skin, or country of origin. It has provided Aborigines with housing and craft training.

In regard to the Highways Department, the total expenditure during the year 1965-66 amounted to \$30,000,000 and it is estimated that the figure for 1966-67 will be \$33,000,000. In addition to the maintenance of existing roads, bituminous surfacing was extended and reconstruction carried out on 450 miles of road during 1965-66. It is expected that the figure for 1966-67 will be about 500 miles.

I think I have said enough to convince members opposite and anyone interested that it has paid the people of South Australia to elect the Walsh Government because it has proved conclusively that it does pay better dividends. The people can live better with Labor than they could live under the Playford Administration. I have the greatest pleasure in saying that I wholeheartedly support the motion so ably moved by my colleague.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is very pleasing that the previous speaker also supported the motion because I believe that in his salad days he did, on one or two occasions, oppose the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It has been evident in this debate that the Government's speakers are those who are in danger of being defeated at the next election. Those members who think they are safe have not listed their names for the debate.

First, I pledge my allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and express my loyalty to the people of South Australia. I stress this because of the statements that have been made by the newly-elected Premier. When he attained that office, he went on record on the *Four Corners* programme on Channel 2 as saying that he was going to sell South Australia down the Socialist river as soon as he could.

Mr. Langley: He did not say that at all.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I should like to dissociate myself entirely from the Premier's television statement that he was going to destroy the South Australian Constitution as soon as it was convenient and practically possible to do so. That statement seems to be typical of Socialist thinking in other places, also. Last Sunday I, with many other Liberal and Country League members, attended the annual commemoration service that draws the attention of the public to the mass deportations from the Baltic States into that Socialistic paradise, Russia, in the early 1940's. It was obvious that, although many Liberal and Country League members were present, no member of the Australian Labor Party attended. Any indication that may openly criticize any action of the Government of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics is not supported by them.

Mr. Langley: Who was the guest speaker?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Unley has asked about the guest speaker. The guest speaker on this occasion was none other than the fellow Parliamentarian of the member for Unley, the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), who delivered a fine oration.

Mr. Langley: Have they ever had a member of any other Party speak?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not know. That was the first occasion on which I attended.

Mr. Langley: I have been to several of them.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I have been to several, but I have not noticed any Labor members present.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) indicates that he has not noticed any Labor members at any previous service. I regret that His Excellency Sir Edric Bastyan was unable to declare open this third and last session of the Parliament and hope that his health is soon restored. This would have been his last opportunity to open a session of the State Parliament. He has had a fine career as our Governor and he and Lady Bastyan have done much to improve the status of South Australia. I shall always be grateful to His Excellency for his visits to the Light District. I add to the remarks of other members my appreciation of the work done in this Parliament for our State by the Hon. R. S. Richards, the Hon. Dudley Octoman and Mr. Rufus Goldney, who have passed on. I had the pleasure of working with the late Mr. Octoman for the all-too-short time he was in this Parliament. He was indeed a fine colleague. Mr. Goldney retired before I came into Parliament, but I knew him very well when he was the House of Assembly member for Gouger. I welcome the Hon. V. G. Springett, the new Legislative Council member for the Southern District, who lives at Murray Bridge. He will be a great asset to this Parliament. We now have a doctor in Parliament, and there is not much doubt that we will have two doctors in Parliament after the next election, when the endorsed L.C.L. candidate for the District of Norwood becomes the new member.

Mr. Langley: I will have a wager on that!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I thought perhaps one previous speaker from the Government side was rather prophetic when he suggested that the Premier was likely to "do a John Gunn" and be paid off with some larger-salaried job on the other side of the world.

Mr. Millhouse: As he is a Queen's Counsel that is possible.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: He made himself a Queen's Counsel as soon as he became a Minister of the Crown, no doubt thinking of the day when he would accept some plum job in the John Gunn style, as suggested by the member for Adelaide. I should like to commend the Hon. Frank Walsh on the work he did during

his term of office as Premier of the State. He treated me as a private member very well and always answered correspondence promptly—that is much more than we can say of the new Premier—and answered questions in the House faithfully and freely. On at least two occasions he graced the District of Light by visiting it. His visit was very much appreciated by the people.

In the Speech made by the Governor's Deputy when he opened Parliament, it was made very obvious that the Government was careful not to introduce very much controversial matter. It is obvious that the Government is going to coast along quietly, trying not to offend the electors of the State any more than it has already done in its previous two unfortunate years. On television last Friday night a very prominent political scientist described the Australian Labor Party Administration as disastrous.

Mr. Langley: Did he mention South Australia?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My colleague, the member for Albert, prompts me by saying that the Premier saw fit, when speaking in a debate on a television broadcast, to endeavour to refute what this very prominent political scientist had said last Friday evening.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: A potential Liberal candidate, isn't he?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: For Whyalla, perhaps!

