

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 6, 1967.

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

QUESTIONS

GAS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I refer to the statement recently made by the Premier that he had had discussions with the Electricity Trust regarding the price being negotiated for gas from Gidgealpa and Moomba and that he would also have, with the owners of the gas, talks designed to bring negotiations on this matter to a speedy conclusion. It is public knowledge that the trust has at present a term contract with oil interests for the supply and purchase of fuel oil at prices that are extremely favourable to the trust. Can the Premier say how much longer this contract has to run and whether he is aware that the type of fuel oil used by the trust has a rather limited market, in that it can be used only where extremely heavy fuels can be handled and that, therefore, it is heavily over-supplied and production cannot very well be reduced because it is a residual refinery by-product? If he is aware of this, does he realize that, faced with competition from alternative fuels, the oil interests would almost certainly meet such competition by offering fuel at a lower price at the end of the present contract? If the Premier does appreciate this probability, will he assure the House that no pressure will be put upon the trust to accept a contract for natural gas supply at a price higher than that which the trust would be prepared to accept without any representations being made to it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall get a considered reply for the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier seen a report in this week's *Financial Review* that a company drilling for oil at Mereenie, outside Alice Springs, is confident that it will shortly be able to achieve a satisfactory output? If such an output is possible, the company contemplates piping it to the southern seaboard (I assume that this means South Australia). Can the Premier say whether any approaches have been made to his Government by the companies working on this field in connection with this pipeline and, if so, has any assistance been given by the Government? Also, if this is so, can the Premier say whether the Government has considered the idea of using this

pipeline alternatively with oil to carry natural gas, which is also present on that field?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been no recent approach by the companies—certainly not since I have been Premier. I shall make an investigation and let the honourable member have a report.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Premier did not say just when he would bring down a report and, as I am most concerned about this matter, will he now assure me that he will not exercise persuasion or exert pressure on the trust in this matter until he brings down to the House the report that he promised?

The SPEAKER: Although I will allow the question, I again draw the attention of members to the Standing Orders covering questions. Those Standing Orders stipulate that questions are to be directed solely for the purpose of seeking information. I know we have established a practice from which I am not prepared to depart, but I do ask members to co-operate with me in order to see that it does not get out of hand.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that I intend to exert no improper pressure on the trust. The trust must get its fuels at a reasonable price, and I do not think a reasonable price to the satisfaction of the trust is far off.

MURRIE ROYAL COMMISSION.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I ask leave to make a Ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Because of the illness of Mr. Justice Walters and the inevitable delay in the proceedings of the Royal Commission (established at the request of the Director-General), which would be lengthy in any event, the Government has, in the interests of the public generally and of education in particular, reviewed the circumstances leading to the demotion of Mr. J. D. Murrie and the establishment of the Royal Commission. In doing so, the Government has had regard to the evidence already given, but this review has been prompted mainly by a desire that the important work of the Education Department should not be indefinitely hindered by a strained relationship with the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which is one of the regrettable consequences of the Murrie case. The Government supports the Director-General in his view that, however sincere Mr. Murrie may have been, his actions could not be condoned or overlooked.

Mr. Murrie has admitted that to criticize the department in a newsletter to parents was irregular, and that he used inflammatory

language. He also now acknowledges that some of the principal statements of fact in his newsletter of February 16, 1967, were exaggerated or to some extent inaccurate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is a matter before the Royal Commission. It is not proper for the Minister of Education to canvass these matters in the House when a Royal Commission has been constituted. There has been no announcement about the abandonment of the Royal Commission.

Mr. Langley: You are not the judge. Anyone would think you owned the place!

Mr. Millhouse: That is childish.

The SPEAKER: The House has given the Minister leave to make a Ministerial statement. The Minister will know that he is not permitted to refer to a matter before the Royal Commission. He understands that before he makes his statement. I propose to let the Minister continue, in that knowledge.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It has been claimed on Mr. Murrie's behalf that the decision to demote him, and the terms in which that decision was announced by me, failed to give proper recognition to Mr. Murrie's undoubted capacity and devotion as a teacher and his past achievements as a headmaster at Larrakeyah. The Government notes the evidence of the esteem and regard in which he is held by many people in Darwin, including a large number of his professional colleagues.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order, the Minister is now directly referring to matters in evidence before the Royal Commission.

The SPEAKER: I have already ruled on that point of order.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: However, in subsequent criticism of my statement, publicly reported, the words "existing malpractices" were used with reference to the department and its senior officers. The South Australian Institute of Teachers has informed the Director-General that, in using these words, it adopted the language of a resolution of the Darwin Teachers Association (an affiliated association) and that the Darwin Teachers Association intended to refer only to departmental policies and decisions with which it disagreed. S.A.I.T. (and through it the Darwin Teachers Association) has given an unqualified assurance that the use of the word "malpractices" was not intended to imply or suggest that the conduct of the department's officers was in any way corrupt or dishonest, or in any sense morally wrong. No such imputation was ever intended

and they regret any misunderstanding or false impression that has been created by the publication. The Director-General has accepted this explanation, this assurance and this expression of regret.

The Government, in its turn, accepts the assurance of S.A.I.T. that it has throughout acted in good faith with the object of promoting the welfare and interests of teachers and the public, including the children and parents who are or may be affected by the matters which were brought before the Commission. When I decided, on the recommendation of the Director-General, to demote Mr. Murrie, it was stated publicly that Mr. Murrie would not be denied the opportunity to regain his former status by promotion. It will be remembered also that some doubts were cast on the legal foundation for the Minister's actions, and these doubts contributed to the ultimate decision to have a Royal Commission. It now seems that it will be several months before these doubts could be resolved, and to allow the whole matter to remain in suspense for so long is not in the interests of Mr. Murrie, of the department, or of the community. Therefore, the Government has decided, having regard to the whole of the present circumstances, that instead of being demoted Mr. Murrie shall be severely reprimanded, and that he will not be granted further promotion before the beginning of 1970. He will be reinstated as headmaster of the Larrakeyah Primary School. Both Mr. Murrie and S.A.I.T. accept this decision, and Mr. Murrie has given an undertaking to comply with departmental procedures and regulations in the future. The Government considers, moreover, that it can help in restoring mutual goodwill between the Education Branch of the Northern Territory and the Darwin Teachers Association and, at the same time, remove a source of general misunderstanding (evidence of which emerged during the hearing held by the Commission in Darwin) by giving—and it unhesitatingly gives—an assurance that at all material times the Superintendent of Northern Territory Schools has authority to engage teachers locally and to transfer teachers from one Northern Territory school to another without first referring the proposed engagement or transfer to the South Australian authorities. It has always been realized by the Government that the staffing of Northern Territory schools presents special problems.

The Commission to Mr. Justice Walters will now be terminated. The Government is deeply

grateful to him for his work on the Commission (which has already proved most helpful to the Government), and sympathizes with him in his recent illness. He has been consulted about this decision and supports it. The terms of reference of the Royal Commission included matters of general concern to the teaching profession, particularly its relations with the department on such matters as discipline, appeals, and the right of criticism. I will invite S.A.I.T. to make detailed submissions to me on these matters (much as it would have done to the Royal Commission) in the hope that changes may be made, where necessary, beneficial to teachers and to the community. It is intended that those submissions will contribute to an investigation of the matters referred to, which the Government hopes will be both comprehensive and thorough.

That concludes the agreed statement. The final decision in relation to this statement was made yesterday, too late for a statement to be made to the House, and the reference to the Director-General of Education in the statement applies, of course, to the then Director-General (Mr. Mander-Jones), who retired from that position yesterday.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, the Minister said that it would be some days before he could make a statement on this matter, but I was pleased that he was able to hasten the issuing of this statement. I particularly desire to refer not to matters before the Commission but to the terms of reference dealing with matters of principle. The Minister dealt with these briefly in his statement and said, if I understood it correctly, that he would invite the institute to make submissions to him on these. Can the Minister say whether the institute's submissions will be made public when they are made, as they would have been before the Royal Commission? Is it intended that an impartial authority (such as Mr. Justice Walters was when acting as Royal Commissioner) will inquire into these matters and report on them, or is the matter simply to be left for the Minister's decision?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The South Australian Institute of Teachers will make submissions to me in the same way as it has done to the Minister of Education over the years. I am sure that, by discussion, we shall be able to satisfactorily solve the matters that concern the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the Education Department and the Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot see in the Royal Commissions Act any machinery for the termi-

nation of a Royal Commission. I know that, once the report is presented, that automatically ends a Commission, but here, of course, no report has been issued. Section 9 of the Act seems to be against the termination of a Commission, if anything, but there is no other mention of it in the Act. I, therefore, ask the Attorney-General precisely what steps the Government has taken to terminate the Commission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The steps that the Government has taken have been to have discussions with the Royal Commissioner, who will, in all the circumstances, now report.

Mr. Millhouse: It is not terminated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, we have not said that the matter has been terminated. We have said that it will be terminated.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, I see.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, I hope that the honourable member does see. I am trying to make it plain. It is obviously obscure to the honourable gentleman, though not to anyone else. We shall receive a report, in all the circumstances, from Mr. Justice Walters.

Mr. Millhouse: This will be made public?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the Attorney-General's answer to me to the effect that the Commission has not yet been terminated. I remind him that a number of the terms of reference of the Royal Commissioner related to matters of principle upon which the Government felt it desirable that an impartial authority should give a report. As the Royal Commission has not yet been terminated and the Royal Commissioner is still holding the commission, will the Minister of Education consider requesting the Royal Commissioner to report upon these matters since it is obviously desirable that an impartial, outside authority should report—

Mr. Coumbe: After he has recovered, of course.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, after his recovery; it does not matter whether this matter is delayed a little while. It is desirable that an impartial, outside authority should report for the sake of the teaching profession and its relations with the Government.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall adhere to the agreement that I have firmly made with the South Australian Institute of Teachers. If the S.A.I.T. is happy to agree with me on a certain course of action, as has been stated, then I do not know why the honourable member should be so concerned.

ABORIGINES.

Mr. HUGHES: In this morning's *Advertiser* there is a report containing statements attributed to Dr. Fay Gale (Lecturer in Geography at the Adelaide University). The report is headed "Aid Clinic sought for Aborigines". Would the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs care to comment on it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: At present I cannot comment on the details of the report, but I should like to inform the House that Dr. Gale has informed the Director of Aboriginal Affairs, who in turn has informed me, that she gave an address to an adult education class at the university, and she was unaware that press reporters were present. It was not a public meeting: she was addressing students who had paid fees to attend. Dr. Gale claims that her remarks were misreported and taken out of context, and that the negative aspects of what she said were played up and the positive aspects played down. I shall be getting from Dr. Gale a full statement on this matter and I shall then be pleased to answer the question more fully.

KANGAROO MEAT.

