

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 19, 1967.

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

QUESTIONS

TRANSPORT STRIKE.

Mr. HALL: As a press report states that 250 members of the Transport Workers Union, employed by oil companies distributing oil products in South Australia, are at present on strike can the Premier say whether this action presents a threat to industry and employment in South Australia and, if it does, what action he intends to take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should not consider that it did, but I am having discussions on the matter.

MUTTON PRICES.

Mr. LAWN: I understand that for some time the price of mutton at the abattoirs has been steadily dropping without a consequent reduction in retail price to housewives. Although the price of mutton is not controlled at present, will the Premier, as Minister in charge of the Prices Department, examine this matter and obtain a report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

PLUMBERS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns charges for plumbing work. I raised this matter during the debate last week on the amendment to the Prices Act, when I quoted from a letter I had received from the Plumbers Association, which complained about the Premier's telecast in which he had referred to plumbers in an unfavourable context about overcharging. (I put it that way so as not to offend his susceptibilities.) In view of the unfavourable light in which the plumbing trade was placed by his telecast and his remarks generally, does the Premier intend to take steps to remove the misapprehension that he has caused in the minds of the people of South Australia about the general practices of plumbers in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member assigns to me, again, something for which I am in no way responsible. I have repeatedly invited the honourable member to examine the script of the telecast, which is available to him. At no time have I made general statements relating to the plumbing trade in South Australia, and I have repeatedly

said in the House that those charges are completely base and false.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I phrased the question, I thought, carefully enough to avoid the implication that the Premier had actually said that all plumbers were rogues. I merely said that this was the impression that his telecast gave, whether it was intended or not. Will the Premier take steps to remove from the public mind the impression that he undoubtedly created on that occasion?

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule that that question has already been asked and answered.

KEITH WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a further reply to the question I asked him yesterday about the Mines Department's intentions to drill for water at Keith?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Further to the information that I gave to the honourable member in the House yesterday, a report just received from the Mines Department has recommended the sinking of two bores, one of which will be an observation bore, in the Emu Flat area north-east of the township of Keith. The estimated cost of drilling and pump testing is \$21,000, and I have now given approval for this expenditure to enable the work to proceed. The Mines Department expects to commence drilling the first bore on Monday next (July 24).

IRRIGATION.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the recommendations contained in the report of the inter-departmental committee (tabled in the House last Thursday), which was inquiring into the availability of Murray River water, have been adopted by the Government? If they have been, will he say what action the Government intends to take in relation to those recommendations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Government has adopted the committee's recommendations. Each application will be considered on its merits, and legislation will be introduced in regard to one aspect of the report.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I heard on the radio this morning (and I have no doubt that the report was correct) that farmers in the Kimba area have already disposed of 30,000 sheep, and have only a fortnight's supply of water left. Can the Minister of Works say what steps the Government is taking to maintain the supply of water to Kimba that was promised earlier this session?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Government will honour its promise. Further, I intend to visit Kimba on the weekend of July 29, when I shall be pleased to meet the honourable member and any person experiencing difficulties in this regard. We hope that we shall be able to meet farmers' demands as much as we can. The Government is anxious to keep up the supply of water, without cost, to the people drawing water from the tanks.

MEATWORKS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether it is correct that Noarlunga Meat Limited's quota of meat for sale in the metropolitan area (under the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act) has been halved and the time factor limited? If that has occurred, will the Minister explain why?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: A permit has been granted annually to Noarlunga Meat Limited and its renewal is subject to review every 12 months. Since I have been in office I have renewed it twice in its entirety but this year, because of complications regarding the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board and the drop in sales caused by inroads resulting from country killed meat being brought into the near metropolitan area, the metropolitan abattoirs and other abattoirs have been affected. I have discussed this matter with both the board and the company. The quota has been halved and it is to be reviewed again at the end of December, 1967. This information has not yet been sent out to the company but, when I have told them this, I am sure that its officers will appreciate my position.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I know that the company does not favour a reduction in its quota. Is the Minister aware of the effect on employment at Noarlunga Meat Limited if the quota is not restored, and can he say what the policy will be at the end of the six-month period?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have been informed of the employment position both at Noarlunga and at Gepps Cross. The Manager and Secretary of the company at Noarlunga have seen me several times, and I intend to speak to them again, as I sympathize with them because of the current position. I informed the honourable member by note that I should like a discussion with him on abattoirs generally, as many problems exist not only in this State but throughout Australia. At the Agricultural Council conference I was informed

that 12 abattoirs in Victoria had become insolvent recently, and that Anderson's (a large abattoir in New South Wales) had closed down. The regulations promulgated by the Department of Primary Industry have caused extra expenditure: overhead costs have increased at works killing for export and, in addition, the United Kingdom market has been considerably reduced. I have had several conferences not only with representatives of the Noarlunga firm but also with all other sections of the meat industry in order to solve the problem. Ministers in every State are concerned, and long discussions took place at the conference concerning killing works, especially those involved in the export trade.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should be happy to talk to the Minister about abattoirs generally, but I am concerned about the reduction in the company's quota. Is the Minister satisfied that the action he has outlined will meet the position that could arise in this State this year, as it has arisen in other dry seasons, when there could be a sudden influx of stock for slaughter, thereby requiring severe emergency conditions to be imposed in the killing industry? Further, can he say whether he is tackling this matter correctly by reducing the quota, thereby almost forcing the reduction of killing staff by this administrative action?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not satisfied with the situation, otherwise I would not be continuing discussions with members of the industry. This matter is being kept under constant review and will be attended to as the situation arises.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has today answered questions about Noarlunga Meat Limited, which operates under legislation passed by this House and which was given licences that were extended from year to year. These arrangements were made before the company's big new works were opened by the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) in August, 1965. An important part of the company's planning related to the quota for the metropolitan area. Indeed, it was suggested long before then that licences would eventually be issued for a longer term than the annual period. The system of yearly licences was introduced to apply until the position could be re-examined in the light of experience. These quotas were recommended by a committee comprising the Auditor-General, the General Manager of the Government Produce Department and one or two other senior public servants including, I believe, the Director of Agriculture. This quota has now been halved and,

from what the Minister has said, there is no guarantee about what will happen in future. We have a dry season at present and conditions could become critical. In a dry season, such as the 1958-59 season, the number of livestock killed increases enormously. The reduction of the quota will doubtless mean the reduction of employment, too. The Minister said in reply to a further question that he was not happy about the position. Will he reconsider the whole matter of the quota, having regard to what has been said this afternoon?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall reconsider the question as the situation arises. The matters now raised are not new: they have been considered all the time. However, I am not aware of promises made by the former Government, as they are not shown in the docket and are not evident to me. The situation concerns not only the management of the company at Noarlunga but also many other people. I am sure that those at Noarlunga are aware of, and are sympathetic in regard to, what has taken place.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What do you mean by "sympathetic"?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is the term they used when speaking to me.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do they agree with your action?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: They did not say they agreed with it, but they said they realized the situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! There should be no debate.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Until the last year Noarlunga Meat Limited had not used its full quota. Early last season it did not do so, and the reduced quota is not much below what is used in the first six months of last year. The whole matter is being discussed by people interested in killing meat, and the position is being constantly reviewed.