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I shall be happy to see him.

Mr. Hughes: Do you mind giving us his name?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not think it is fair to give the names of people outside this House who cannot enjoy the privilege of Parliament to defend themselves or to present their case. Concerning agriculture, the Speech prepared by the Government states:

The wheat production of 1966-67, estimated to be 53,250,000 bushels, almost equals the best wheat yield ever in South Australia.

This is a fine achievement by the rural sector in this financial year, in a season not entirely favourable throughout the State. One part suffered a poor season, so that the results indicate the high quality of technology in the farming community, as a South Australian record has almost been equalled in a year that was only mediocre, to say the best. I hope the present dry spell will not continue: if it does, our cereal yields will be greatly depleted and the Labor Government will find it more difficult to balance its Budget for the remainder of its year of office.

Mr. Clark: It will do that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Government will not be able to boast when it goes out of office next March or April that it has been a "remarkable achievement". I hope the drought will not continue, and that the Australian Labor Party will not have to cook the books in order to boast of its achievements. The member for Unley is interjecting and he has already spoken in this debate, but his total contribution to Parliament in five years has been to promote the licensing of electricians.

Mr. Langley: And the people of Unley.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The honourable member is facing almost certain defeat at the next election and is making sure that he will be on as easy a street as he can be. In the Speech, several references are made by the Government to rural industries. This is different from the scanty references that were made to rural industries in the Speeches made at the opening of the first two sessions of this Parliament. His Excellency's Speech states:

The orange crop, the harvest of which will start this month, will be less than 60 per cent of last year's crop because of the effects on tree health of the leaf drop associated with the high river salinity early in 1966 and the heat wave conditions during flowering in November. As oranges are the principal fruit crop of the State and South Australia provides 60 per cent of Australia's export oranges, the influence of the light orange crop could be widely felt. A record crop of 3,000,000 bushels of oranges was harvested last year and sold at good prices, reflecting credit on the Citrus Organization Committee in its first year of operations.

That is so, and I hope that this committee continues to serve the industry well, but every orange farmer in the State would question whether it sold the crop at good prices. I visit the Murray River district frequently, and have heard many complaints about the low price of oranges. Everyone with experience in rural industries knows that the price of oranges is poor, not good as was stated by the phantom drafter of the Speech.

I should like to say something about the orange area in my district. I refer to the Cadell irrigation settlement, which has a long history of irrigation. I think the first settlement on the Murray River at New Era, about one mile from Cadell, took place in about 1890. It was the scene of one of the very early communistic village settlements. Apparently a group of people from Adelaide thought they could live at New Era, conduct their irrigation enterprise, and live their lives on the communal principle, which is the principle that

nobody owns anything and that all one's worldly goods belong to the common pool. Mr. Speaker, as one would imagine with any communistic society like that, it soon failed.

Civilized settlement did not recommence until 1920, when Cadell was the site of one of the First World War soldier settlements. No doubt to the early settlers the Cadell area was very attractive, and for that matter it is still very attractive to this day. The Cadell settlement is almost on the north-west bend of the Murray River. It forms part of an old oxbow of the river, with the centre of the oxbow making up a mallee island, and the periphery of the irrigation area consists of a very high limestone cliff. Theoretically, it is an excellent irrigation site. The surface soils are good, but unfortunately there is a clay band and the planners of the First World War irrigation settlement did not know as much about salinity as we know today. Consequently, there were many failures in the area.

Cadell is still a thriving community, although very small. Its irrigation area has in recent years been greatly augmented by the Cadell Training Centre, about which members probably will know something. It is one of those prisons without bars where the emphasis is not on punishment but on rehabilitation. I believe that the Prisons Department now has about 600 acres under irrigation. Only a relatively small part of that area consists of trees and vines, the rest consisting of irrigated pastures. One thing for which provision has not been made at the Cadell prison farm is a proper and adequate deep drainage system, and it has become most apparent in recent years that part of the seepage draining from the Cadell prison farm is tending to increase the saturation in the actual Cadell irrigation settlement. I believe that the department has some plan to provide at some time in the future a proper deep drainage scheme over the prison farm area, a scheme that will greatly improve the public relations of the prison farm as well as the irrigation prospects of the permanent settlers in the Cadell irrigation settlement. One thing that occurs to me is that the labour to lay the drainage pipes could be provided cheaply if the trainee labour could be utilized for this purpose.