Mr. McKEE: I noticed in Tuesday's *Advertiser* a statement by Alderman I. G. Symons that buffalo and donkey meat was being sold in Adelaide for human consumption. He also said that kangaroo meat was being sold for human consumption, some of it in hamburgers. If there is a shortage of cattle and sheep, I agree that buffalo meat would be the next best choice, but I think that most people would agree that the method of slaughtering kangaroos is most unhygienic, and that the meat is therefore unsuitable for human consumption. I believe that the disease caused by salmonella, which is a micro-organism, spreads rapidly through kangaroo meat and causes food poisoning, enteritis and possibly typhoid. As a recent case of typhoid in Adelaide was reported, will the Minister representing the Minister of Health consider this matter as urgent?

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Minister of Social Welfare, I point out that I created a precedent yesterday in extending on behalf of members birthday greetings to the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford). Knowing that that met with the concurrence of the House, I am sure members support me in wishing the Minister of Social Welfare many happy returns of the day.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At three score years and 10, I

believe I have had a good innings. As I am rather perturbed about the matter raised by the member for Port Pirie, I will ask the Minister of Health, in the interests of the public generally, to make a full investigation.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether Cabinet has considered my suggestion to set up a committee comprising officers of the Agriculture Department or other Government departments, in order to investigate the possibility of providing feed (particularly from other States) for starving stock, and of rendering other assistance to farmers who are suffering because of the prolonged drought?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Cabinet decided this morning to set up a committee, as suggested by the honourable member, to examine the whole question of drought assistance. The committee will consist of four members (two officers from the Agriculture Department, one from the Lands Department and one from the Treasury). As a result of the committee's examining all aspects of the matter, I am sure that its findings will help in many ways.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I was disturbed to see a recent report that the Commonwealth Government had indicated that it could be about three years before a new terminal was constructed at the Adelaide Airport. As the Commonwealth Government has indicated in the past that this urgent work would be undertaken much more quickly, will the Premier raise the matter with the Prime Minister?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I raised the matter with the Prime Minister, while I was in Canberra recently, as a specific item of Commonwealth construction that could contribute to the revival of the building industry here. As I have not had a specific reply from the Prime Minister, I will again take up the matter with him.

STATE'S FINANCES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the authority for transferring certain items from Revenue to Loan Account?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The additional charge against Loan Account late in 1966-67 for grants to non-Government hospitals was made under the authority of the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1966. Section 5 of the Act authorized payments for certain purposes set out in the First Schedule, including capital

grants and advances for non-Government hospital buildings. The same section authorized the Treasurer to transfer appropriation authority from any one purpose to another mentioned in the First Schedule.

In accordance with this authority, I approved the transfer of an amount of unused appropriation (primarily for waterworks and sewers and railway accommodation) to increase that available for grants for non-Government hospital buildings. The further grants were charged against that appropriation. This procedure is long established and was used on many occasions by the honourable member's Party when in Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer has quoted the section under which authority was given, presumably, for a transfer of certain items from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account. I have read that section with much interest and was particularly interested to hear that it was a policy of the previous Government. Can the Treasurer give an instance of where money was taken from the Engineering and Water Supply Department to prop up the Revenue Account?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer that I gave to the honourable member was that the course of transferring an appropriation from one of the scheduled items to another was a policy that had been followed by the previous Government. Next week I will give the honourable member a series of instances where this has occurred.

Mr. McANANEY: We have been told this afternoon that certain unused waterworks appropriations have been used for other purposes. Can the Minister of Works say what specific works have been delayed or postponed because of this action?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand that answers have already been given, but I shall find out what they are and repeat them for the honourable member, if necessary.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer said that certain works in the Engineering and Water Supply Department had not been proceeded with and that the money to be used for those works had been devoted to other purposes. Can the Minister of Works say why those works were not proceeded with? Was it through lack of labour or material, or was it a policy decision that they should not be proceeded with so that it would be possible to have some surplus money from the Loan programme to prop up the revenue?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If the honourable member looks at pages 146 and 147 of last week's *Hansard* he will find the answer.

PORT RIVER.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a statement that appeared in the Port Adelaide *Messenger* alleging that raw sewage was being pumped into the Port River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Since replying to the honourable member yesterday, I have found that my office had in fact received a letter of complaint from the Port Adelaide Local Board of Health dealing with this matter and that it was already being investigated. I have now received a report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and I am pleased to assure the honourable member that there is no truth in the statement that raw sewage has been or is being discharged into the Port River from the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works. In fact, there is no way in which raw sewage can discharge into the Port River for the following reasons: first, there is no bypass from the rising mains directly into the Port River; secondly, the only bypass we have is from the primary sedimentation tanks to the sludge digestion lagoon which has no outlet to the river; and thirdly, the only outlet to the Port River is through the works when the sewage must receive full treatment as we supply our own power and have, in case of emergency, a power supply from the Electricity Trust of South Australia. However, if the Port Adelaide council will inform the department of the reasons for its suspicions, we shall have the matter investigated, confident of the facts I have stated.

MODBURY INTERSECTION.

Mrs. BYRNE: The intersection of the Main North-East Road, Montague Road and Golden Grove Road, Modbury, is dangerous, accidents having occurred there. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads to obtain a report on any plans the Highways Department may have for making the intersection safer? Will he also ascertain whether the department intends to take any action now or to wait until the Main North-East Road has been widened to this point?

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

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: Before asking my question, I, too, wish to congratulate the Minister of

Social Welfare on his birthday. Yesterday, the Minister gave me the following reply to a question I had asked about the standardization of the Gladstone-Wilmington line:

I have to report that, although the standardization agreement covers, *inter alia*, the conversion of the whole of the Peterborough Division of the South Australian Railways, at this stage the Commonwealth Government has only approved the conversion of the line from Port Pirie to Cockburn. However, this department has always pressed for the work to be carried out in full, as covered by the agreement, but at this juncture approval for this has not been received.

It is also most important that the Orroroo-Peterborough line and the Port Pirie to Adelaide line through Crystal Brook and Merriton be standardized. Therefore, will the Minister ask the Minister of Transport to continue (and, if possible, redouble) the efforts being made to have the whole system of lines standardized, which work would create employment in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Long distance haulage is undoubtedly a railway proposition, and improvement in the Peterborough Division is essential. I shall ask the Minister of Transport for a detailed report.

MIGRANTS.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Immigration say how many migrants came to South Australia during the year 1966-67, and express that figure as a percentage of the Australian total?

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

COONAWARRA ELECTRICITY.

Mr. RODDA: On June 29, I asked a question of the Minister of Social Welfare, as acting Leader of the Government, concerning the supply of electricity to Coonawarra. I understand the Minister of Works now has a reply to my question.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust reports:

The connection of the electricity supply to properties near the existing 11,000-volt line to Coonawarra will be done as part of an overall programme for rural extensions in the Penola district. The trust's policy is to connect rural consumers in groups and to supply them in the same area under the same conditions. This work must be done in this way, so that it can be carried out as economically as possible. Because of extensive commitments throughout the State, it will not be possible to undertake any significant

amount of work in the areas surrounding Penola for some time. A special situation exists at Coonawarra, where considerable amounts of power are required for pumping water for irrigation and for frost control in the vineyards. The existing 11,000-volt line is not capable of supplying this power. To meet this need, the trust plans to build a 33,000-volt sub-station at Coonawarra and to supply it by extending on to Coonawarra the 33,000-volt transmission line recently built to Penola. Priority will be given to this work, and it is expected to have it completed within about two years.

SOUTH-EAST IRRIGATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a further reply to my question concerning the effect of irrigation on the water levels of bores in the Keppoch-Pathaway Basin?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Director of Mines reports:

The department has no evidence on the lowering of the water levels in bores in the Keppoch-Pathaway Basin. In 1962, the possibility of depletion was raised with the department by landowners in the area, who were asked to keep a record of water levels and to advise the department. No information has come in from this source, and so far as the department is aware there is no immediate problem. However, any basin in which large-scale pumping is practised, and in which intake is limited, will inevitably suffer depletion. Unfortunately, the department has not the staff available to make a detailed investigation in this case, but it will keep the matter in mind.

OUTER HARBOUR RAMP.

Mr. RYAN: I was approached recently by a member of a boating organization who considers that representations should be made to the Marine and Harbors Department for the installation of a light over what is known as the public ramp behind No. 4 berth, Outer Harbour, near the Royal Yacht Squadron's premises. This ramp, which has considerable use, has no light, and after dark it constitutes a hazard. Recently many of the members who use this ramp were requested to assist in a search for a lost vessel, and resulting from that they consider that for safety reasons a light should be placed there. Although this seems a small request, it is a major matter for the members of the organization concerned. Therefore, will the Minister of Marine take the matter up with the department?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to take this matter up with the Director of the department and to see whether something can be done.

PORT PIRIE GAS.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the price of gas at Port Pirie?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following on the honourable member's question, the following letter was received from the General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company:

We note from a newspaper report that the member for Port Pirie has requested the honourable the Premier to take up with the Prices Commissioner the question of the price of gas at Port Pirie. The South Australian Gas Company sustained substantial operating losses at Port Pirie for many years with the distribution of coal gas, the loss for the year to June 30, 1964, being \$51,000, which increased to \$56,000 in 1965. Coal gas manufacture was then discontinued, and replaced by the reforming of light virgin naphtha. Because of this, the operating loss for the 1966 financial year was reduced to \$22,000. There will be a further improvement for the financial year just completed, but Port Pirie is not yet on a profitable basis and, therefore, it is not economically feasible to reduce prices at present, as much as the company would like to do so.

At the same time, the price of gas at Port Pirie has not been increased since 1957, and is considerably cheaper than in most country centres. We believe that Ballarat is the only provincial city in Australia with cheaper gas. If the honourable the Premier considers an investigation by the Prices Commissioner is desirable, we would welcome such an inquiry, but we would like it postponed until the completion of our financial statements for the year just completed.

YUNTA SCHOOL.

Mr. CASEY: It has been brought to my notice that the people living in the Yunta district are desirous of having their school made a special rural school and I understand that negotiations have been carried out by departmental officers in this particular area. Can the Minister of Education say how far these discussions have gone?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The introduction of special rural schools has been particularly well received by country people, who appreciate the availability of secondary education in primary schools where it was not available hitherto. I shall have much pleasure in getting details about the particular case that the honourable member has mentioned.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM.

Mr. COUMBE: During the last session I asked the Minister of Works what steps the Government had taken to plan for the now discarded Islington sewage farm area. This area has not been used for sewage purposes

since the introduction of the Bolivar treatment plant about 12 months ago. Before that time, negotiations had been conducted by the Director of Planning, the Railways Department, the Education Department and the Highways Department with a view to making this area available for industry and housing. It is about three or four months since I asked a question on this matter and I ask the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. I drew the attention of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the appropriate Standing Order. Explanations are in order so far as they are necessary to explain a question. I would ask members not to comment while asking questions.