Mr. RODDA: As the Minister said that matters concerning abattoirs are being investigated, when will the findings be released?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I did not say what the honourable member said I did. I said the position was constantly reviewed and was the concern of all interested people. That completely changes the import of his question.

Mr. McANANEY: I have been told that certain wholesalers buy stock in South Australia, take it to Victoria to have it killed, and then bring back the meat. Apparently they think they can operate more profitably that way at certain times of the year. Does the

Minister of Agriculture believe that, if the company's quota is reduced, this interstate movement will be increased?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No.

Mr. McANANEY: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that the Adelaide abattoir is being bypassed and stock killed in other States because South Australia's charges in this connection are higher than those in Victoria?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say whether there have been discussions about whether action should be taken to prevent this stock going to other States for killing?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, there have been.

Mr. McANANEY: Will action be taken regarding the stock going to other States?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I hope so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McANANEY: What action will be taken regarding this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This depends entirely on the discussions now taking place with interested people.

Mr. McANANEY: Why cannot our abattoirs compete with other abattoirs?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter is being investigated.

HOLDEN HILL INTERSECTION.

Mrs. BYRNE: On October 19, 1966, in reply to a question in this House, I was told that plans for making safer the intersection of the Main North-East Road and the Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill, were being prepared, that the proposal was to install a roundabout there, and that construction was expected to commence this year. As the installation of this roundabout is necessary, this intersection being dangerous in its present condition, will the Minister of Lands bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Roads and call for a report?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

PROMOTIONAL FILM.

Mr. COUMBE: On July 16 last year, the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) announced that the Government intended to make a film to promote primary and secondary industry in this State. He said it would be sent to the Agent-General in London so that it could be used in Britain and other countries to promote development here. Can the Premier now say what has happened to this film and what effect, if any, has resulted from its introduction?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Several scenarios for a film of this kind were examined by the Government. However, none of them, in the Government's view, met the requirements of a film for the purpose for which it was originally specified. Therefore, the whole project was re-examined and it was decided that the production of a film was more time-consuming and would be less effective than certain other means of industrial promotion through direct contact by officers with figures supplied to them. In consequence, it is not now intended to proceed with the production of a film of this kind.

WATER RATES.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I understand that, at present, water and sewerage rate accounts are being sent out quarterly. As inquiries have been made concerning the procedure to apply in respect of people wishing to pay rates in advance, will the Minister of Works explain the procedure?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: All people who are receiving notices have been told that any ratepayer wishing to do so may pay rates in advance but it is important to remember that this should be done before any quarterly account becomes overdue. The annual amount payable will be four times the amount of the current charge for rates shown on the first quarterly account. Where the account shows a previous balance outstanding, this must be added to the payment. As the department's arrangement with the Savings Bank of South Australia only provides for payment of the amount shown on each account, all payments in advance must be made direct to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Agriculture give the names of those members appointed by the Government to the committee to consider providing assistance to farmers in need as a result of the drought? What are the terms of reference of the committee; when is it expected to commence work; and will it have the authority (as I understand one of its members is from the Treasury) to allocate money for drought assistance?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The committee will comprise Messrs. J. D. McAuliffe (Chairman) and J. M. Lobban from the Agriculture Department, Mr. F. N. Joy from the Lands Department, and Mr. E. J. Carey from the Treasury. The terms of reference are wide: the committee is to investigate and

report on action necessary by the Government to enable farmers affected by drought conditions in certain approved drought areas to carry on, and to submit for consideration by the Minister procedures to be established to give effect to its recommendations. The committee held its first meeting on Monday and is meeting again tomorrow. I understand it expects to visit the honourable member's district on Monday and Tuesday of next week. I further understand that a meeting will be held in that district that the committee will attend: it will be most anxious to listen to the problems put forward and to assist in any way possible.

BRUCE BOXES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Forests say whether the Woods and Forests Department can now supply the timber necessary to construct the Bruce boxes used in the orange industry, or whether timber for this purpose must still be imported from the Philippine Islands? Also, can he say what the Government is doing to improve timber sales, as the stocks of timber in the mills are building up and will become an embarrassing problem if prompt action is not taken?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Because of the type of log produced in the South-East, it has not been possible to provide the timber used for Bruce boxes. Therefore, as the investigation into the matter has shown that the present timber is unacceptable, it has been necessary for those who make Bruce boxes to continue to import timber. The Government is conscious of the build-up of timber stocks in the South-East. As the honourable member knows, the department employs salesmen to sell timber and every effort is being made to sell as much timber as possible.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think a disservice was done to the forestry industry when alternative forms of container for our fruit were introduced. Will the Minister ascertain whether his officers can develop from our local timbers a suitable box for packing oranges, apples, and other fruits, for which the products of the Woods and Forests Department are not being used at present, because much employment was involved in supplying this case timber to the various industries?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

Mr. RODDA: There is general concern amongst people engaged in the forestry industry about using materials that have come from another source. As the chip-board process in the private mills uses much second-grade

material that is made into a first-class article, will the Minister say whether the Government mills intend to install a chip-board processing plant?

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

Mr. QUIRKE: As some difficulty is being experienced in supplying suitable South Australian timber for the manufacture of Bruce boxes, has the importation of timber from New Zealand been considered for the manufacture of these boxes in order to assist the export trade in oranges to New Zealand?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter has been fully investigated, but I have not got the details of the report with me. I will try to obtain a detailed statement for the honourable member.

NARACORTE-BORDERTOWN ROAD.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of last week about the danger caused by kangaroos to motorists on the road between Bordertown and Naracoorte?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that the presence of kangaroos on roads

in rural locations of the State, particularly where large areas of natural scrub adjoin the road, is a hazard normally encountered during motoring, and can be expected at any time. Erection of signs does not alleviate the hazard, as kangaroos may be expected to cross roads at any time and at any place, certainly not necessarily at the place where signs are erected. However, an investigation will be made at the site in question to determine whether kangaroos are in fact congregating in large numbers in a restricted area so as to warrant the erection of special signs.