I should like to go on now to comment on the reference in the Governor's Deputy's Opening Speech to the Nuriootpa viticultural station. I am very pleased that my colleague, the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner), discussed this matter this afternoon. I point out that the grapegrowing industry is an

important one in the District of Light and we boast that at Watervale we are progressively going to out-produce the Barossa Valley. I think I have referred previously in the House to the excellent vine country at Watervale. The area has a high rainfall, a relatively high elevation and fine red-brown soils, which are perfect conditions for the slow ripening of the high-quality table wine grapes that the winemakers in the Barossa Valley are keen to purchase. Indeed, I believe that I should correct the member for Angas when he says that the Barossa Valley riesling is the premier white table wine grape: the riesling grape grown around Watervale is the premier white table wine grape.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: In that district!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I intended to be more expansive and to suggest that the Clare riesling would be the best in the Commonwealth. My district contains vineyards in the Barossa Valley where the district borders that of the member for Angas and, of course, there are vineyards also in my district at the Cadell irrigation settlement.

I was gratified to hear the Governor's Deputy refer to minerals and to the value of mining. Mining in South Australia has been traditionally a great source of the State's wealth. In fact, it was through the mining industry generally that the early Colony of South Australia was first able to progress. One of the early successful copper mine ventures in this State was carried out at Kapunda in my district. Between 1844 (only a few years after the proclamation of the Colony) and 1877 more than 13,500 tons of copper was produced at the Kapunda mines, the value of which production exceeded \$2,000,000. That was an enormous contribution to the economy of the young and tiny Colony of South Australia.

Mr. Rodda: Hasn't the opening of another copper mine in the North been announced?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, the Premier made that announcement, and I hope that if the mine becomes a reality it will contribute to our economy in the way that the early Kapunda and Burra mines contributed. The only reason why the Kapunda mines were closed in 1877 was the inrush of water into the workings, when the pumping facilities were not satisfactory.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That happened in many other instances, too.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I believe so.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Barton, near Truro, was another case.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I should think the Truro mine would be considered almost as part of the Kapunda complex. Extensive exploratory work has recently been undertaken in the Kapunda area in an endeavour to establish a viable deposit of copper, although I understand that tests have not as yet been greatly encouraging, despite the benefits of the modern techniques now used by geologists.

I turn now to the reference in His Excellency's Speech to the roads programme. Paragraph 16 states:

The road programme continues: during the current financial year the bituminous road system was extended by about 200 miles.

I am sorry to say that of that 200 miles only about one mile was laid in the District of Light.

Mr. Heaslip: You are lucky to get one mile.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, but I'm not satisfied with just one mile. I admit that this one mile is on an important highway, the famous North of the River Road, which connects Port Pirie and Port Augusta with the Eastern States *via* Morgan through to Sydney. This section of road, about 10 miles in length, has remained unsealed ever since I have been a member of Parliament. I know that the Playford Government was about to complete its sealing when it had the unhappy experience of going out of office. As, during the two years and three months of the Socialist Administration, only one mile of this important road has been sealed, I hope that, despite the financial stringency that this State is now suffering, the Minister of Roads will conjure up a little money to complete the sealing of this road.

His Excellency's Speech refers to the Licensing Bill being reintroduced into Parliament a little later this session. When it comes back to us, I hope that, if it is not reprinted, at least substantial amendments will have been made to it. If it passes in a form similar to that in which it was last session, many winemakers in my area will be forced out of business mainly because they depend on cellar door sales. I hope that the provision for the removal of the bottle liquor franchise from licensed clubs in the Murray River area will be restored to the clubs, because they will be in a difficult financial position if this is not done. I was very annoyed with the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) when, in a most offensive way, he referred to the licensed clubs on the Murray as "pubs up the river". He has gone on record in *Hansard* as describing

licensed clubs in the River Murray and Barossa Valley areas in this offensive way. It will not be appreciated by the people in those areas.

Mr. Rodda: Nor will it be appreciated in Wallaroo.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am sure it won't be. The people of Wallaroo will not approve of that description of these licensed clubs. One thing that causes me to rejoice a little is that the faceless men of the State Labor Party conference have now decided that the State Labor Parliamentarians must support the introduction of barmaids. There was a most interesting reference to this in a speech made by the Attorney-General last year. I thought it was a masterly example of double talk. This is what he said during the second reading debate on the Licensing Bill:

A provision for barmaids cannot be introduced by a member of the Labor Party. It is a free vote except that every member of the Labor Party is bound by a pledge that he has signed.

Although the Commissioner in his wisdom recommended the introduction of barmaids, South Australian Labor Parliamentarians could not support their introduction because the faceless 146 at the Trades Hall said they could not. Who are these faceless men who determine Labor policy? Are they elected in accordance with a democratic principle? We do not know who they are or how they are elected, yet these 146 individuals determine Labor Party policy. I am glad the masters have again spoken and that we are going to have barmaids in the fullness of time. If we do not get barmaids, members opposite will have to face their makers and I suggest that they will be in trouble. The previous speaker quoted from Abraham Lincoln, who said, "government of the people, by the people, for the people." I do not know how he can tie up the faceless 146 who meet at the Trades Hall with what Lincoln said.