Mr. COUMBE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because of the time that has elapsed since I last asked the question and also because of the importance of this matter to the community, will the Minister of Works say what steps the Government intends to take regarding this area and when those steps are likely to be taken?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Before the sewage farm was declared to be of no use for sewage purposes, or before the transfer of the operations to Bolivar, the Government considered how the land should be cut up. The honourable member possibly remembers seeing, in my office, a plan showing proposals about what land would be reserved for Government departments and about other land set out for industrial purposes. The Minister of Lands has the right to dispose of this land and it is readily available, on negotiation, to any industry that desires to purchase it. The matter can be taken up with the Minister of Lands.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. McKEE: As the Premier is aware, there is a serious shortage of justices of the peace at Port Pirie. Will he request the Attorney-General's Department to speed up the appointment of some of the people whose appointments have been recommended?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hold in my hand all the applications for appointment as justices in Port Pirie and, if the honourable member consults me later this afternoon, we may dispose of the matter speedily.

CRUDE OIL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Premier a reply to my question of June 29, in which I asked whether the closure of the Suez Canal had had any detrimental effect on the supply of crude oil to the Port Stanvac refinery?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chief Storekeeper reports:

The Supply and Tender Board would be interested in this matter to the extent as to possible effect on the contract held by Mobil Oil Aust. Ltd. for the supply of motor spirit and other products from the Port Stanvac refinery for the various Government departments. Inquiry shows there has been no shortage of crudes coming to the State and it is expected that there will be no future difficulties in this regard. To meet the recent crisis in the Middle East, it has been necessary to make some adjustments in world-wide transportation. Since the last war in the Middle East in 1956, other sources of crude oil are available and super tankers carrying much larger quantities are engaged.

FIREWORKS.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply from the Chief Secretary to my recent question about a fireworks display at Langhorne Creek?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The regulations under the Explosives Act were amended in 1966 to provide special provisions relating to the period during which certain fireworks may be sold. The practice of the Government is not to grant permission for organized fireworks displays to be held during the summer months. Should the Langhorne Creek Community Oval Committee desire to hold a fireworks display in the spring rather than in November, I would be prepared to grant the necessary permission.

WALLAROO PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. HUGHES: My question deals with the releveling and asphaltting of the Wallaroo Primary School yard. The Minister of Education was good enough to advise me by letter some weeks ago that he had discussed this with the Public Buildings Department and there was a favourable report. However, as I have been approached by the Secretary and the President of the Wallaroo School Committee and as the yard has deteriorated badly in recent weeks, I again ask the Minister to take up this matter with the Director of the Public Buildings Department to see whether this work can be expedited with a view to preventing any further accidents there—because there has already been one accident in the yard.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that and see that it is treated as an urgent matter.

UPPER PORT REACH SCHEME.

Mr. COUMBE: Since the Upper Port Reach development scheme was deferred by the Government following a Public Works Committee report, can the Premier say whether the Govern-

ment has reconsidered this matter and whether it intends to proceed with this scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter is currently under consideration; I expect an announcement to be made shortly.

SEISMIC PLANTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines, give the House any information about where the two seismic plants owned by the South Australian Government are now operating?

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When the Minister is obtaining information from the Minister of Mines as to where the seismic plants are working will he also obtain a report from his colleague as to how many drilling plants are at present operating in the Great Artesian Basin?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

INNER SUBURBAN REDEVELOPMENT.

Mr. COUMBE: My question relates to inner suburban redevelopment and follows the Premier's television announcement last night. Can the Premier say whether it is a fact that, while some councils have submitted to his office their plans for redevelopment in their areas, other councils have not? Can he indicate when he expects all those submissions to be in his office, and when he will have sufficient to be able to make a concrete plan for this work to proceed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some councils have not yet submitted proposals. On the other hand, we have some submissions that fit in with the general provisions of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan. I expect that it will be possible during this financial year to come to some conclusions about redevelopment projects. This does not mean that we shall have been able to complete an overall plan during that period, given the necessary feasibility studies for the whole inner metropolitan area, but some plans will be able to be completed that will clearly fit within the general terms of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan and any overall study; so I hope we shall be able to make an announcement about some specific projects during this financial year.

SUMMONSES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have looked at the report of the Commissioner of Police for the year ended June 30, 1966, that was laid on the

table a couple of days ago. On page 4 appears a reference to the extraneous duties that police officers have to perform, particularly in the personal service of summonses. The last paragraph reads:

It is hoped that the recommendations for the enactment of legislation to provide for the service of summonses by post will receive favourable consideration.

I understand that a reply to a question in another place last week was to the effect that there would not be time to do that. In view of the Commissioner's report and the obvious desirability of relieving police of these duties so that they can concentrate on more strictly police duties (and I think the honourable gentleman agrees with me, because I have heard him say it), will the Attorney-General reconsider the decision not to go ahead with legislation to provide for the service of summonses by post?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Several amendments to the Justices Act will have to be made for any reasonable law reform to take place in the near future. As the honourable member will realize, the Notice Paper for this session will be heavily loaded with matters that were specifically mentioned and were an issue during the last election, and upon which the Government was elected. We have only so much time available, and we are trying to make all speed. We have accomplished far more law reform in South Australia in the last two years than had taken place in the previous 30 years.

Mr. Millhouse: I think the police need help.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have received much more help from this Government than they received from the previous Government. I do not expect that we will have time during this session, but the matter is in the hands of the honourable member and his colleagues. If we make all due speed we may be able to find the time to do it.

POSTAL VOTING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A constituent of mine was in South Africa recently just before the Commonwealth referendum and, therefore, had to vote absentee. He found it impossible, in what is now a foreign country, to comply with the requirements as to the witnessing of his vote, because this has to be done by someone who normally would not be found in a foreign country. I have looked at the State Electoral Act and the provisions are broadly similar to the Commonwealth Act, which means that it is not possible for a person travelling in a foreign

country to record a valid vote for a State election. As this situation is obviously undesirable, will the Attorney-General examine this matter with a view to introducing amendments to the Electoral Act to provide for such cases?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. In the Parliamentary Draftsman's office we have listed a series of desirable amendments to this Act, but it will not be possible to deal with all of them this session. If the honourable member considers what we intend to do this session he will see the reason. This Parliament has dealt with more legislation in its sessions than has ever been done in a single session in the previous 15 years. In the last two years much long overdue reform legislation has been introduced. It is intended to introduce amendments to the Electoral Act this session dealing with the position of the Returning Officer of the State. A senior administrative officer in this field, his position, compared with similar officers in other States, is entirely unjust, and it is intended to do something about it. Also, an amendment will be introduced with respect to the hours of polling. However, time will not be available this session for a comprehensive amendment of the Electoral Act.

BARLEY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In view of the dry season will the Minister of Agriculture obtain from the General Manager of the Australian Barley Board details of the quantity of unsold feed grades of barley at present held in South Australian silos?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

STATUTES.

Mr. CUMBE: Three or four months ago, when I asked the Premier what progress had been made in consolidating our Statutes, he explained the difficulties. Can he say whether arrangements have now been finalized for the Statutes to be consolidated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No arrangement has been concluded, but current discussions are taking place which, I hope, will be concluded in the next week or so and which may lead to the consolidation being undertaken.

MATHEMATICS COURSE.

Mr. RODDA: In travelling around my district I find an immense interest shown by people in the new mathematics syllabus, but many parents find it difficult to understand the new method and some are concerned at the

change. It was stated in yesterday's *Advertiser* that many city parents are attending classes to enable them to understand the new method, and parents at Naracoorte are attending the Adult Education Centre familiarization classes. In view of the difficulties of parents in understanding this new method, will the Minister of Education consider asking service clubs, such as Rotary and Lions, to conduct special courses in the new mathematics?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will examine this suggestion. However, I remind the honourable member that, although we are anxious to do all we can, if we extend these operations an additional load will be placed on trained personnel who are in a position to carry out this work. I want to emphasize the very heavy load of work that is already on officers of the Education Department, both those in the field and those in the central office. I do not think it is necessary to enlarge on this, because the honourable member knows of the tremendous increase in educational responsibilities that have been undertaken by the department in recent years. However, I shall examine his suggestion and see whether it is possible to adopt it.

CABINET CHANGES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Is a reorganization of Cabinet contemplated next month and, if it is, does it involve a request to Parliament for an additional Minister?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE. It has been reported quite freely that it is proposed to appoint an additional Minister who would be Treasurer. Can the Premier say whether his answer means that he proposes personally to continue to carry the very heavy Ministerial load that he assumed when he became Premier?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes; I do. I point out to the honourable member that, prior to the Labor Government's taking office, there was no such office as Premier or Minister of Housing. In so far as these offices entailed any duties whatever, although they did not exist formally, they were discharged by the Treasurer. In addition, the Treasurer of that day had the portfolio of Minister of Immigration, which I do not have.

Prior to the Labor Government's assuming office, the office of Attorney-General was considered to be a reasonably minor portfolio, but we have got a bit of work done since then.

I point out to the honourable member that the duties entailed in the office of Attorney-General have been decreased in the last few weeks by removing those that relate to town planning. In addition, some alterations in relation to Ministerial administration of departments will be made, with some transfers from the Treasurer's office and some further transfers from the Attorney-General's office to other portfolios. Consequently, I do not expect that the load I shall be carrying will be any greater than that which was borne by my predecessor or by Sir Thomas Playford, and I hope to be able to give a reasonable account of my duties in that regard.

WINNS ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Lands been kind enough to obtain from the Minister of Roads an answer to the question I asked a week or so ago about Winns Road, Blackwood?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the position with regard to the Highways Department's proposals for Winns Road, Blackwood, has not changed since the previous question asked by the honourable member on this matter earlier this year. In reply to the previous question, it was stated that the Highways Department proposed improvements to both Winns Road and the present main road through Coromandel Valley. These projects should be regarded as of a long term nature and it is not expected that any construction work will be commenced until such time as improvements are required by actual traffic volumes. At this stage, only preliminary investigations have been carried out and there is no definite scheme. In any case, it is of very low priority and not likely to be dealt with in the foreseeable future.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From time to time since this session commenced I have asked the Premier whether he could do something with regard to tenders for the supply of spectacles to pensioner patients in Government hospitals, as a result of representations made by the Australian Optometrical Association. About a fortnight ago, I think, the honourable gentleman undertook to look into this matter urgently but I have not yet heard from him. Is the Premier in a position to give me an answer today or, if he is not, will he be kind enough to supply an answer on Tuesday?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have a note in my bag that this matter is the subject

of a considerable report to the Minister of Health, who wishes to discuss the matter with me personally before a reply is given. I expect to see the Minister tomorrow, and I shall let the honourable member have a reply next Tuesday.

EGGS.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister of Agriculture has announced that he will be calling a meeting at Murray Bridge with regard to eggs. Can he give early notice of the date of this meeting so that members can keep the night free?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member is not correct in saying that I will be calling a meeting. I said that the Egg Board would be calling a meeting, which I understand is to be held on Monday, July 24. The board intends to send a written invitation to each member on the other side of the House who is obviously interested in this matter.

BIRDSVILLE TRACK.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Lands obtained an answer from the Minister of Roads to my question about the programme of works to be carried out on the Birdsville track?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No. The honourable member asked this question on Tuesday, and the reply should be forthcoming by next Tuesday.