GOVERNMENT WORKS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Can the Minister of Works elaborate on the answer he gave yesterday to my question about a statement he made dealing with Loan expenditure during the past financial year by the Public Buildings Department?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I may have been under a misapprehension yesterday when answering a question by the honourable member, my reply may not have been correct in detail. The details of the total cost of the Public Buildings Department works programme during 1966-67 are as follows:

| | State funds. | Commonwealth funds. | Total. |
|--|--------------|---------------------|------------|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Capital works: | | | |
| School buildings | 10,757,161 | 906,480 | 11,663,641 |
| Hospital buildings | 6,571,643 | — | 6,571,643 |
| Police and courthouse buildings | 923,133 | — | 923,133 |
| Other Government buildings | 5,751,347 | 236,125 | 5,987,472 |
| Total capital works programme | 24,003,284 | 1,142,605 | 25,145,889 |
| Maintenance and service operations (revenue expenditure) | 6,549,861 | — | 6,549,861 |
| Total Public Buildings Department programme | 30,553,145 | 1,142,605 | 31,695,750 |

The total expenditure of \$25,145,889 for capital works from Loan funds was subject to reimbursement from the Commonwealth for science and technical training buildings, making the net cost to the State for capital works \$24,003,284 and the total net cost to the State for all works \$30,553,145. There are other reimbursements received by the State from the Commonwealth for capital works, for example, for mental health projects, which are not reflected in the figure of Commonwealth funds shown in the above statement. The figures quoted in the radio talk were correct, in that the amount of \$31,500,000 was the amount of the works programme undertaken by the Public

Buildings Department in 1966-67. The figures were quoted to show the application of funds by the department, not the source of funds.

LAND TAX.

Mr. HALL: Much land situated in the Virginia and nearby water basins is assessed for land tax at a sum related to the sale price of adjacent land used for market gardening and other irrigated agricultural production. Since the introduction of control of the use of water from the underground basins, it is virtually impossible to obtain water to use on additional land. Therefore, the valuations based on irrigated production are today not valid. As the

high land tax paid by landholders in these districts continues to be an exorbitant and almost prohibitive penalty on available forms of production, will the Treasurer have the land tax assessments adjusted to a realistic value?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall obtain a report from the Commissioner of Land Tax about this matter.

INTAKES AND STORAGES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: A month ago, in reply to my question, the Minister of Works said that only about 300,000,000 gallons was stored in the Warren reservoir. As this is a dangerously low level considering the large area served by this reservoir, can the Minister say whether the recent rain has resulted in an intake into the reservoir and whether water is being pumped from the Mannum-Adelaide main into the reservoir as fast as possible?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I have information on reservoirs I have nothing on the Warren, but I shall obtain details for the honourable member. The position of our reservoirs is causing general concern. Metropolitan reservoirs have a total capacity of about 36,000,000,000 gallons. At this time last year the metropolitan storage was 11,125,700,000 gallons whereas the present storage is 10,202,200,000 gallons. By considering the current rainfall figures we can appreciate the difficulties. From May 1 to July 17 last year 676 points of rain was recorded, but this year the total was only 211 points.

WATER PIPES.

Mrs. BYRNE: Residents of the Ebenezer area have brought to my attention the fact that large disused water mains are lying on the side of a road, in a creek and on private property in their area. Indeed, I know that to be the case, because after receiving a complaint I inspected the area. Apparently the pipes were replaced by a new water main from the Warren reservoir that was installed over 12 months ago. As the pipes are unsightly, will the Minister of Works investigate the matter with a view to removing them?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Like the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner), the honourable member has had much trouble concerning pipes such as these, and I agree that they are unsightly. The department has had much difficulty with the contractor concerned but steps are now being taken to remedy the position. As the honourable member has raised the question specifically, I will see what can be done.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the possibility of a large block of saline water entering South Australia via the Murray River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

At the present time a block of saline water is being traced down the river. It reached Euston on June 29 when the salinity rose from 150 to 330 parts a million total dissolved solids. The same water reached Merbein on July 12, and on July 13 the salinity figure was 382 parts a million total dissolved solids.

This water will probably reach Lock 9 about the end of this week. A careful watch is being maintained and it should be possible, by careful manipulation, to ensure that the water will be diluted to a reasonable figure for passage through South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am perturbed to hear that this water is flowing down the river, and I am surprised that the Minister condones it, in view of the many complaints that are made now about the quality of the water (particularly when it reaches the metropolitan area through the pipeline) and in view of the Minister's wellknown antagonism to such additives to water as fluoride. What steps will the Minister take to make sure that the water, when it reaches the metropolitan area, is not further contaminated?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I resent the suggestions made by the honourable member, who does a great disservice to South Australia and to the Engineering and Water Supply Department by suggesting that the water is contaminated. We go to no end of trouble to see that it is not. I assure him (and I am sure my predecessor, the member for Flinders, will agree) that there is no question about the purity of the water delivered for South Australian consumption.

Mr. Millhouse: This block of water is contaminated. It must be.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If the honourable member does not want a reply I will not give it.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the salinity of the Murray River and the powers of the River Murray Commission in controlling the tributaries that flow into the river?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that the River Murray Commission is at present seeking a consultant to examine the question of salinity in

the Murray River basin. This examination will cover a very wide field of operation and four headings that have been submitted to consultants offering their services are: (a) river regulation; (b) operation of reservoirs; (c) drainage practices; and (d) the nature, scope, effect and estimated cost of recommended works. The whole inquiry is based on examination of the problem and its causes. This will be necessary to the commission to enable it to make propositions on the scope of any additional powers that may be required to properly regulate the quality of the water in the river.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The quality of much of the water coming down the river must be produced either by accident or by bad management in another State. Can the Minister say whether the origin of this water could be traced in order to see that a repetition of it will not occur?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Having received the reply I have given this afternoon, I took up this matter with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Unfortunately, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief was away on other duties but, as I am as interested as the honourable member in this matter, I shall certainly take it up. I, too, feel that all possible steps should be taken to avoid such an occurrence in the future.