It has been noticeable that no member opposite has referred to transport co-ordination. Although I do not have the specific press reference, the former Premier said that the Labor Party would go on with road and rail co-ordination. I do not want to make more than a passing reference to the merger of the State Bank with the South Australian Savings Bank. Undoubtedly this subject will become wellknown to the South Australian public between now and the date of the next State election. I should like to comment on the shortage of veterinary practitioners and persons holding veterinary permits

in the District of Light. I am sorry to say that there is no qualified university graduate veterinarian in my district. The surgeons nearest to my district are at Clare and Gawler, but, as most of the district of Light is remote from Clare and Gawler, it would be expensive for a person living in my district to hire the services of a qualified veterinary surgeon who had to travel some distance into the District of Light. It is just not economical to pay out perhaps \$30 or \$40 for the services of a veterinary surgeon to treat an animal, the worth of which may be much less than the charges made by the professional veterinarian for his services.

I am sorry that several applications for a permit to practise, made by a farmer in the Tarlee, Riverton and Saddleworth area, have been rejected by the Veterinary Surgeons Board. I hope we will see some relaxation in the board's policy. People in my district would not like to continue to have to choose between hiring a high-price professional veterinarian and letting an animal suffer and die merely because it was just not worth the expense of treating it. More permits should be issued so that country districts, such as mine, can receive some measure of veterinary service.

The Minister of Agriculture is not in the House at present. I hope he will come back soon or that he will hear my remarks through the extension speaker in his room, because I want to comment on the protest meeting which was held at Murray Bridge last Thursday week and which had regard to eggs and the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan. In this regard, the Minister said in this House, when describing this meeting, "I believe that at that meeting many lies and half-truths were told." I must say that I am as familiar with the egg industry as he is, but I did not really notice any lie or half-truth uttered by any speaker there that evening. One speaker perhaps was a little controversial when he said, "I have no faith in the State Minister of Agriculture," and all those in the hall (over 400 people) applauded vigorously. As I have not much faith in the way the Minister has been administering a part of his portfolio, I applauded too. However, some of my colleagues who were there with me maintained a statesmanlike silence.

I should like to spend a little time in going back over the background of the industry, so that members will be able to understand the disturbed minds of the 400 people who met in the Murray Bridge town hall about a fortnight

ago. Before the Second World War the South Australian egg industry was in an unhappy and unstable position; prices were low—they varied from almost nothing in the peak period to perhaps 20c or so a dozen in the short season. Under the stress of war-time conditions in 1941 a board was set up to control the marketing of eggs in this State. Three members were appointed by the Minister to represent egg producers from a panel of names submitted to him: there was a wholesalers' representative, a retailers' representative, and an independent chairman. The board worked very well during the first few years of its existence because it was able to compete on a very keen export market. However, in latter years the export market has fallen away drastically, and now we find that export eggs are worth only 6c or 7c a dozen, and the various State Egg Boards are trying to maintain prices in Australia that bear some relation to the cost of production.

We made what we thought was a big step forward in 1963 when the Act was altered so that the three producer members hitherto nominated by the Minister were elected by a growers' poll, but unfortunately we found that only very few producers were able to vote at the election. I stress the essentially part-time character of the South Australian egg industry. In fact, there are only about 300 South Australian producers who gain more than half their gross income from the sale of eggs and poultry, and yet figures I received today from the Secretary of the State Egg Board show that about 4,000 individual producers are delivering eggs to agents of the board and paying the equalization levy.

The following figures indicate plainly that the overwhelming majority of the 4,000 people engaged in commercial egg production in this State are in a small way. The latest figures I have are as follows: 1,735 producers keep fewer than 75 hens; 1,045 producers keep between 76 and 150; 966 producers keep between 151 and 500; 164 producers keep between 501 and 1,000; 94 producers keep between 1,001 and 2,000; 42 producers keep between 2,001 and 5,000; eight producers keep between 5,001 and 10,000; and five producers keep over 10,000 hens.

I have given those figures to stress the small scale on which most of the poultry farmers in this State operate. I had some hand in this when legislation was passed in 1964 to give growers a vote for Egg Board election. It was decided that a production of 3,000 dozen eggs a year should be the franchise to

entitle a producer to vote at the election of members of the board and we divided the State into three electoral districts. However, when the South Australian Egg Board prepared the roll only 607 producers in South Australia were entitled to vote at the first Egg Board election, and of that number, all of whom received ballot papers, only 363 voted.

The Labor Government, with the Opposition's general support, amended the legislation two years later to provide that the figure to be adopted in connection with the franchise for an Egg Board election should be a minimum of 250 birds kept for six months of the year or for 13 C.E.M.A. levy days. It was only as a result of vigorous representations by the Opposition at that time that the figure in relation to the franchise was changed from, I think, 24 levy days to 13 levy days. The Minister insisted that his plan to stagger the elections of the three producer members be supported and only one grower member of the board, the member for district No. 1, was required to face the electors in March, 1967.