LICENSING BILL.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier say whether this House will be debating the Licensing Bill next week?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. As soon as the Bill is restored to the file, I hope that we shall have available the amendments proposed to be moved by Government members, together with explanations. I hope that the debate will commence on Tuesday week.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that the amendments to be placed upon the file relate to the many matters that have been raised since the Bill was first introduced. Also, I understand that the amendments are quite extensive, and that the Parliamentary Draftsman was authorized to answer any questions concerning them. Can the Premier say whether he will consider the suggestion that, instead of bringing in many complicated amendments, if there is not any further debate at the second reading stage, we could adopt the amendments in accordance with a system that we had previously, so that

we would have the amendments and the Bill complete? I think that the Premier on a previous occasion had a Bill considered (although not redebated on the second reading) with the amendments incorporated so that there would not be a complicated debate. As many of the amendments would not be debated (no objection to them would be made; they would simply be formally moved and carried automatically), I believe the proceedings would be shortened considerably. Will the Premier consider this suggestion, with a view to helping honourable members and expediting the business of the House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will see what can be done in that regard.

WARREN RESERVOIR.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Most of the settled area in the Light District is supplied with reticulated water from the Warren reservoir. In view of the delayed seasonal opening, can the Minister of Works say what reserves are in the Warren reservoir, and whether these will be adequate in the foreseeable future?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The present storage of the reservoir is 412,900,000 gallons, whereas at this time last year it was 249,000,000 gallons. There appears to be no reason for concern at the moment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 5. Page 406.)

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I am proud to have the honour to speak to the Address in Reply debate on this occasion.

Mr. Coumbe: Before you are put out at the next election?

Mr. RYAN: Once again, we, as Government members, have the pleasure to speak to the Address in Reply.

Mr. McAnaney: Make the most of it this year!

Mr. RYAN: Further, every member of this Party, with the exception of the Minister of Social Welfare, who is retiring at the end of the session, will have the honour to speak again to the debate as Government members in 1968.

Mr. Hurst: Plus more members on this side!

Mr. RYAN: There will be additional members undoubtedly. Whilst some members have expressed pleasure at the recovery in health of His Excellency the Governor, I must unfortunately express regret today at the relapse

that His Excellency has now suffered. I know that I express the unanimous hope of members that His Excellency's present illness will be short and that he will soon be fully restored to health. The Hon. Frank Walsh is compulsorily retiring at the end of this session. Incidentally, if I were a good singer I would be inclined to sing "Happy Birthday" to him.

Mr. Clark: It would be one way of clearing the Chamber!

Mr. RYAN: Indeed, that is the very reason why I do not intend to sing, because I do not wish to be the only listener. We wish Frank Walsh well; we sincerely hope that he will enjoy good health during the retirement that he has so richly earned. He has especially earned it as a result of the burden he has carried over the last two years. There is no doubt that the member for Edwardstown will go down in the State's political history. Since first being elected as Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party, he has been in the happy position of never being defeated at an election. After the first election that he experienced as a member, he returned with one of the biggest majorities that any member received. However, because of the existing circumstances, he was not successful in becoming Leader of the Government until 1965. I have no doubt that the present Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) will further improve the Government's representation in the House at the next election.

Mr. Rodda: Do you mean it will be increased?

Mr. RYAN: There is no doubt about the fact that the representation on this side will be increased after the next election. Our only problem will concern the seating of Government members at the opening of Parliament next year. We shall be even more crowded (but happily crowded) as a result of our increased representation.

Mr. Rodda: Are you serious?

Mr. RYAN: I have never been more serious in my life and never more convinced that the forecast I make will prove correct. It is interesting to observe the disappointed faces of the members of the Opposition because of what has occurred over the last two years. Fortunately for us, after the next election we shall see fewer of those faces. In regard to those members who are voluntarily retiring at the end of this Parliament, I think that I must first deal with the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) who has had a good, long innings. I wish him well in his retirement. The honourable member will also go down in political history

for his services to South Australia, even though I have not always agreed with the policies he has enunciated over the years.

Dealing with the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), I think that he will long be remembered, after leaving this august Chamber, as "Appila Jim", because no member has ever set out to create a more humiliating position for a Government than he has. However, he remained in the House sufficiently long to suffer defeat in that respect. To his bench mate, the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg), who will also be retiring, each one of us, irrespective of political beliefs, wishes the honourable member well. We are not certain whether other members will be voluntarily retiring, or otherwise.

I think it was the member for Gumeracha who, during Question Time today, referred to the quality of questions asked and replies given in the House. Here, I wish to refer only to the quality of the remarks made by members of the Opposition during this debate. There has been a complete somersault on the part of members opposite who have spoken to this debate. We have already witnessed the spectacle of members of the Opposition, when occupying the Government benches, and at a time when there was considerable unemployment, blaming the Commonwealth Government for the situation. However, on this occasion Opposition members who have spoken to the debate (their speeches have been short and lacking in quality) have not once placed the blame for the present situation where it rightly belongs: that is, on the Commonwealth Government. Opposition members have blamed the present Government for the unemployment position in this State. The member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) was loud in what he said in 1961: at that time he said the responsibility for the employment position rested in the main with the Commonwealth Government. In explaining the Budget on September 5, 1961, he said:

The reactions upon business confidence and upon the consumers' readiness and ability to buy were considerable. As a result unemployment developed quickly, particularly in the industries producing motor vehicles and domestic appliances and in the constructional trades. At the same time, apart from Governmental activities, few other avenues of employment were able or willing to take up the unemployed. South Australia, unfortunately, because of its extensive employment in recent years in just those industries most affected, was more seriously threatened than most other localities. . . . The extent of unemployment in this State was kept generally lower than in most other parts of Australia, although the initial

impact upon our main industries was probably the most severe.

He said that the responsibility rested with some other Government. An amazing aspect at that time was that the press in this State supported the Government and said that unemployment was the result of the Commonwealth Government's activities and not of the State Government's activities.

Mr. Langley: How times have changed!

Mr. RYAN: Yes. In 1961 the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) was loud in expressing the view that the responsibility for the employment position rested with the Commonwealth Government rather than with the State Government. Other members of the Government at that time expressed similar opinions. However, during this debate Opposition members who have spoken have forgotten the Commonwealth's responsibility and have stated openly, clearly and decisively that the responsibility rests with this Government. The press has supported the opinions expressed by Opposition members that the responsibility for unemployment in South Australia rests with the State Labor Government. Of course, members on this side know differently.

Mr. Broomhill: I think Opposition members know, too.

Mr. RYAN: Of course they do. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) freely offered advice to the Government when he spoke in this debate. A part of his advice (thank goodness it was not accepted) was that the Government should not criticize the Opposition. He said that it was not good politics to criticize the Opposition and that it should be treated with respect. He said this although all Opposition members who have spoken (with the possible exception of the member for Albert) set out to attack the Government and its activities over the last two years. If Opposition members want to hand it out they must be prepared to take it! Members of the Government Party will accept justifiable criticism, but we will not accept unwarranted and unconstructive criticism.

Mr. Langley: Opposition members must have thought they couldn't be defeated.

Mr. RYAN: They thought that for many years, but they are now learning the hard fact that, although it took us a long time to reach the pinnacle of political success, we are going to stay at that pinnacle for many years to come. I shall now refer to one of the most bitter attacks I have ever heard from a State or Commonwealth politician. On August

1, 1961, when speaking in the Address in Reply debate, the member for Burra said:

Let me touch on this aspect. I do not think that a more infamous remark than this (reported in the *Advertiser*) has ever been made by anybody in constitutional authority in Australia or elsewhere:

The Federal Attorney-General (Sir Garfield Barwick) said tonight that unemployment because of the credit squeeze was larger than the Federal Government would have wished or could truly have foreseen, but the Government had come out of the squeeze well.

The man who could make that statement is completely amoral, without any idea of morality. What about the thousands of people who are today suffering because of his action and the action of people like him, who are due for the most thoroughgoing condemnation ever handed out by the Australian people to anyone?

Mr. Jennings: Who said that?

Mr. RYAN: The member for Burra said that in 1961 and yet, two evenings ago, he said that members of the Government Party should not be critical if unwarranted, unjustified and unconstructive criticism was levelled against them. I referred to what the honourable member said in 1961, because the attitude of the Opposition is different on this occasion. Any criticism members opposite have levelled has been against the State Government without any consequential condemnation of the Commonwealth Government.

In 1961, the member for Burra referred to an infamous remark. I shall now read some infamous remarks that one would not find in newspapers that had any degree of decency. I shall quote from the only morning newspaper this State has; it is considered by certain people to be absolutely unbiased but, fortunately, that is not the opinion of the majority. On Wednesday, June 21 (the day after this, the last session of Parliament before the 1968 election commenced), under the heading "Taking the Offensive" (the *Advertiser* implied that the Opposition had taken the offensive), the editorial stated:

Expectations of a livelier tempo to Parliamentary discussions in this State were fully realized yesterday. In place of the normal leisurely opening of Parliament, we had the spectacle—

and what a spectacle it was—

of the Assembly's promptly engaging in a spirited debate on an issue of crucial importance—the revival of the State's industrial and commercial prosperity and the improvement of its growth prospects. It was a probing of the Government's record and policy for which the Opposition was responsible, and from which it emerged with most of the laurels.

That is the greatest joke of the century. Anyone who heard the offensive launched (according to the *Advertiser*) on June 20 knows that it was the most half-hearted attack that any Opposition ever delivered against a Government. The editorial continued:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall) showed initiative in seizing an opportunity to open the discussion. Clearly, the Ministry was caught off balance as speaker after speaker pointed to the slow-down of industry under the present Administration, and to the steps essential to the promotion of confidence and development.

Mr. Jennings: Caught off balance! We did the same thing every year when we were in Opposition.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. While the previous Government was in office, South Australia experienced the worst unemployment it had known since the depression, yet the *Advertiser* was absolutely silent at that time about unemployment. However, when the Labor Government is the Government of this State (a long-overdue one, too, in the minds of the voters of the State) the *Advertiser* is just as caustic in its remarks as is the Leader of the Opposition. If facts and figures are to be quoted in the House, they should be verified.

Mr. Jennings: Of course, there has been a big increase in population since 1961.

Mr. RYAN: I am coming to that point now. The following figures have been supplied by the Bureau of Census and Statistics:

	Unemployed. (1961.)	(1966.)	Reduction.
April . . .	8,098	6,027	2,071
May . . .	8,533	6,714	1,819
June . . .	9,035	7,357	1,678
July . . .	10,053	7,228	2,825
August . .	9,643	7,347	2,296
September	12,148	7,078	5,070

The important feature of the September, 1961, unemployment figure is that that was the time of the delivery of one of the long Budget speeches of the then Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford). There should not be any unemployment, irrespective of what Government is in power; but why is blame for unemployment attributed to the State Government in 1967, whereas in 1961 the blame was attributed to the Commonwealth Government. It is apparent that members of the Opposition have changed their stand and now decided that, instead of placing the blame where it should rest, they should belittle the Labor Government in the eyes of the public, although I do not think that they have been very successful. Much has been said about the confusion in politics

in South Australia, but one should look at the confusion that exists in the Liberal and Country League at present—and this is the Party that offers itself as the alternative Government.