HOSPITAL ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. McANANEY: Some months ago I read an article concerning mutual hospital associations and various medical associations that created some doubt as to whether those associations had sufficient reserves to meet their commitments. As it was recently reported that doctors claimed these associations had excessive reserves and assets, will the Minister of Social Welfare ascertain the present state of affairs?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will have an inquiry made. However, when the Government increased hospital charges the Opposition made a lot of fuss because the associations referred to said they could not meet the costs of hospitalization.

PROSPECT INTERSECTION.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads obtain a report from his colleague on the Highways Department's plans to continue the widening of Regency Road, Prospect? In particular, will he ascertain when the department is likely to implement its plans in order to overcome the

present narrow bottleneck at the intersection of the Main North Road and Regency Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

YORKEY CROSSING.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My question refers to the proposal to build a new bridge at Port Augusta. The first page of the Public Works Committee's report, dated June 2, gives the following brief summary of the history of the existing bridge:

The existing timber bridge was built in 1927 and subsequently widened in 1941 to accommodate the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. The timbers have deteriorated and the bridge is now structurally inadequate to cater for the loads permitted under the Road Traffic Act. Recently load limits were applied to the bridge and heavy transports are now forced to use Yorkey crossing. This is a 15 mile deviation over inadequate "bush tracks" which will rapidly deteriorate with the advent of heavy traffic.

I previously asked the Minister a question regarding the surface of the road to and from Yorkey crossing in the deviation area, and I was assured that steps were being taken by the Highways Department to make it an all-weather road. I was told that ramps were being installed to facilitate the passage of traffic. At the same time, a report from Port Augusta stated that the road was unusable because at that time, after rain had fallen, some semi-trailers were bogged on the road and other traffic could not get by. I also understand that the department is considering putting a crossing at a point nearer Port Augusta than Yorkey crossing. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether this could be done? Further, is the department examining the position with a view to making a permanent road around the new crossing, because it will obviously be some years before the new bridge to carry the heavier loads is ready for use?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain that information for the honourable member and bring down a report as soon as possible.

ABORIGINAL WOMEN'S HOME.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs ascertain the number of Aboriginal women and girls in residence at the Aboriginal women's home in Sussex Street, North Adelaide?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

GRAIN RESERVES.

Mr. RODDA: Considerable concern is being expressed in certain areas by farmers who have not been favoured with an early start to the

season, and the matter of grain reserves has been raised. As the Minister of Agriculture has recently returned from a meeting of the Agricultural Council, can he say whether this matter was discussed at that meeting, and has he been assured that adequate grain reserves will be available to meet next year's likely fodder requirements?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter was discussed generally at the council meeting, when I outlined South Australia's position and expressed concern on many aspects, including the one mentioned by the honourable member. As the honourable member no doubt realizes, barley is controlled by the Australian Barley Board, with which we have direct contact. I assure him that the board is being made fully aware of my feelings on this matter. It is conscious of the problems facing us, as indeed, is the Wheat Board although, unfortunately, we have no direct representation on the latter board. However, the Wheat Board has done what it has thought to be correct, and has held back large stocks for this purpose. I believe that it is watching the position with the same concern as we are experiencing.

MAGAZINE EDITORIAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Education about the magazine of the Murray Bridge High School, of the council of which school I understand his colleague the Minister of Agriculture is Chairman. I asked whether that magazine, which contained an attack on the Leader of the Opposition, was paid for wholly by the students or whether it was paid for partly by the Government or by some other body. I understand the Minister now has a reply.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: First, I should like to correct the honourable member: it is not a school magazine. Also, I fail to see what it has to do with the matter of the member for the district happening to be on the high school council. It has no relationship whatever. In answer to the other part of the honourable member's question, the paper published by the students of the Murray Bridge High School every two or three weeks is entirely a student paper and is not a school magazine. It is regarded as part of the work done in connection with English and Social Studies and is sold at 5c a copy. The money derived from sales covers the complete cost. It is very difficult to obtain a copy of the last issue, which sold out like the proverbial hot cakes. The headmaster has laid down a particular policy for the editors, but does not exercise

editorship; he makes no attempt to stifle discussion but insists that the general approach should be impartial.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Wait until I have finished: do not be too precipitate. There is no reason to suppose that a different view of the Leader of the Opposition may not be expressed in the next issue. I entirely agree with high school students discussing matters of Government and politics if they so desire. In fact, I have said previously that, if the school desires to have as an extracurricular activity an organization where controversial issues can be discussed, it is at liberty to have it. I believe that is part of Social Studies and a very valuable exercise.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In explaining his question, the member for Mitcham said I was Chairman of the Murray Bridge High School Council, and that is true. I have had the honour of being Chairman of the council for 12 years (in fact, ever since I have been member for the district) and this has been a worthwhile exercise. Because of the inference to be drawn from his question, does the honourable member consider that I had any part in the preparation of the editorial?

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Mitcham desire to reply?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. First, I should like to correct the Minister of Agriculture: there was no inference at all in my question. I merely said, in further explanation—

Mr. McKee: In passing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, as the honourable member on this occasion so rightly says, I merely said in passing that, in fact, the Minister was (or is) the Chairman of the council of the high school at which appeared this article containing a virulent attack on the Leader. I do not know whether or not the Minister had any direct influence in the preparation of that article.

Mr. Casey: Do you think he would have?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know; I am just prepared—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are just prepared to sling a bit of dirt.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That surely is an unworthy comment for the honourable gentleman to make about me. I cannot believe that he really thinks that.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: The dirt was slung in the publication.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. All I will say is that it is a jolly funny thing that this editorial appeared in a school paper and that the Minister is, in fact, the Chairman of the high school council.

The SPEAKER: Order! Now I want to say something. Again I draw to the attention of honourable members Standing Order No. 125, regarding the putting of questions to a Minister, which states:

In putting any such questions, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

Yesterday, I was on the point of drawing the attention of honourable members to that Standing Order. My attention has been drawn to the fact that the explanation of one question yesterday took four and a half minutes. As a result of practices such as that, twice during this session it has been necessary to extend the period of Question Time so that some members should not be denied the right to ask questions. Once more I ask honourable members to co-operate with me in making their questions as short as possible without unduly interfering with the right they have to explain their question properly. Also, I ask them to avoid matter that is not necessary in order to make the question understood.

A member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I point out that it is also out of order for honourable members to reflect on other honourable members and I am not prepared to allow that.