Only 188 were entitled to vote with the new franchise, so we can safely assume that under the new voting system only about 600 persons are entitled to vote at an Egg Board election, yet 4,000 farmers in South Australia are paying the C.E.M.A. levy. That was the greatest complaint made by those producers who attended the meeting at Murray Bridge 10 days ago. I know that the farmers' case is strong and I know that the Minister of Agriculture feels insecure. As well as having faced a large swing against his Party in his area at the last Commonwealth election, he will be facing angry farmers at the next State election. I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not present. I do not doubt that he is listening in his room to my speech.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: How many more times are you going to ask for him?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The previous speaker spoke for about 2½ hours and I do not think it unreasonable for me to speak for one hour. I am making these remarks for the benefit of the Minister of Agriculture, who must have known that I would be speaking on matters connected with egg marketing, yet he has not had the courtesy to be in the Chamber to hear me.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: How often are you absent?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Today I asked a question about the collection of levies and said that a farmer in South Australia who kept 20 or more birds was required to pay the levy. I asked

the Minister whether this was the situation in other States, and he said as far as he knew it was. If he knew his industry, he would know that Tasmanian farmers who keep 50 or more birds pay the C.E.M.A. levy. On South Australian figures this means that if we were to lift the number for C.E.M.A. levy to 50, more than half the growers in South Australia who pay the levy would be exempt. Small wonder that the poultry farmers at Murray Bridge were very annoyed with the Minister of Agriculture.

It was also alleged at the meeting that poultry farmers in North Queensland were not paying their levies either. I remember two years ago that a group of Liberal and Country League Parliamentarians went to a similar protest meeting at Murray Bridge and the Minister of Agriculture told them that every poultry farmer in Australia would pay the C.E.M.A. levy. Now, we find that the poultry farmers of North Queensland are not paying the levy. I should like to quote from the *Courier Mail* of Saturday, April 8, which gives a very interesting account of the situation in that State. I hope the Minister studies this, because it is one of the things that is going to cause his downfall at the next election.

Mr. Clark: You are joking!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not joking. There were 400 angry poultry farmers at the meeting at Murray Bridge, and the Leader of the Opposition has addressed almost 1,000 people in the Murray District, so I think we are not going to have the satisfaction of having the Minister here in the next Parliament unless he bucks up very quickly. The article in the *Courier Mail* states:

Egg chief resigns: Claiming he was a victim of a "stunt," Mr. C. H. King, a Toowoomba poultry farmer, yesterday announced his resignation as chairman of the South Queensland Egg Marketing Board. And the board will refund about \$12,500 already paid by North Queensland Egg Producers as a price-equalization levy.

The article continues:

Free market: Though South and Central Queensland have egg boards, North Queensland producers sell their eggs on a free market.

I hope that that is getting across to honourable members opposite. Remember that the Minister of Agriculture addressed a meeting in the Murray Bridge Town Hall and said that every poultry farmer in Australia would pay the levy. The article continues:

Mr. King claimed yesterday the South Queensland Egg Marketing Board, "as the authorized agent of the C.E.M.A.," had power to collect levies from North Queensland poultrymen. He said in the first 18 months we collected about \$12,500 from the North Queensland egg producers. Many of them refused to pay.

I hope members opposite note that, Mr. Speaker. The article continues:

Figures from the returns indicate that \$41,000 should have been paid in that period. Our own inspectors estimate that the total due for the two-year period from North Queensland producers is about \$50,000. There was considerable understatement in returns. These people were told that they have to pay up. We made a move through the Commonwealth Crown Law Office to collect the money. The article goes on in this strain but I do not intend to read the rest of it. I have heard that in southern Queensland many farmers have been prosecuted under the same legislation for failing to pay the levies and have refused to pay the fines. In some cases they have been fined, so I am told, on several occasions and they have still refused to pay. I do not know what will happen to the C.E.M.A. plan if this sort of thing continues. This was one complaint at the Murray Bridge meeting, but several other complaints were made.

Mr. Langley: Did you speak there?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I was not invited to speak, and no L.C.L. parliamentarian of a large team present was invited to speak. We went to hear the case. The Minister of Agriculture did not attend (he said he had a prior engagement) and he did not send one of his colleagues. He could have sent the member for Unley to represent him.