The brilliant and upstanding member for Mitcham asked the Premier how much money had been transferred from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account in order to make the Budget look as though it had been balanced. Although I shall not refer to the Dave and Mabel column in the *Advertiser*, published by the Liberal and Country League, I will refer to the political commentary that appeared in the *Advertiser* of July 1, in the L.C.L. political column, which states in part:

Thirdly, we find that the Premier "balanced" the State Budget by a mere flick of the pen in transferring Loan moneys to general revenue.

The mouthpiece of the L.C.L., in its political column several days later, stated that the Government had transferred revenue expenditure to Loan Account. The L.C.L. officialdom is confused: it does not know what is going on, and it is seeking information along the lines I have mentioned, without knowing which statement is correct. Does it make any difference, as long as the Budget is balanced, and with one essential requirement: as long as no unemployment is created by balancing the Budget.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think unemployment will be created as a result of that?

Mr. RYAN: Certainly not. Any unemployment created in this State is the result of the withdrawal by the Commonwealth Government from the activities within South Australia. The member for Mitcham went to great lengths to try to explain (how, I do not know because he did not have an argument) the expenditure by the Commonwealth on building activity in this State. The figures quoted by the Opposition were far from factual, because the sum spent by the Commonwealth Government over the years has been falling ever since this Government took office. It has dropped from 25 per cent of the Commonwealth Government expenditure a few years ago to the present alarming 4 per cent. Many people have stated that over the years South Australia has been dealt with fairly on a population basis. The Opposition has made great play in recent months about the expenditure a head of population in South Australia by the Commonwealth Government. The following figures have been supplied by the Bureau of Census and Statistics:

	Commonwealth expenditure in South Australia. \$	Expenditure in South Australia per capita. \$
1956-57	3,580,000	6.25
1957-58	3,520,000	5.34
1958-59	4,190,000	8.36
1959-60	4,410,000	12.73
1960-61	4,100,000	8.09
1961-62	4,230,000	7.26
1962-63	4,170,000	6.49
1963-64	4,320,000	5.47
1964-65	5,750,000	4.74
1965-66	7,800,000	4.99

The estimate for 1966-67 is \$9,270,000, or \$4.02 a head of population. Figures showing the actual expenditure by the Commonwealth Government over the years have been included in *Hansard*. It is most noticeable that the Commonwealth's expenditure since 1965, when the Labor Party was overwhelmingly elected in this State, has dropped considerably. We have the spectacle of the members for Gumeracha, Mitcham and Torrens saying, "What difference does it make if only a few million dollars is spent in Commonwealth building in this State?"

Mr. Jennings: And we have a South Australian as the Commonwealth Minister for Works, too.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and we have been getting less since he occupied that position.

Mr. Jennings: Ned Kelly!

Mr. RYAN: Yes. What a terrific spender. The real Ned Kelly robbed the rich to give to the poor, but this one is adopting an entirely different attitude. I say that millions do count in the building activities of this State, and there are many jobs that the Commonwealth could start now to help improve the drastic position that exists in the building industry in this State today.

Mr. McKee: Mr. Jessop claims that Commonwealth expenditure in this State has not decreased.

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Jessop does not know what he is talking about. The official figures that have been quoted over the years do not substantiate such a claim. Some of this State's Liberal representatives in Canberra do not seem to be concerned about the amount of expenditure in this State: their main concern is to do everything possible to belittle this State's Labor Government in the eyes of the people. However, they are not going to be successful.

I want to say something now about the speech made yesterday by the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford). I say that it was one of the finest speeches I have

ever heard from him, and when I say that it must be obvious that I have an ulterior motive for doing so. The reason for that is that the honourable member, apparently because he has no further say in the determination of an L.C.L. policy (if ever it had one, which I doubt), has come around to the ideas that the present Government has enunciated over the years. He may try to dispute that fact, but *Hansard* will show that what I am saying is true. He made the amazing statement (coming from him) that he believed we must adopt Australian standards and not make our own. I point out that over the years he was responsible for fixing South Australian conditions and that these were far below the conditions of every other State. He often boasted about how South Australia was a low-wage State, and the people who suffered as a result of the then conditions were the workers in this State. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) has not much to be proud of, either, after the statements he made yesterday. Let us have a look at what Sir Thomas Playford said yesterday about Australian standards:

We are a part of the Commonwealth of Australia and section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution makes trade, commerce and intercourse between the States absolutely free, so South Australia cannot have a false value about any of her undertakings. Whether we like it or not, we are tied to the Australian economy. Probably half of our industrial workers are registered in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court. If we are to make our way in the Australian economy, we must adopt Australian standards, not make our own standards. If we go above the Australian standard on one item, we must go below that standard on another, or the balance is destroyed.

He then went on to refer to the Government's decision to provide an extra week's leave for all Government servants. A little later he said:

The cost will be borne, in the main, by people who will not enjoy the privilege. One member said that this concession was being given by the Government but that was completely wrong; the cost will be met by people with families, and the big families will be the hardest hit. The facts of life cannot be ignored.

Coming as it does from the member for Gumeracha, that is an alarming statement. Although I do not criticize the conditions enjoyed by Government workers, I point out that they enjoyed three weeks' annual leave for many years while the ordinary worker in industry was deprived of that benefit. The workers of this State applied to the State

Industrial Court on many occasions for the same conditions, but without success. Therefore, the workers in industry were paying for the improved conditions that Government employees had enjoyed over the years.

As I say, I do not criticize Government employees for that: if their conditions can be improved, good luck to them. Their entitlement for some time has been three months' long service leave after 10 years' service. What happened when this Government attempted to move an amendment to the Long Service Leave Bill when it was before this Parliament about six months ago? Every member of the Opposition opposed the Government's amendment. Therefore they opposed the workers receiving the same conditions as the people employed by the State had been receiving for years; they considered that the worker in industry was worth only three months' leave after 15 years' service. I reiterate (in case people try to misquote me) that I believe that if people employed by the State have a privilege, let them try to improve upon it.

Mr. Jennings: Then the member for Torrens would have to tell lies about it.

Mr. RYAN: Yes; he went to great lengths to try to explain why those employed in private industry should not receive the same benefit. Therefore, it is apparent that the honourable member is now at variance with the member for Gumeracha.

Mr. McKee: He is recognized as the Liberal champion of the workers.

Mr. RYAN: A better title for him would be "Disowner of the workers". He would be one of the greatest screamers in this Parliament if any worker had his conditions improved; he would say that would be the end of industry, that South Australia would disappear as an industrial force in Australia. That has been the attitude of the member for Torrens over the years. He would not want to give ordinary employees the same conditions as those enjoyed by State employees.

Let me go further in my remarks about the alarming change of policy on the part of the member for Gumeracha. He continued:

So there is no criticism of the Public Service in what I am saying. I hope it has as good terms of employment as can be found anywhere else and that the Government is a good employer and sets an example, but there is surely no case for public officers in South Australia getting better terms than public officers in other States get. Half of the submissions for wage increases and better working conditions in South Australia are based upon comparisons with other States.

You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, being vitally concerned in the industrial activities of this State, know that that is the greatest joke of the century, because over the years South Australia has lost many of its highly qualified and knowledgeable technical men and officers because the wages here were lower than those in other States. Of course, if the member for Gumeracha had continued as Premier, he would not have made such statements, because by making them he would have been leaving himself wide open to attack. Yesterday he went on to say:

One thing we have to guard against is the giving of sectional advantages. If this Parliament can confine itself to making laws that will give advantages to all the people and will spread those advantages, this Parliament will be fulfilling its purpose; but, if we are to pick out little pressure groups and discriminate, we shall get into the unhappy position of providing class legislation which would have an undesirable reaction on this State.

Those who have known the member for Gumeracha could not visualize his making statements such as he made yesterday. During the regime of the member for Gumeracha, workmen's compensation—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Are you referring to the previous Government?

Mr. RYAN: I am referring to the member for Gumeracha. He is not and cannot be Premier. When his Government was in office, the Workmen's Compensation Act of South Australia was recognized by all as being the worst workmen's compensation legislation in Australia. The member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) ought not to speak on something that he does not know about. He is absolutely lost outside a rural district. He hopes that the rural workers will never get the conditions that apply to employees in secondary industry. The member for Gumeracha said many times that the workers of this State would never receive workmen's compensation conditions similar to those applying in other States.

Mr. Jennings: It took a change of Government to do it.

Mr. RYAN: We were proud to do it. We were only improving standards to those that had operated in other States for many years.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You brought the cost of living up to their standard, too!

Mr. RYAN: Is there any reason why working conditions here should not be the same as those in any other State? The member for Angas was a member of a Government that went to the Commonwealth Conciliation and

Arbitration Commission asking that there be a differential basic wage for this State, yet his colleagues have been talking about improving living conditions! As the honourable member knows, members of his Government were proud to boast that this was the low-wage State of the Commonwealth. Is there any difference between the workers of this State and those elsewhere in Australia? We are all Australians and are entitled to the same conditions. The Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission makes its findings on an Australian basis, not a South Australian basis.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Why did you interfere with the commission's decision?

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member knows that the most crushing defeat ever inflicted on a Government was inflicted on a Government that said it would abolish the commission.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Why did the New South Wales Labor Government sabotage it?

Mr. RYAN: The only people who have been sabotaged are South Australians under a Liberal Government. If I could not do better as a Parliamentary representative than members of the present Opposition have done, I would resign. I have had experience in Opposition, and the effort that has been put forward by the present Opposition is the worst that I have known. When the Party of which I am proud to be a member was in Opposition, our criticism of the Government was constructive, not destructive as the Opposition's criticism in the last few days has been. Not one positive proposition about the State was put forward by any Opposition member except the member for Albert. Opposition members change their spots as the leopard does. When the Playford Government was in office and things were not going well, the Government said that the responsibility rested with the Commonwealth. For the benefit of the member for Angas, I shall read what his former Leader said. It is probably harder to get through to the member for Angas than to other members, and that may be because of his training as a lawyer. His attitude would probably have been broadened if he had been an industrial advocate, because, whether he liked it or not, he would have had to hear the case put by an opposing advocate. The honourable member's former Leader said:

If we are to make our way in the Australian economy we must adopt Australian standards, not make our own standards.

What has happened in this State over the years?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Tell them.

Mr. RYAN: They hate being told. The days when South Australia was a low-wage State have gone.

Mr. Broomhill: The Opposition would like to have them back.

Mr. RYAN: Of course. Any improvement that has been made by this State Labor Government will not be altered by any Liberal and Country League Government. I challenge any member to give one instance of a Liberal Government having taken away conditions granted by a Labor Government.

Mr. McKee: They would like to but they are not game.