WHEAT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Previously, when a dry season occurred near Adelaide, although it had large stocks of wheat in South Australia, the Wheat Board charged a heavy premium to cart wheat to the Adelaide district. Will the Premier take up the matter with the Minister of Agriculture or the Wheat Board (whichever is the appropriate authority) to see that, while sufficient wheat is left in South Australia, that wheat is placed close to where it will be required so that a premium will not have to be paid to cart it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIN: I thank the Minister of Works for the reply he gave me yesterday about the Watervale water supply. However, I should like one aspect of that reply amplified. Yesterday, he said:

The Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that the present position is that a major scheme has been prepared to supply water to the areas in Watervale, Leasingham, Sevenhill and Penwortham, with several alternatives which will eventually be dependent upon the economics of the schemes.

Will the Minister say what alternatives the Director and Engineer-in-Chief is considering?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Not only will I inquire of the Director, but I shall also be happy to inform the honourable member of the reply. I regret that inquiries on this scheme have taken such a considerable time but, as the honourable member will appreciate, there are alternatives and the original proposals have been extended considerably; of course, this has caused delay.

Mr. QUIRKE: Can the Minister say whether the scheme for Penwortham, Sevenhill, Watervale and Leasingham is a new scheme or whether it was the original scheme that was drawn up about 15 years ago, soon after a water supply was provided at Clare? The original scheme was fully surveyed, figures were made out, and quotations were given to people along the route, but then that scheme was not proceeded with. If it is the original scheme, it will be an effective one.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: To the best of my knowledge, it is the original scheme, with some additions.

POWER GENERATION.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works ascertain what progress has been made by the Electricity Trust on a project that the trust was examining some time ago whereby power would be generated on the south coast of South Australia by pumping water at off-peak periods and letting it run back to the sea, which project was discussed by the trust's investigator?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

FRUIT CARGOES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Agriculture information about submissions to the Commonwealth Government regarding a large consignment of apples that was delayed in the Suez Canal?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As I told the honourable member previously, I had sent a telegram to the Minister for Trade and Industry, Mr. John McEwen. I received the following reply this morning:

Regarding your representations on behalf of South Australia fruit growers stop Apple and Pear Board are investigating insurance position on behalf of the industry but position will not become fully clear until final amount of loss is known stop situation is that ships are now blocked in the Bitter Lakes by vessels sunk both north and south of the lakes and cannot return to Suez or proceed to Port Said stop the clearance of the canals is closely linked with general question of Arab-Israeli relations which is at present under discussion in special session of United Nations General Assembly stop Australia is of course participating at this special session.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises from an answer that the Premier gave to the member for Gumeracha yesterday about Government advertising. The Premier explained that the practice which had been adopted during the term of office of the Playford Government of directing all Government advertising through the Director, of the Tourist Bureau had been discontinued so far as departments under the Premier's control were concerned. Presumably, the practice that previously applied still pertains to departments controlled by other Ministers. Can the Premier say whether the arrangement has been discontinued so far as he is concerned because of his own staff of public relations officers, or whether he does not desire that advertising from his department should be directed through a department controlled by the Minister of Lands?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I explained the reasons adequately yesterday.

LOTTERIES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The State Lotteries Commission has now been in operation for some time.

Mr. Ryan: It is very successful, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going to say it had been operating with some degree of success. As the Premier knows, were it not for the special Act under which the commission operates, the lotteries would, of course, be illegal under the provisions of the Lottery and Gaming Act. Now that we have established a State Lotteries Commission in this State, does the Government intend, because of the contrasting provisions in the Lottery and Gaming Act, to overhaul that Act in the same way as the Licensing Act is at present being overhauled?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not under consideration at present. The amount of reforming legislation we have asked the Parliamentary Draftsman to prepare is enormous.

We have already announced an extremely heavy programme and I think we have gone as far as we can go at present.

COMPETITION.

Mr. McANANEY: I desire to ask a question of the member for Frome (Mr. Casey). Last evening he said in this House that he believed in free competition.

Mr. Lawn: Question! What is the question?

Mr. McANANEY: Does the honourable member believe in free competition by private enterprise operating against the Metropolitan Export Abattoirs Board?

The SPEAKER: It is not provided in the Standing Orders that a member can ask for the opinion of another member.

SWINGING BASIN.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Swinging Basin, No. 3 Dock, Port Adelaide.

Ordered that report be printed.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, 1963. Read a first time.

SAN JOSE SCALE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I move:

That an address be presented to the Governor praying His Excellency to revoke the proclamation made on April 20, 1967, under the Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act, 1885-1959, in respect of the prevention of spread of infestation by San José scale, and laid on the table of this House on June 20, 1967.

I now understand that this regulation is to be disallowed. However, I bring to the notice of the Premier, as Attorney-General, a matter that should be examined. The Acts Interpretation Act provides for the disallowance of regulations, but that provision applies after the passing of that Act: it does not apply to legislation introduced before it was passed in 1915. The Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act was passed in 1885, and there seems to be no method by which a regulation of this kind can be disallowed, except by an address presented to His Excellency.

I suggest that Crown Law authorities should examine whether all legislation should be brought under the Acts Interpretation Act for the disallowance of regulations. I understand that legislation passed before 1915 contained a provision for disallowance, but apparently that aspect was overlooked in this legislation. The committee, when recommending the disallowance of the regulation, stated that it took away the rights that previously existed, but I am not sure whether it does that or not. I object to the regulation because its definition of "fruit" is too wide. This imposes a heavy loss on the industry and, in a particular area, imposes many unnecessary obligations. I do not object to the regulation, except for the definition of "fruit", and this should be examined with relation to the definitions in the principal Act. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

That in the opinion of this House, for the purpose of restoring the momentum of this State's development, the Government should immediately:

- (a) create a Ministry of Development;
- (b) appoint a Director of Development; and
- (c) form an Advisory Council of Development.

(Continued from July 12. Page 532.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I am glad to have the opportunity to reply to the Leader's motion to create a Ministry of Development, to appoint a Director of Development, and to form an Advisory Council of Development. It is gratifying to see the support that is given by the Opposition for a substantial portion of our policy. As has previously been stated in the House, until the Government came into office we had no Department of Development. It was not that this could not previously have been created; it could easily have been created during the period of the Playford Government's office. All that was necessary for that Government to do was to have taken administrative action and create such a department, but that was not done. It was done by the Labor Government, and we created a department specifically concerned with development.