Mr. Hughes: He would have been well represented.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Of course. We should like to have had the member for Unley or any other Socialist parliamentarian represent the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Langley: If he had been there he would have answered any question, the same as I can answer yours.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Two years ago when the Minister of Agriculture addressed a similar meeting at Murray Bridge he said that C.E.M.A. levies would be used to defray export losses only. The first report under the Poultry Industry Assistance Act stated that part of the levy was used to meet payments of freight costs incurred in transferring eggs from one State board to another. This was the subject of a legitimate complaint by speakers at the Murray Bridge meeting, who said that the

Minister of Agriculture had given them the wrong impression. Another complaint was the reimbursement of 50c for each 30-dozen case of eggs imported by a State Egg Board from another State Egg Board to cover the cost of deterioration of packing materials and cases, and the cost of regrading. This money should have been used to defray export losses, but was being used to supply new egg cases and packing materials for the State Egg Boards' traffic between States. This stuck in the gizzard of those at the Murray Bridge meeting. Also, they had heard that Tasmanian poultry farmers were not paying the C.E.M.A. levy. What was said at Murray Bridge was not quite correct, but the shade of error was small. Tasmanian egg farmers were given a special rebate of 30c a hen in the first financial year of C.E.M.A. Why were they singled out from other poultry farmers?

Mr. Quirke: They did not have any export losses, because they do not export.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The C.E.M.A. plan is essentially a Commonwealth plan, using the Commonwealth Government's power of excise to collect levies. When the plan was first put before us it was never suggested that any poultry farmer in the Commonwealth would receive preferential treatment. Small wonder that there is great unrest in the district represented by the Minister of Agriculture.

Recently, I attended a poultry science conference at Surfers Paradise in Queensland to find out what was going on in the poultry industry in the Eastern States. What impressed me greatly was the large extent of vertical integration in the poultry industry. Most of the large flour-milling companies in Queensland and New South Wales operate poultry food and feeding plants; they maintain breeding farms and they let birds to small farmers to grow as broilers, which are being marketed through the group outlets.

I think this is the sort of thing we are going to see in the Eastern States in egg production as well. In my opinion, we will see more vertical integration and tighter control of the industry right from the flour-milling stage to the finished table bird or the egg, as the case may be. I was interested to note that one big flour-milling company is employing no less than four university graduates on its staff to ensure that technical excellence is maintained at every phase of the industry. As the previous speaker spoke for about 2½ hours, the hour is now late, and because of that I will conclude now by indicating my support for the motion.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I understand that His Excellency the Governor is still indisposed, and before proceeding further I should like to wish him a speedy recovery to good health. I join with other members in paying my respects to the memory of the late Hon. R. S. Richards, who served the Labor Party and this State for many years. I had known Mr. Richards for a long time. He was a gentleman who was respected by all, and right throughout his political life he gave loyal and yeoman service to this State. I am sure that we all regret his passing. I join with previous speakers in expressing sympathy to the relatives and friends of the late Rufus Goldney, who was not personally known to me, and also to the late Dudley Octoman, whom I knew for a short time while he was a member in another place.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the high honour you received recently from Her Majesty. I have known you, Sir, for some years, and I say without equivocation that you have justly deserved that honour. You have served South Australia, and your own district particularly, in this Chamber for many years, and I am sure that you have gained the respect not only of the people in the District of Stuart but of all people throughout the whole State. I sincerely wish you all the very best for the future. I also pay my respects to our former leader, the Hon. Frank Walsh, who gave this State magnificent service as its Premier for over two years until his recent retirement from that high office. He was responsible for lifting South Australia from the political doldrums and for leading into office a Party that has shown itself by its record to be one of the most progressive Parties this country has ever seen. More social reform was implemented under the leadership of Mr. Frank Walsh than we have ever seen before. Those reforms were necessary for the advancement and betterment of the State.

Mr. Clark: And long overdue!

Mr. HURST: Yes. Indeed, not only the people of South Australia appreciate the work undertaken by our former Leader: many tributes have been paid by people in other States to his work and leadership. He stood down from leadership of his own accord, indicating his unselfish attitude towards his Party, and enabling members on this side to elect a new Leader, who will return to Parliament after the next elections a progressive

Government, in accordance with the wishes of the South Australian public.

One only has to listen to the speeches made by members opposite in criticism of the Government to realize how weak their criticisms are. I think it would have taken the Leader of the Opposition fully five minutes yesterday to say what he meant to say, had it not been for the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). Most of the Leader's speech was devoted to reading extracts from the remarks made by the member for Wallaroo. True, the Leader endeavoured to criticize here and there, but I think it was clearly illustrated that he is finding it difficult (indeed, one might say practically impossible) to level any accurate or worthwhile criticism at this Government.

Mr. Broomhill: It also shows what a fine speech the member for Wallaroo made.

Mr. HURST: Indeed, it does, and I congratulate the member for Wallaroo on the able manner in which he moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I am confident that his constituents respect the ability and integrity of their representative in Parliament and that they appreciate the way he is tackling problems that arise in the district. I am sure, too, from what the member for Wallaroo said when moving the adoption that we shall see him returned to the Chamber for many years to come. I believe that, politically, his future is assured through the respect that he has gained from people in his district, through the way he approaches each problem and through the intimate attention he gives to the needs of his constituents. Those people, like any other democratic people, will accordingly show their respect for the honourable member's services.