Mr. RYAN: They are not. It is all right to say, "Let us have Australian standards". We have advocated this policy for many years: at least let us bring up our standards to those of other States. After all, is there any difference between being a Victorian or a New South Welshman and being a South Australian?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: There is a difference: you can get a job in Victoria.

Mr. Jennings: You can get a job as a hangman; that is about the only job.

Mr. RYAN: Let me deal with some of these prosperous States. The Leader of the Opposition has been on a Cook's tour of Victoria and New South Wales. He spent a couple of days in each State. In Victoria he did it all in two days. He had discussions with Sir Henry Bolte. The previous Liberal Premier yesterday went to great lengths to explain how Sir Henry Bolte was a past master in scratching other people's backs. He said Sir Henry was not concerned with what other States got from the Commonwealth as long as he could scratch the back of someone in the Commonwealth to get something extra for his State. Principle did not count as long as he could deal with people of the same colour as himself to get something extra. Our former Premier and present Premier at least face the facts as they actually are. They did not do any back-scratching. What this State received was obtained on the merits of the case submitted.

The latest figures provided by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics reveal that Victoria had more unemployed during the last month than the rest of the Commonwealth put together. This is the prosperity and great employment position in Victoria! Let us look at the Melbourne *Age*, a newspaper that would print something in favour of the Labor Party—I don't think! This is what the *Age* of last Friday (June 30) said:

Bolte warns tough Budget to offset Canberra setback. Taxes, services will go up. Victorians are facing a "horror" State Budget this year. Sir Henry Bolte yesterday foreshadowed tough and wide tax increases in September. Also rises in some other Government charges—fares and freights, gas and electricity tariffs—seem likely. Sir Henry warned that the Government would clamp down on loopholes in present tax arrangements . . . The Premier's warnings followed failure of the States to get significant increases yesterday over their tax reimbursement entitlements . . . Sir Henry said after the Premiers' Conference yesterday: "We will have to raise taxes. They have left us no alternative. There is no question of cutting back on development. The only question now is where to increase taxes and to what degree."

Let us now look at the editorial, which is just as biased as the editorial in the *Advertiser*. This is what the editorial of the *Age* reported on the same day. The *Advertiser* can quote it—I am not afraid of the *Advertiser*. Freedom of the press has been referred to here today, but we have never known it in this State. The editorial of the *Age* states:

The State of Victoria is still \$12,000,000 short of its needs—

the land of milk and honey, the "prosperous" State, as we have been told by the Leader of the Opposition! If that is the best he can put forward, he will remain the Leader of the Opposition for many years to come, unless he is defeated in the district he represents. The editorial continues:

Sir Henry Bolte has said State taxes must rise in September. The only alternative would be to slow down State development; it is not an alternative that any responsible Premier could contemplate.

Members opposite have been loud in their criticism of this State's running into a deficit to keep the wheels of industry turning smoothly. Day after day they have criticized this Government for running into a deficit in the hope of maintaining the development of this State.

Mr. Nankivell: You paid extra for nothing more.

Mr. RYAN: They have criticized this Government for at least putting its shoulder to the wheel. While they have levelled destructive criticism at this Government, they have also criticized it for not spending more.

Mr. McKee: They have criticized the Premier for spending money; they cannot make up their minds.

Mr. RYAN: Yes; they criticize the Premier for spending too much, then they criticize him for not spending enough, and then they criticize him for spending money like a drunken sailor. Does Sir Henry Bolte think that the present Premier is a "drunken sailor"? I

think not, judging by the remarks Sir Henry Bolte made as a result of his personal knowledge of our Premier who had "fought the fight well for South Australia". He referred to him as "a thorn in the side of the other Premiers for many years to come". There is no doubt that Sir Henry is sure of his facts when he states that our present Premier will be going to the Loan Council for many years to come, because why else would he, as a blue Tory-Liberal, say that our Premier was going to be a thorn in the side of the other Premiers for many years to come?

Mr. Millhouse: Do you agree with Gough Whitlam's assessment of Sir Henry Bolte?

Mr. RYAN: If I knew what he said of him, I would comment.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you ever read the papers?

Mr. RYAN: Is the honourable member referring to the unbiased newspapers of South Australia?

Mr. McKee: No; that was in the L.C.L. newsletter.

Mr. Millhouse: It was in the *Advertiser*. You should have your eyes open.

Mr. RYAN: I always have my eyes open. Members opposite have not a policy.

Mr. McAnaney: You have a different policy every day.

Mr. RYAN: It is amazing that for once we have not had the Australian Labor Party's rule book and policy brought out and shown to us every time a member opposite has spoken. Not even the financial wizardry of the member for Stirling could find anything wrong with this Party's policy. The Labor Party is progressive: it amends its policy in accordance with the progress and the requirements of the State.

Mr. Millhouse: I am glad you told me it was progressive, because no-one would have known!

Mr. RYAN: For the benefit of the member for Mitcham who has criticized the Labor Party, the Government, and the faceless men, I read in the *Advertiser* that Mr. Kelly, a Commonwealth Minister who refuted the statement about diminished Commonwealth expenditure in this State, spoke to the rural committee of the L.C.L., but not a name was given: apparently, they are faceless. The annual convention of the Australian Labor Party is open to the press and to television stations, not conducted behind locked doors. It is open to everyone.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you vouch for me next time so that I can go to it?

Mr. RYAN: I will never lower myself to such a height.

Mr. Millhouse: You have given yourself away. If it is open to everyone, why can't I go?

Mr. RYAN: Does the member for Mitcham believe that any sane person would vouch for him? He thought he was the greatest certainty to be selected for a vacancy in the Commonwealth Parliament, but he came off second best. He then attacked the member for Unley, who had defeated the candidate who had opposed and defeated the member for Mitcham. Then he asks to be vouched for.

Mr. Millhouse: If it is open to the public why shouldn't I be there?

Mr. RYAN: If the honourable member had a mind that could be improved he would learn something.

Mr. Millhouse: You are twisting!

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member would learn something if he were capable of doing that. I have never heard of the L.C.L. convention being open to the public, the press, or to television stations, and I have never seen pictures of delegates, but these people have the cheek to say that Labor Party members are faceless.

Mr. Millhouse: You won't live up to your boast.

Mr. RYAN: Recently, at a meeting of the Commonwealth executive of the L.C.L. in Canberra, two delegates represented South Australia but no press comments were published of what happened, and no reference was made to those who attended. When an A.L.P. conference is held everyone in Australia knows who attends: it is shown on television, members of the press are admitted, and the policy enunciated after the convention is published in newspapers throughout the Commonwealth. Members of the L.C.L. are not allowed to criticize the opinions of the hierarchy of that Party.

The Governor's Deputy's Speech contains many details of what is to happen in the future. Many Bills have to be introduced and many amendments made because of the stagnant state of affairs that existed in the legislation of this State. Many Acts should have been altered before the Labor Party assumed office, but it has become necessary for the Labor Government to amend legislation in accordance with the modern requirements of the people of this State. This is the last time that members will be able to speak in the Address in Reply debate in the thirty-eighth Parliament. No Government mem-

ber need fear anything contained in the Speech, or what has been done by the Government, or what is to be done in the dying months of this Parliament. The Government has a record second to none; it has attempted to improve conditions and amenities so that they now compare favourably with those in other States. To some extent, our legislation is an improvement on that in other States. It has taken many years for legislation to be introduced that is in accordance with the wishes of the people, but this has been accomplished by the Labor Party. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I join with other members in congratulating those who received special mention in His Excellency's Speech, and add my tribute to those that have already been expressed. Although I do this briefly I do it no less sincerely. The list of members in this category is long and important, either because they have passed on or are retiring. No doubt we will have the opportunity later to express our good wishes to those members who are retiring at the end of this session. Today, I inquired and was informed that His Excellency's condition had improved, and I am sure this news will please everyone. His illness has prevented his projected visit to country districts of this State. This has been a severe blow to His Excellency and Lady Bastyan, and a big disappointment to those who expected to see them. The important thing is that the Governor's health is improving, and we all hope that he will speedily resume his normal activities.

This debate has included a mixed bag of speeches. The member for Wallaroo moved the motion in his usual style and conveyed much information to the House, and we have heard speeches of varying ability and content. Yesterday afternoon we were particularly fortunate and privileged to hear what I think was a memorable speech by the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford), who, without introducing any degree of political bias, spoke about the things that really matter to South Australia. The attention paid to him was a fitting tribute that showed the esteem in which he is held in this Parliament and, whatever arguments may be engendered by political considerations in this place, obviously Sir Thomas is still regarded as being a striking and dominant figure in South Australian politics, and will be so regarded for many years to come. I thank members for the tribute they paid the honourable member by the attention they gave to his remarks.

I should also like to compliment two members from this side of the House, the members for Torrens and Albert, on their excellent contributions to this debate. Their speeches substantially raised the tone of the debate. Last week and early this week we listened to some speeches that I thought were of the opposite calibre. The member for Adelaide descended into the realms of near blasphemy in the very curious approach he had to some of the matters he spoke about; I do not quite know what these matters were, but I recall that he made great fun out of framing funny prayers to the Almighty. I do not like this sort of thing because it does this Parliament great discredit, and I tender to the people of this State an apology on behalf of this Parliament for the things that the member said then.

I have a similar attitude towards the contribution to this debate of the member for Enfield. We do not want the development of bar-room oratory in this place: we want a reasonable contribution concerning the things that matter in this State. I regret very much the tone of his remarks, the unfortunate innuendoes in his speech, and the double meanings that were patently obvious to everyone. Again, I regret that this sort of thing has been injected into this debate, for it must necessarily appear in *Hansard* for all the world to see.

I also want to criticize some of the Ministers for their comments during replies to questions yesterday. I twice noticed that, when members from this side asked questions, the Ministers informed them that they had had the replies in their bags the day before but, because the members had not seen fit to ask the questions then, they had taken the replies out. Over the nine years that I occupied a Cabinet position I frequently carried answers to questions in my bag for three months, waiting until the member concerned saw fit to ask the question. I often reminded the member that I had the answer for him. Ministers might perhaps bear this in mind. I realize that their bags become full of documents but I do not think it is asking too much for Ministers to carry replies in their bags for a day or two, so that the members concerned may be able to receive them when they ask for them.

I was disgusted with the answer that the Premier found it necessary to give to the member for Rocky River yesterday; the

Premier repeated a story that came from the Commonwealth Parliament, and he got out of answering a perfectly legitimate and logical question that was of great importance to this State by telling a story which, incidentally, did not fit the case at all. If the implication contained in it applied to anybody, it applied to the Premier himself.

Mr. Langley: I take it that you have never said anything like that?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is interesting that the story the Premier told related to an exchange between the late Hon. Archie Cameron, when he was Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the member for East Sydney in the Commonwealth Parliament, the late Mr. Eddie Ward. I thought it was not in good taste, nor was it well applied.