As is the case under the Liberal Government of Victoria, that department is the Premier's Department, and we set out to provide an Industrial Development Department; we engaged staff; we took the senior officer

of that department from the Commonwealth Department of Trade, and he is an experienced and effective officer. We showed from the outset of our Government that we were certainly as interested as anyone in the future development of South Australia and that we were taking positive steps for intensifying the growth of the South Australian economy. In spite of what the Leader of the Opposition and the former Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) had to say on the subject, success has been achieved in this field, despite a downturn in consumer spending throughout the Commonwealth (brought about by conditions outside our control). The downturn was considerably assisted by one of the worst droughts in Australia's history and the redistribution of Commonwealth expenditure towards defence equipment, most of which has been purchased overseas.

Without the work undertaken by our department, South Australia's economy would be in a far worse position than it is at present, and firms such as Comalco, Chrysler, Hill's Industries Limited, and many others, would not be expanding here, as they are at present. Negotiations have been going on for some time concerning other major developments in South Australia. These negotiations have been conducted by the Premier and officers of the department and, undoubtedly, the results of this initial work will show fruit within the next few months. However, we realized, after the creation of the department, that we would need to increase the activities of industrial promotion in order to match the vigorous establishments that had been set up in other States, and we have been conscious of this for some time.

Immediately on my taking over the duties as Premier (on the first day, indeed) the position was re-assessed, and it was considered that the time had come when the work in the industrial promotion field could be further stepped up by the appointment of a Director of Industrial Development. On the day I took office I undertook discussions for a suitable appointee to the post. We had to be sure that we had the right man for the job and that the status of our establishment would not suffer in comparison with other States. This did not call for any hasty, ill-considered appointment. We needed to find a person who could have oversight of the industrial development of the State and the formation of a section or department that would be capable of providing industrialists with the type of information they required. The department would highlight the

advantages of the State and be able to sell these advantages not only to Australia but overseas. Management throughout the world no longer locates in a particular country or area without going into the full ramifications of the situation, so that any selling of the State must be backed up by sound economic facts and figures.

Those discussions were undertaken. It was widely known in many business spheres in South Australia that I was having these discussions and considering suitable appointees. The appointment was duly made and, in fact, it has been acclaimed by the leaders of industry and commerce in South Australia as an entirely suitable one to the post. It has been stated that we were indeed fortunate to obtain a man of Mr. Currie's background, experience and qualifications to take this important post for South Australia. While I was having discussions, the Leader of the Opposition made a public statement about the necessity for our proceeding with this post. I was glad to have his support for what we were in the process of doing; I am glad that we have been able to do it and that our actions have received widespread support in this State. However, it must be quite evident to the Leader of the Opposition that this section of the motion is completely redundant: what he is asking us immediately to do has already been done.

The Leader of the Opposition has also in his motion suggested that an Advisory Council of Development be formed. Once again, it appears that someone has let the cat out of the bag, because we have been thinking along these lines and I have already had discussions with the newly-appointed Director of Industrial Development about this matter. I have already had discussions, too, with some industrial leaders in South Australia and some suitable appointees to such a council about the precise nature of the council, the kind of duties it would undertake, and the kind of suitable appointee to the post. Discussions are continuing as to the formation of the council.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Would the people appointed act in a voluntary capacity?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Millhouse: Was anything done about this before you came into office?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There had been some discussions concerning the council and advice in relation to this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: So it isn't your idea?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not purely my idea; I do not suggest that I have

not leant heavily on the experience of my predecessor in this area.

Mr. Millhouse: I am glad to hear you say that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One of the first tasks of the Director of Industrial Development, after our discussions, has been to make a detailed submission on this matter to the Government. There are many ways in which an advisory council can be formed, but we will ensure that the one we have in South Australia will be more than comparable with those existing in other States. Again, the matter about which the Leader is speaking in his motion is already in train; it was in train before he gave notice of his motion to the House.

I should also like to refer to the figures produced by the Leader regarding the state of South Australia's economy, as compared with that of the economies of other States. For some reason (I suppose it is a matter of political expediency to members opposite) there has been a great tendency on their part to proclaim doom, despair and disaster for the South Australian economy. They get up and talk about the necessity to restore confidence in South Australia; they do their best to knock it. They have made some reflections on unemployment in this State. I realize that action must be taken to remedy this situation. This Government has acted on unemployment. However, action in this field is not solely the responsibility of the South Australian Government, but the reasons for the present unemployment figures in South Australia are largely reasons that can be accounted for by a Commonwealth policy.

Instead of taking the attitude which it has proclaimed at Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings that, in its view, despite the unemployment figures throughout Australia, the Australian economy is finely balanced and therefore it cannot offer a further stimulus to the economy without undue inflationary action, the Commonwealth Government should act to minimize unemployment throughout Australia. One course of action that would be of considerable moment to South Australia I pressed on the Commonwealth at the recent Premiers' Conference, and I hope there will be agreement on it.

I did my best to urge the Commonwealth Government to reduce by 2½ per cent the sales tax on motor cars. If the Commonwealth Government gave a stimulus to motor car purchasing in Australia by a marginal reduction in sales tax, it would more than recoup the apparent loss in revenue by increased sales of motor cars. That would give the necessary

stimulus in one important area of the South Australian economy. There are only three areas in which the South Australian economy has been in any way lagging. The two manufacturing areas are in respect of motor car manufacture and home appliance manufacture. Elsewhere in South Australia there has been an expansion in employment and considerable development. In the farming machinery industry, which normally recovers much more quickly after a drought than do the other manufacturing industries in Australia, employment is at its highest level in South Australia at present.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you seen the figures for the intake of migrants to this State for the last 12 months?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have a look at those statistics, but I suggest that the honourable member listen to what I say rather than try to get me off the track. In the other areas of manufacturing South Australia is expanding; indeed, there is under-employment in certain areas. Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to get labour within South Australia mobile, and action is being taken by the Government in this regard. The fact remains that in certain areas of South Australia industries are unable to obtain workmen.

Mr. Heaslip: Not too many places!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member likes to go and talk with the directors of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla, he will find they could cope with a considerable increase in employment and are looking for it.

Mr. Heaslip: That may be one. Where are the others?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants the details, I will give them to him. I have them in my office and I will bring them down. I could let him know of others as well. For instance, Mannum is another such area. Let us look at the unemployment figures at the end of June as compared with the May figures quoted by the Leader. At the end of May unemployment in New South Wales was 1.3 per cent, compared with 1.4 per cent at the end of June. In Western Australia it had risen from 1.1 per cent to 1.2 per cent; in Tasmania it had risen from 1.4 per cent to 1.5 per cent; but the percentage had remained stationary in South Australia and Victoria and had dropped by .1 per cent, from 2.1 per cent to 2 per cent, in Queensland. Overall, in Australia the percentage of persons registered for unemployment had increased to 1.5 per cent of the work

force at the end of June as compared with 1.4 per cent at the end of May.