The member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford), who was Premier of the State over a period of years, has announced that he does not intend to seek re-election at the end of this session. Everyone knows the strong hand with which he governed this State, although we on this side did not agree with his methods. I believe he decided to stand down to make way for someone younger. Within his Party before he made that decision I believe pressures were possibly applied to him and he decided to let a younger man take the reins; but I fear it will be many years, if ever, before his successor reaches the standard that Sir Thomas Playford attained during the course of his Premiership. His successor would be floundering were it not for the member for Gumeracha prompting him sometimes. I believe the job is too big for

the Leader of the Opposition. We have only to listen to the inaccurate statements made by him to realize that. One would expect a leader of an Opposition Party, with greater facilities available to him than to the average member of Parliament, to at least be able to come into this Chamber and make concrete suggestions. But what do we find? Practically every time he attempts to attack the Government or a Minister, his statements are full of inaccuracies and misinformation. While it is true that by spreading misleading stories one can fool the people some of the time, it is not possible to fool them all the time. The people are now waking up rapidly to the misrepresentations that have been made about the progressive legislation that this Government has introduced.

The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) has announced that he will not be seeking re-election. Why, I do not know. He has not told us why. We should like to know why, but he is not in the Chamber to say why, so I shall have to leave it at that. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) is stepping down. His contributions to the debates in this House have been valuable and sound. He is a keen debater. Whether or not we agree with his views, at least he does contribute much to the debates in this Chamber. Then the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) will not be here. Whether or not we agree with his politics, we have to acknowledge that he has served his Party quite loyally over the years. I say "quite loyally". I differ greatly from some of his political views but, from his Party's point of view, no-one could point the finger at him. He, unfortunately, not of his own choice but through an apparent undercurrent within the Party, has found himself in a position where he will no longer get the endorsement of his Party. I regret to think that a political Party can, contrary to the desire of its own member, stoop to such levels as to bring about his defeat in this way.

Mr. Hughes: And after 34 years.

Mr. HURST: Yes, after 34 years of loyal service. Although the opinions of members on this side differ from those of the honourable member, none of us can say that he has not served his own Party well. What will be the position after the next election? The Labor Party has elected the Hon. D. A. Dunstan as Premier of the State. He is a young, capable and vigorous man who has ideas and initiative and is prepared to work for the benefit of the State. I am confident

he will lead the Labor Party to victory at the next elections. On the other hand, we will find the Opposition completely torn to shreds. That the best of its men are leaving can be seen from the contributions made by some of its less experienced members. For these reasons, I am sure that the State will have a Labor Government for many years to come.

The people are beginning to appreciate the legislation we have introduced. I do not intend to deal with every aspect of that legislation and with each item, of the progress that has been made. My colleagues, the members for Mount Gambier, Wallaroo, Unley, Adelaide and West Torrens, have given the House a summary of the beneficial legislation to which the Government has given effect. As the people appreciate and respect what we have done more and more every day, the Government will be returned at the election with increased numbers. Possibly we have gone a little too fast for the people to absorb the situation properly, but during the next nine months they will come to understand the position fully and at the next elections they will place in us the confidence that we so rightly deserve.

I now turn to matters that affect my district. We have seen that the Government is providing for containerization. Most members realize that possibly the shipping industry is on the verge of some of the most revolutionary changes in its history. At this stage, I believe it is considered that Port Adelaide should be only a minor terminal for containerization. I have a report on the matter before me. However, I do not intend to go into every detail of it, as I understand it has been forwarded to the Containerization Consultative Committee which has been set up to deal with the matter. However, some points are worth considering. I sincerely believe that a case can be made out to have Port Adelaide established as one of the main terminals for containerization. I hope that the committee co-ordinates all sections of the community interested in this matter. Shipping is Port Adelaide's major industry. Although I do not wish to encroach on the ground of my colleague, the member for Port Adelaide, the district I represent is just as much concerned with shipping as is that of my colleague. Indeed, the affairs of the State generally are involved in this matter. We have to preach the gospel of establishing a main terminal at Port Adelaide in order that the authorities will thoroughly investigate every aspect of this important subject in the interests of the progress of Port Adelaide and of South Australia as a whole.

I believe that one of the main factors in containerization is that of ensuring a quick turn-round of vessels and of avoiding delays, so that vessels can use the facilities efficiently and be kept moving as much as possible. Only in this way will we derive maximum value from the capital outlay.