I now wish to turn to some matters of considerable importance. First, I shall refer to the current problem of the negotiations between the owners of the gas in the Gidgealpa-Moomba field and the Electricity Trust regarding a possible contract enabling the trust to use the gas from the field for a period. The submission to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance for the establishment of a pipeline stated:

It is not intended to commit any extensive funds for the pipeline by actual calling of tenders until sufficient drilling is completed to confirm the deliverability—

these words are important—

to confirm the deliverability of at least 750 billion cubic feet.

When the Bill was before the House the then Premier, the Hon. Frank Walsh, said that it would be necessary for the owners of the gas at Gidgealpa to carry out further drilling before he would be prepared to go further in committing finance to the project. In other words, his statement on that occasion fully supported the statement made in the submission I have referred to.

Now we find that the present Premier is retreating from that standpoint. He has absolved the owner of the Gidgealpa wells from doing any further drilling. He says that he is prepared to accept the proved reserves of 630 billion cubic feet instead of the 750 billion cubic feet that was required earlier, and that he is prepared to go ahead on that basis. I think that the figure of 750 billion cubic feet was slender enough, in any case, but if he is in a great hurry for this pipeline to reach Adelaide to make the gas available to industry and also to make a political splash in the

process, then I think this is very unwise. We have a 480-mile pipeline to construct and much money is involved.

There are three parties involved in these negotiations: the owners of the gas in the field, the pipeline authority (which is concerned with the pipeline between Gidgealpa and Adelaide), and the consumers—the Gas Company and the people who depend upon it for their supplies of heat for industrial and domestic purposes. In addition, we have smaller industries, such as cement manufacturers, that could find good use for this heating material if it was available at the right price. However, the most important potential use of the natural gas is that of power generation by the Electricity Trust.

It is not common practice around the world to use natural gas for the generation of electricity; this is a well-established fact. Last year I inquired overseas into the utilization and transportation of natural gas, and nowhere did I find that it was extensively used for power generation. Natural gas was not used in this way in Holland, which has the biggest field in the world. In connection with the development of the natural gas resources underlying the North Sea (the exact extent of which is as yet unknown but proven to be gigantic), the authority set up in Great Britain to develop and utilize these resources was not proposing—I repeat “not proposing”—to use these resources for power generation. This point is referred to in the authority’s statement to the press, of which I have a copy.

South Australia is proposing to proceed in a different way from that followed in other places; in view of the lack of precedent we must proceed cautiously. We find that in the negotiations for the use of the gas the Electricity Trust is subjected to consistent pressures. Indeed, I sympathize with its position in the matter, because all the pressure is on the trust to make a deal with the suppliers of the gas—a deal, I am afraid, at a price that is higher than the trust desires. First, there are the producers, who own the gas and who are anxious to sell it, having spent much money in locating the product. Then, there are the financiers, who are intending to advance much money for the pipeline and who are looking for a reasonable return on their money.

The press is inclined to take the side of the producers and financiers; indeed, there is considerable influence in press circles from those two groups of people. Then, we have the Government, headed by the Premier, which has a political axe to grind in this matter. Indeed, the Premier makes no secret of that fact.

However, he also has a vested interest in the project. As Treasurer, he knows that the higher the price the vendor of the gas obtains at Gidgealpa, the greater will be the royalties attracted to the State Treasury. Because of his vested interest, I think the Premier would also be inclined to press for a deal to be made at a reasonably high price.

Then there is the public interest in the matter and what is sometimes stated to be the national interest. The public, which is naturally attracted to a project that has some novelty, is alert for developments. Of course, the argument exists that to use our own indigenous fuel we shall save much overseas currency which will assist the nation as a whole in its balance of payments problem. However, I point out that the material used by the electricity-generating undertakings of South Australia is material that would have to come to Australia, in any case. It comes here as part of the content of crude oil, which is brought into our refineries in order to keep up with the demand for oil products (petroleum, aviation fuel, kerosene, jet fuel, diesel fuel, and fuel for vehicles, including farm machinery, and so on). However, the fuel used by the trust has little use in any other industry; being a heavy fuel, it can be handled only in special circumstances. It is a by-product of the other operations of a refinery that must continue regardless and, therefore, the oil companies are anxious to get rid of it at almost a by-product price.

If that is true, whether or not we use the fuel oil for power generation does not have much effect at all on the national economy and the balance of payments situation. Therefore, I believe that the trust should largely be left alone to conduct its own negotiations on this matter and I believe it is capable of doing so. The trust has no vested interest, as have the people at the other end of the pipeline. The trust functions entirely for the benefit of its consumers and on a cost basis. The whole tenor of public discussion seems to point the bone at the trust but that is not fair, for the trust has a great interest in the welfare of the State. It has the sole responsibility of providing power to industry at a price that will enable industry to compete and to expand.

The trust must assist the housewife in her budgeting by keeping domestic costs of living down to the lowest level, and it must also develop its capacity to extend services to the more remote areas and to generate power to meet increased demands. Indeed, the trust has undertaken all these things on its own initiative

and as a result of prudent business decisions, assisted by an encouraging Government under Sir Thomas Playford. Therefore, the trust should definitely be permitted to buy its fuel on the cheapest possible market; it must be free to conduct negotiations in its own way, because nobody can do better than the trust can. I point out that if we assume a price of 20c a million British thermal units to the Electricity Trust in Adelaide, and if we deduct 10c from that sum as the cost of transportation from Moomba-Gidgealpa to Adelaide (which is the estimate that I think is pretty well accepted by everybody), that will leave 10c for the owners of the gas at the well-head. That is equivalent to the price that overseas owners are obtaining, and it is the general average of what is obtained in North America.

Having made some inquiries concerning the matter, from Los Angeles to Toronto, I was informed by a consultant to the Canadian Bechtel organization that if I wished to use a figure as a guide to considerations, the figure of 10c at the well-head would be a reasonable one to adopt. The producers and the owners of gas in this country (who, after all, went into the area searching for oil and obtained gas as a bonus payment—as a by-product of their intended development) cannot reasonably expect to obtain more than what is obtained on the other side of the world, where gas is available in such huge quantities over such a wide area. If the trust could have gas at 20c a million b.t.u. delivered to Adelaide, it could cut the price of power tomorrow, which is what we want.

We do not want the equivalent of present costs or anything above the level of present costs; we want something that is lower. However, we cannot have the price too low; we must be reasonable to the people who produce the gas, and their commitments must be considered. Gas at 20c a million b.t.u. in Adelaide would enable the trust to cut its cost of power generation and to pass on benefits to industry which everybody, including the Premier, knows. Indeed, the Premier suddenly realizes that we have to keep down South Australia's industry costs. The trust must be left free to conduct its negotiations in its own way, and nobody can do it better. Officers of the trust are conscientious; they are reliable citizens, who control a huge enterprise and who are acutely aware of their responsibilities and of the effect their decisions may have on the welfare of the South Australian people. There is certainly

no place in the negotiations for vested pressure, political expediency, or emotional loyalties. There is no justification for all or any of these things to be substituted for sound business judgment or to be permitted to exercise any influence upon such a judgment.

When the Premier assumed office, he quite naturally was the recipient of many congratulatory remarks in which I believe all members of the House joined. To be elevated to the position of Premier means that a member has reached the highest position that can be reached in this Parliament. The Premier was also besieged by people and by the press for comments about his achievements. He made what I believe was a rather interesting and revealing statement to the representative of the *Advertiser*, Mr. Stewart Cockburn, that included some discussion on his background, his ambitions in life and his personal feelings at the time of his elevation to the leadership. Some of the remarks he made then were interesting to me. I suppose all of us in this place study the personalities of other members. What I have to say now is not in a spirit of carping criticism: I desire to make a few observations that I think are obvious from the remarks the Premier made in the statement to which I have referred. In this article we learnt that in his younger days the Premier did not support the Labor Party: indeed he was a firm supporter of Liberalism, taking an active part in the Liberal organization until he was about 18 years of age. He even made a radio broadcast opposing the late Dr. Evatt's referendum proposals in 1944.

Then his mind began to change on politics. He read a book, Dr. Evatt's life of the Labor leader W. A. Holman, which he said completely altered his outlook on political matters. At this stage I should like to transgress and commend the *Advertiser* for its daily presentation of page 2. The practice of this newspaper now is to use the services of feature writers (after they have made suitable research) to develop a particular subject matter, and this is usually well worth reading and of much interest. When I was in London for several weeks last year at about this time, I noticed that the London press (and this also applied to the American press) contained articles which were the result of much research work and which provided much valuable information for people who wanted to read them. In these papers, such as the *Times*, there are always three or four well-researched and well-written articles on topical subjects and matters of national importance.

This struck me as a useful method of creating public opinion and of educating people in matters of interest. I commend the Adelaide *Advertiser* for following this trend, which I hope will continue, because I often derive pleasure and profit from reading the articles.

To return to the Premier, it had previously been decided that he would make politics his objective in life. This was a laudable and proper ambition to pursue and I am not being at all critical about it. The article then refers to a comment he made which I think is interesting. The Premier is reported to have said, "If one wants to achieve something politically, one works with the organization at hand." To me that is an illuminating statement. I have often wondered why, over the course of the years, the Premier has displayed such intense political animosity towards the former Leader of the Liberal and Country Party in this State, Sir Thomas Playford. I was a member of this place for several years before the Premier entered politics, and it has been obvious to me and to all other members that ever since he has become a member there has been some reason why he has always felt it necessary to tackle Sir Thomas.

I believe the statement I have just quoted is the key to his attitude. Probably he does not realize just how strong a force Sir Thomas has been during his political life. I believe that the Premier looked at the Liberal Party and, in looking down the corridors of time in the political sphere, he could see the road to the top of the Liberal Party being barred by the burly figure (burly in stature and in political reputation) of Tom Playford, as he then was. Aggressive and ambitious as the Premier was, he could see that the road to leadership, via the Liberal and Country Party, was closed for a longer period of time than he was prepared to wait. Sir Thomas Playford was then only 49 years old and had not reached his prime. Therefore, the Premier could not travel that road.

Subconsciously perhaps, he realized this and saw that he had to seek another road; Labor was the organization, or the means, at hand and he chose it. I do not suggest for a moment that this was his sole reason for doing so, but I believe that subconsciously something was operating within his mind that inclined him to look for an alternative: the thing operating in his mind was the figure of Sir Thomas Playford as the head of the Liberal Party. I am not doubting the Premier's sincere espousal of the Socialist cause. If he had doubts in the first years (and I believe

anybody who changes political faith must have some moments of doubt), he has, by immersing himself deeply in the movement, long since become a sincere devotee of Socialism or an actor of exceptional competency (maybe he has become something of both). I believe the figure of Sir Thomas Playford, standing in his way whichever path he might pursue, has been a factor of great consequence to him, consciously or subconsciously.