Mr. Heaslip: South Australia has the second highest percentage of unemployment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but if the honourable member would listen, so far from unemployment increasing significantly in South Australia, although it has increased significantly elsewhere, that has not been the case in South Australia. In fact, we have been able to arrest the unemployment trend here. We are showing an upward trend, particularly in the pressed metal areas of our industry. There is a distinct improvement in the outlook for the pressed metal industry itself.

There are some paradoxical features in the latest report of the Department of Labour and National Service. In the section dealing with factory overtime and short time we find that South Australia has the second highest percentage of employees working overtime of all States, and the second highest in the average hours of overtime worked. I am most gratified to see the Opposition concerned about the welfare of the people and the unemployment that has occurred in some areas. Elizabeth has been cited many times by members opposite as an area causing them deep concern. However, I did not hear any comments from them concerning the agreements reached following the recent Kennedy Round negotiations in which the Commonwealth Government undertook to remove entirely the present protective tariff on sewing machines imported into Australia. There is only one sewing machine manufacturer in Australia, located at Elizabeth. As we all know, this firm is already having difficulties in the financial sphere.

Mr. Heaslip: Is that a manufacturing or just an assembling plant here?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So much work is done by the Pinnock factory, that this is virtually manufacture. It has certainly done enough work on the making of sewing machines to enjoy, prior to these agreements being made, a protective tariff. The Leader, in his motion, has moved that a Ministry of Development be created, and yet in his speech he eulogizes the work being done in Victoria to attract industry. In that State these activities come under the Premier's Department, as is done in South Australia. At present I see no reason why this should be changed, as I intend to work closely with Mr. Currie when he takes up his duties full-time. There is one other point. In his speech, the honourable member referred to the four weeks' leave that we intend giving

to Government employees. He said this would have a disastrous effect on the State's economy. In the same speech he pointed out the success of the New South Wales Liberal Government in industrial promotion, but he did not point out that that State gave its Government employees four weeks' leave some years back. Has this slowed down the growth of New South Wales? I don't think it has, and according to the honourable member it has not. According to him, the disastrous effect he says this leave will have on the South Australian economy is not to be seen in New South Wales. In his motion, the honourable member refers to the creation of a department, but we already have a department working in the fashion of a department in a State the industrial development of which he eulogizes. He asks for the appointment of a Director of Industrial Development, but one has already been appointed. He asks for the appointment of an Industrial Development Advisory Council of some kind. We have already undertaken the discussions for this and I have announced that it will be done as soon as possible after firm recommendations are made by the Director. In that case, what is the purpose of the Leader's motion? With great respect to him, I think that no further point exists in discussing a motion in this form. The things he is seeking have already been done or are clearly under way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The most important phrase in the motion now obviously is (and the Premier has been at pains in the last few minutes to drive this point home almost *ad nauseam*) "for the purpose of restoring the momentum of this State's development". The Premier has made a good deal of play of the fact that he has announced the appointment of a Director of Industrial Development and that he intends to form an advisory council of development. One point of which he conveniently did not remind honourable members is that when notice of this motion was given that announcement had not been made and nothing had been said publicly about it at all. It was a funny thing that the announcement was made on the Monday before this motion was due to be debated; one cannot but suspect that the announcement was made in some haste to forestall debate on this motion.

Mr. Clark: The converse might be the case.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but it is strange that the Leader gave notice of this motion in one week and on the following Monday, suddenly and quite precipitately and without any preliminary announcement at all, the

announcement of Mr. Currie's appointment was made, with this motion due to be debated on the Wednesday. Therefore, it is quite hollow for the honourable gentleman to pour contempt on the motion. Its terms were prepared and it was tabled before he did the things that we ask should be done. I am surprised that the Premier has taken such a cheap line as he has in speaking to the motion.

Having said that, I say again that now the most important phrase in the motion is "for the purpose of restoring the momentum of this State's development". That should be the aim of all of us. I venture to say that it is common ground between both Parties in this House: that is what we are all trying to do. We can argue about the causes for the slackness at present in South Australia, and we can blame the present Government (as I do in large part) for what has happened. However, whatever the causes may be, what we all want to do is to get the State moving again and, of course, that is the great reason why this motion was tabled by the Leader. I say quite unreservedly that I am glad the Government has acted as it has and has appointed a Director of Industrial Development. This was something which, in my view, should have been done by the Walsh Government.

Mr. Langley: What about the former Government?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The answer to that argument (and it is the point that the Premier tried to make) is that Sir Thomas Playford, when he was Premier, was such an outstanding figure, not only in South Australia but throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the world, that he carried the whole load on his own, and this State got the goods then without any other machinery or administration being at all necessary.

Mr. Shannon: Don't forget his two typists.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, he had two typists to help him. The fact is that we had a man who could do the job on his own; he did the job, South Australia developed, and industries came here and established here from overseas and from other States. Then there was a change of Government and what happened? Just like flicking the switch, the whole thing stopped and we did not have any more development in this State of any significant proportions at all. It was only then, when we lost the man who could do the job on his own, that it was necessary to establish an industrial development department, or whatever has been

done. This was the time when it became necessary, and I cannot for the life of me understand why it took two years for the Labor Party, once it was in office, to go ahead and to appoint a Director of Industrial Development. I understand that the proposition had been put to the previous Premier but that he refused or declined to act on it, and that it was only (as the present Premier says) on the first day that he came into office that anything started to be done about this. Yet, in my view, it was a perfectly obvious step in the circumstances into which South Australia had fallen for this to be done, and it should have been done earlier. It was so obvious a step that surely nobody can blame the Opposition or say that the Opposition was trying to steal the Government's clothes when the Leader tabled this motion.

The appointment of a Director of Industrial Development is not of itself enough to get things going. I do not know Mr. Currie (I am looking forward to meeting him), but he has a tough job indeed ahead of him. He is going to have to tell the present Government, and especially the present Premier, a few home truths about the economy of the State. He will have to say some unpopular things indeed to the Government about the increased costs in industry and he will have to say that that has been going on since the Government came into office. I do not envy him the task. If he is to do his job effectively, he will have to advise things which are entirely contrary to the policies of the Government and which are counter to the things that should have been done by the Government and by its predecessor over the last two years. Let there be no mistake about that: we cannot have development unless we act on sound business principles, and the Government (and the Walsh Government before it) has not been acting on sound business principles.