I do not have time to go into the many ramifications of containerization; committees are working on this matter continually. Australia's main shipping ports are mainly designed to cater for shipping from European countries; in this connection, Port Adelaide is one of the main centres for Australia. Figures that were worked out by people whose livelihood is connected with shipping clearly show that considerable time could be saved by developing Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour as main terminals. Indeed, if these figures are examined, it can be seen (depending on the mileage) that it would be possible for a vessel travelling at average speed to make one more trip a year to Port Adelaide than it could make if it visited Sydney and Melbourne.

When one considers the congestion in these larger ports and the space readily available at Outer Harbour for the development of containerization depots, one wonders why it was decided to establish those facilities in the ports of the other capital cities. The first requirement is efficient turn-round. When we remember that it is possible to save over a day by coming to Port Adelaide and when we multiply that by the number of trips a vessel would make, there would be considerable savings in freight costs. Ample facilities are available at Outer Harbour, including a double-track railway and good roads. When the new Jervois bridge is built, there will be ample outlets for the cartage of containers to rail-head for transport to various centres.

The Commonwealth and the State are spending much money on rail gauge unification, and we ought to utilize to the maximum every transport facility. I hope that this matter is not treated lightly. It arose at a symposium in Canberra in, I think, 1966. Evidence is available from people in different walks of life about the transformation in the shipping industry and, although many points need clarification, I hope that the weight of evidence will result in the establishment of Port Adelaide as one of the main terminals in Australia.

I express appreciation to the Government for the work that has been done regarding the provision of sewerage facilities in the Semaphore South area and hope that work will continue in other areas. Although the installation of proper

warning devices at the Gedville rail crossing has been advocated since 1961, I have not yet been able to persuade those concerned to carry out this work. The present Minister offered to arrange for the improvement of the pedestrian crossing, but this is not sufficient and I shall continue to advocate the provision of proper facilities.

Problems regarding transport in the developed areas will receive my attention from time to time. Semaphore South is not adequately served by public transport. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) and I have been trying to persuade the departments concerned to improve facilities for children, and other improvements are needed. Largs North has not been properly developed but houses are being completed and better public transport will be required. I consider there could be more tidying up of the old Semaphore railway line in Semaphore Road, although I appreciate what the Railways Department has done to tidy it up. The Port Adelaide City Council has done a magnificent job in improving the foreshore and facilities at Semaphore, although the work has to some extent been marred by the obstruction of some old platforms and buildings. Assistance has been given for the construction of highways, the building of schools, the extension of water mains, the duplication of water mains to improve the services to my constituents, and the building of the Police Academy at Largs for the training of cadets, and considerable numbers of tourists use the caravan park at Fort Glanville. Although some improvements have been made at Outer Harbour, a new passenger terminal is needed there. The member for Burnside has supported me and expressed her thoughts in this regard.

Mr. Ryan: The Playford Government said that the facilities were there.

Mr. HURST: I disagree. I am confident that, with the co-operation of the Minister, the Government will continue with this work as funds become available. The member for Angas mentioned unemployment in the building industry. This matter is receiving the attention of the Government. No-one on this side of the House wants to see unemployment, but I consider that one of the greatest contributing factors to unemployment in sections of the building industry is the technological changes taking place in the respective building trades. The member for Angas quoted certain statistics, but I suggest that if he forgot about looking at statistics and had a look at the activities in the building industry he would see that one of the major

contributing factors is the changes that are taking place in the building industry. How many large buildings today are constructed of brick? Honourable members have only to look at the building on the corner of King William Street and North Terrace—not a brick is visible in that building. Techniques in the building industry have changed in the last few years, with a drastic effect on labour in that industry. Recently, a representative of the plumbers union, one of the first to acknowledge that changes and progress were taking place, told me that 60 plumbers were employed on the State Bank building, but on the new Reserve Bank building, with more amenities and a larger building, six plumbers only were employed.

One problem in the building industry is the difficulty for tradesmen to get work and continually follow their trades because of technological changes that have taken place. Today, many steel prefabricated garages are advertised in newspapers, but not so long ago a carpenter would do much work in erecting a garage. If the member for Angas analysed these facts instead of quoting meaningless statistics he would realize what causes these problems in the building industry. The member for Light said that 146 faceless men at the Labor Party conference had now decided to support the introduction of barmaids in this State. That number is grossly misleading: far more than 146 delegates attend a Labor Party conference. The conference is open to the press and to the public, but those facilities are not available at L.C.L. conventions.

I am one of the faceless men, but I have never been ashamed to face anyone in society. Practically every member of this Government attends these conferences, together with Commonwealth Labor members. The Labor Party has a democratic method to formulate its policy, and in any democratic society changes take place. The question of barmaids will be debated at the appropriate time. Government members will take no notice of what is said by the member for Light, because they are competent and capable of interpreting the decisions that are made. I consider that we would be getting to a very low standard if we had to rely on assistance from members opposite to give effect to the decisions we make and the policies we adopt from time to time.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, June 29, at 2 p.m.