This probably explains his public antipathy and his political enmity against a man who we all know tendered to the Premier so many personal kindnesses over the years. It probably explains the fury of his attacks during the Stuart inquiry, during the course of which the lengths to which he ventured, in and out of the House, suggested that he was motivated by much more than a sense of justice. It almost certainly explains his continuing efforts since Ministerial appointment to denigrate Sir Thomas, and it shows why in his first statement as Premier he saw fit to launch yet another attack. Much as he would hate to admit it, I can come to only this conclusion: that Sir Thomas Playford has been and still is the towering figure in South Australian politics. He is a man who has set the standards for behaviour and achievement; whose wisdom, energy, perspicacity and integrity have set the standards for Parliamentarians on both sides of politics. Therefore, if the present Premier is to make any impact and succeed in retaining office, the image of Sir Thomas Playford must be destroyed. He is determined to do that if he can.

Mr. Ryan: That is only a reporter's opinion.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I looked up Shakespeare to support my opinion, and this is what he had to say in *King Richard II*:

As in a theatre, the eyes of men,
After a well-grac'd actor leaves the stage,
Are idly bent on him that enters next,
Thinking his prattle to be tedious.

I think it would be fitting if the Premier at some rare moment gave credit to Sir Thomas Playford for what he had done. I suppose it is equally proper that on some occasions if members of the Opposition can find an excuse for it they should give credit to the Labor Government for what it has done. The Government needs credit, because it has run out of cash.

Mr. Lawn: In other words, you will not give credit?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member who has been interjecting—the honourable member for Adelaide—

Mr. Lawn: I have not been interjecting.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I would like the member for Adelaide to study this remarkable achievement of balancing the Budget.

Mr. Lawn: You do not know what you are talking about. I have not made an interjection. Tell me what I said.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will tell you what you said.

Mr. Lawn: I am not talking about when I was speaking.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: You talked about "red cows that gave white milk from green pastures".

Mr. Ryan: Isn't that true!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, but what the honourable member ought to have said was: "Borrow money; pay debts; problem solved". The present Government is under the difficulty at the moment of fighting on at least two fronts (it may be three). It is always difficult for any general to occupy the enemy on two or three fronts, particularly when it is a different enemy. The Government is fighting on the industrial front (the Trades Hall front). Everybody knows that when the Labor Government was elected some people thought that the millenium had arrived, but because it had not arrived they became somewhat disenchanted with Labor's leadership. Secondly, the Government is fighting on the political front, on which it must endeavour to appease the electors of the State, who are getting restive and critical.

Thirdly, the Government is fighting on the Commonwealth Government front because it is necessary, in order to excuse existing difficulties, to blame somebody else for them. So we hear on every occasion (it is becoming so monotonous) that the State must have assistance from the Commonwealth Government if it is going to do this, that or the other. Has this Government no resources with which to help itself out of its dilemmas? The Premier was talking the other night about redevelopment (on 5AD, I think) and it was reported that he said that the Planning and Development Bill had been passed; that councils around the city of Adelaide had their plans well prepared to commence the redevelopment of the inner suburbs; that the Director of Planning had developed plans; and that things were ready to commence. The only problem was that the Government did not have the money and would

have to go to the Commonwealth Government for it. At the Loan Council the Premier intended to ask that the Commonwealth Government agree to a 2½ per cent reduction in sales tax on motor vehicles. When he was asked whether or not it would be a good thing to reduce the stamp duty on the purchase price of motor vehicles, he replied that this was not the area. "Area" is a magnificent word: Sir Robert Menzies could not have contrived a better one; it sounds large and convincing. It is a good word, and I must use it myself. The Premier said that this was not the area in which the Government could render any assistance to the motor industry. Yet when this measure was introduced by the Playford Government in this House he said that this was a shocking tax to impose; that it would preclude the wage-earner from owning a motor car; that it was a class tax; and that it had no justification or validity whatever.

If that was the case then, surely it is the case now. If it is such a problem for the working man to own a motor car, why doesn't the Premier remove the tax? The wealthy man, of whom the Premier is so fond of talking, would not be worried about having to pay a few dollars in purchase tax. It is not the wealthy man but the poor man who would be precluded from buying a motor car. If the Premier's remarks were correct, he would really do something and say that this was an area in which assistance could be given to the motor industry.

This is typical of the Labor Party in so many matters: it speaks with so many voices. For example, the present Government, and the Premier particularly, is constantly criticizing the other place about revenue measures. Yet only three weeks ago the Commonwealth Labor Senators in Canberra blocked the Commonwealth Government's legislation to increase postal charges. I am not suggesting that the Postmaster-General's Department does not need some overhauling; I think it does, from the point of view of efficiency and getting value for the money it spends. However, the criticisms of Government members here do not tally up with the actions of the Senators in Canberra—their own people in both cases. The Premier went to Canberra asking for more money for the State, and rightly so, but at the same time he said he would ask the Commonwealth Government to forgo a substantial portion of its revenue by reducing the sales tax on motor vehicles. I have already said that the Labor Party has strongly condemned the imposition of stamp duty on motor car purchases, and

now even the Royal Automobile Association has added its voice to the plea from motorists to remove it. However, the Premier said that this was not the area in which the industry could be stimulated.

On other fronts, the Premier is telling us of the action he is taking (and I hope it succeeds) to encourage the development of industry in this State. However, at the same time, according to His Excellency's Speech, he intends to completely overhaul and re-write the Industrial Code. We are also to have equal pay for both sexes in industry and outside of it; we are to have longer leave for Government employees, which involves equivalent situations for everyone else under State awards, and probably Commonwealth awards, too; and we have had a series of increases in charges, some of which probably were unavoidable but some of which were not. If the Premier thinks that this is the way to encourage industry, I suggest that he ought to look at the matter again.

I intended to make some comments on Budget matters, but I think perhaps I had better leave those for the time being. However, I will say that the Premier's claim to have balanced the Budget did not deceive anybody—not for very long, anyway. Balancing a Budget, which the Premier is reported as saying he has done, is surely not spending more money than is being received from all sources. This was a clever sort of interpretation which was intended to beguile the public but which he knew was not strictly true in the way that these matters are interpreted in Government finance circles. He knows, too (which has always been very well revealed and now widely accepted) that he did not earn enough to pay his way: he borrowed it.

I am concerned that in his borrowing he has seen fit to reduce expenditures, particularly of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, to such a serious extent as he has done. According to the Auditor-General's Report, the expenditure by this department in net Loan figures in 1964-65 was \$25,900,000; in 1965-66, the first full year of Labor's Administration in this State, it dropped to \$24,300,000; and in 1966-67 (this is an estimate of net Loan expenditure for the financial year just ended which I obtained, in the reply to a question on notice, from the Minister of Works) the figure has dropped almost another \$3,000,000 to \$21,700,000. I am waiting with much interest to see what the Loan programme produces for the Minister of Works to operate under, because in today's *News* the Minister is reported as saying that there is a five-year plan for the co-ordination of South Australian public works

prepared by the Government which will, as he says, smooth out some of the bumps.

I sincerely hope, for the good of this State and for the proper activity of the departments under his control, that the Minister of Works gets some money this year to get on with some of the urgent public works we so badly need. However, I cannot understand the reasons given to this House for the fact that the Minister could not spend his money in the last two or three years. I have had some experience in these departments, and I just cannot follow the reasons given. To me, they do not make sense. I think the real fact is that the Premier has given instructions to the Minister that to a large extent he is to be the banker for the rest of the departments of the State and that he has to cut back on his works so that there will be some liquidity left in the Treasury at all times. I think that is the absolute truth of the matter and that there is no other factor in it. The fact that the Minister has carried out the instructions of his Premier is only too plain, because he finished up with even more in hand than he expected to have. This has created what is alleged to be, and what we are fondly expected to accept as being, a genuine surplus in the Loan Fund. Well, there is nothing so far from the actual facts of life.

During the course of this Government's earlier activities it blamed the economic recession of South Australia on the drought conditions. I briefly looked at the history of this State in regard to seasonal conditions and Budget results. In 1957-58 we got only 35,000,000 bushels of grain; in 1958-59 we got about 81,000,000 bushels; and in 1959-60 we got only 26,000,000 bushels. They were three years in which the total yield was only about 143,000,000 bushels. On the other hand, in the two years since the Labor Government took office the total yield has been 151,000,000 bushels. In the eight years from 1957-58 to 1964-65 inclusive (the last eight years of the Playford Government), there were three very lean years of harvest results. Despite the bad cereal years the actual Budget result for those eight years was a credit of \$2,124,598.

That was the consolidated operation on the Budget Account for eight years, and this was achieved without robbing the Loan Account. At the same time, we were carrying in the Budget the full weight of the grants to non-Government hospitals and the full weight, as it then existed, of grants to the university and to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute and all that sort of thing; we did not have Commonwealth assistance in those days to the extent that we have it now. Since the Labor

Government took office just over two years ago there have been really good harvests and good returns through the Railways and Harbors Departments, yet the result for those two years in the Budget Account is a deficit of \$13,834,136. I submit that for what it is worth; I think it speaks for itself.

One could go on, but I think I had better spare the House any further comments, for they will keep. A great deal has been said about the building industry, and with a good deal of validity, too. We have a glut of houses at the present time and we have not enough people in jobs who can afford to buy them or rent them. One of the main reasons why we have many unoccupied houses on our hands is that people have left South Australia and gone to other States, where they can get a job. This applies particularly to tradesmen whom we can ill afford to spare if we are going to enter upon that era of upsurge and resuscitation in our industrial fields for which we are looking. This is the problem: approvals for dwellings for the quarter ended February 28, 1966, and the quarter ended February 28, 1967, show that in that year there was a decrease of 23 per cent in South Australia. In New South Wales the increase was 23 per cent. In Victoria, it was 15 per cent, in Queensland 8 per cent, in Western Australia 46 per cent, and in Tasmania 22 per cent. The Commonwealth average was an increase of 17 per cent, taking into account the decrease in South Australia of 23 per cent. These figures speak for themselves.

I consider that the Premier, in his attempt to revive the building industry, particularly his proposal to have more houses built in South Australia, is starting at the wrong end of the problem. We have plenty of houses at present and we do not want to use our resources to build more right now, although I hope that we shall need them before many years pass. The Premier ought to start by resuscitating industry. People cannot afford houses, refrigerators, television sets and washing machines if they are out of employment, so we ought first to get industry kicking along and remove some of the embargoes that this Government has placed in the way of industry. If we do that, the people will be able to obtain employment and so buy the things that they need. If that is done, we shall progress. I regretfully end my remarks at this point and support the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

To insert the following new paragraph:

2a. We express the sincere hope that His Excellency the Governor will speedily be restored to the best of health.

I appreciate the points that have been put forward in the course of this debate, and those matters that call for attention by the Government will be given attention. I do not think I need to explain the new paragraph that I have moved to insert.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor's Deputy has intimated that he will be pleased to receive members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at Government House on Tuesday, July 11, at 2.10 p.m.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1965. Read a first time.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Settlement Act, 1944-1965. Read a first time.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1963. Read a first time.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorize the establishment of a State Government insurance commission; to authorize such commission to carry on the general business of insurance; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Morphet Street Bridge Act, 1964. Read a first time.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1966. Read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 11, at 2 p.m.