Even in the short term, since he came into office six or seven weeks ago, the Premier has made a number of rather unfortunate and disjointed announcements about industry. He repeated some this afternoon. First, we were told that the panacea of all the ills of the State was the need for action by the Commonwealth Government to reduce the sales tax on motor vehicles. The Premier said this would stimulate the markets for the products of the State. He said this was needed because there was a depression in the pressed metal section of the economy. It is jolly funny that our markets for these products are depressed when there is no depression in the States where those markets are at present. Perhaps that is just a

debating point. However, it was an incredibly foolish statement to make and quite irresponsible. The member for Frome laughs, but let him think of it in this way: what is the reaction of the public when it is told that a reduction is likely in an item of taxation? What is the natural reaction of people when they are told that the price of something is to be reduced? They hold off buying to see whether or not it happens. Immediately the Premier came out with this proposal that the Commonwealth Government should reduce sales tax on motor cars, what was the natural reaction of people? They waited to see whether the Commonwealth Government would reduce sales tax.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I have held off buying a car.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This has the opposite effect to the effect desired by the honourable gentleman for this State. In fact, if anything, such a proposal as this would further depress the markets for motor vehicles in Australia, because it was not something that could be done overnight. It was not as though the Commonwealth Government would think, "That chap Don Dunstan has a good idea. We will act on it immediately. It's just the thing for South Australia," and off would come the sales tax. Even if the Commonwealth agreed with the suggestion, it would have had to wait for the Budget session that was then some months ahead. So, it was a foolish suggestion and, as I have said, it was also a shallow and irresponsible suggestion. Any fool can advocate the reduction of an item of taxation and be applauded for that. Everybody likes to hear that taxation should go down and everyone's reaction is to agree. However, what thought did our honourable Premier give to the effects that this might have on the finances of the Commonwealth Government and to whether it was practicable? He did not think about these things at all. All he was interested in doing (and all he is interested in doing) was shifting our responsibility on to the shoulders of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Shannon: Tickling people's ears, and he is good at it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He was tickling people's ears, as the member for Onkaparinga has said. Shift the blame, and he is happy. This was an irresponsible and foolish suggestion to make. Until he repeated it today, we had not heard of it for six weeks. That was the first thing. What was the next thing the honourable gentleman said was going to be done to put this

State back on the road to prosperity? He said that this State was going to become the centre for industrial design in Australia. This sounds fine and it is an excellent idea if it can be translated into reality.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is not a new one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sure that the Minister of Social Welfare and the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford), both of whom have borne the heat and burden, would not be unaware of such an idea. When the Premier was tackled by my friend the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), what did we find that he had in mind? All he had in mind was to give a few thousand dollars to the Council for Industrial Design and to try to persuade it to set up in this State. How on earth is this going to put South Australia ahead of the other States? Of course, this was another announcement that was found, on analysis and examination and when he was questioned about it in this House, to be entirely hollow.

Those are two disjointed announcements that the honourable gentleman has made, words and no action, and damaging words, as I have said. What is his action on another matter? He said both inside and outside this House that it was vital that we in South Australia keep down our costs. That is common ground. We on this side of the House have said it *ad nauseam*. However, what is his attitude when there is likely to be strike action in South Australia? I have asked him questions on this matter and have not had a satisfactory reply. I notice that the honourable gentleman likes to brush me off when I ask questions on these matters.

Mr. Casey: How could he answer a question that was based on supposition?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Frome is a loyal supporter of the Premier.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Not really.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is giving that impression now. He is trying to come to the Premier's aid. He said that it was a suppositious question. This is what the Premier said on July 15, when I asked about this matter:

It is the custom of the South Australian Trades and Labor Council to inform the Government of any likely or intended stoppages in this State . . .

So, he knows when they are going to be and he also knows, as we all do, that strikes are simply an added burden on industry. They disrupt industry, and so on, as we all know. Yet, what is he going to do when he knows

that these strikes are looming? He said in his reply that he would take action to conciliate, but when I have challenged him since, he has not said what he is going to do. He has not given me any proper answer. On July 13 I asked him another question about this matter and referred to the four-hour strike that the Australian Council of Trade Unions is organizing throughout Australia and asked him what he was going to do about it, because the date would be known to him, in accordance with his previous answer. If this is not a masterpiece of prevarication, I do not know what is. He said in his reply:

I have no doubt that, if the Trades and Labor Council has been informed of a decision and takes a decision itself in relation to South Australia, that decision will be communicated to me in due course and I shall have discussions with the council about it.

When I pressed him further and asked him what he was going to do, what his discussions would be and whether he did not think he should take some initiative to prevent this happening in South Australia (as, indeed, he ought to, as the head of the Government), he said:

I have already told the honourable member what action I intend to take, and I do not intend to go beyond that.

The sad truth is that the Premier is (I was going to say he is bound hand and foot, but that might give offence to members opposite) under very heavy influence from the Trades Hall and he cannot afford to offend the Trades and Labor Council of this State, which is the basis of his support.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That does not prevent him from negotiating.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why then does he not say what he is going to do? This strike action will do precisely the opposite of what the honourable gentleman and all other members know should be done. Costs in this State ought to be kept down. The Premier made a few other points this afternoon that I should like briefly to mention. I have mentioned one, his gibe at this side of the House that nothing had been done about a Department of Development when this Party was in office. It was not necessary to do anything. I have referred to sales tax. The Premier also said something about Whyalla, Elizabeth and the Pinnock sewing machine company. I throw this question into the ring for any member opposite who cares to answer: which Government put in all the developmental work in Whyalla and which

Government founded Elizabeth and persuaded the Pinnock company to come to this State? Were these things done by Labor?

Mr. Langley: In two years or in 30 years?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I repeat, for the benefit of the member for Unley—and I think it is a simple enough question for him—

Mr. Langley: How many years was it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Were these things done under a Labor Government or under a Liberal Government? I do not know how long they took and I am not concerned to say that. The fact is that the major development of this State took place when my honourable friend the member for Gumeracha was in charge of the State's affairs.

Mr. Casey: Is he prompting you in any way?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, he is not. I have been in this House for a long time, longer than the member for Frome and most other members.

Mr. Casey: You have been here too long.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hear that from members opposite. During my first session, the then Opposition, which is now the Government that is saying how good things in Whyalla are, moved that the assets of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla should be nationalized. The present Premier supported the motion not only by his vote but in the debate, and every other member of the then Opposition supported it. If anything could have been calculated to reduce the confidence of private enterprise in South Australia, it was a motion of that kind.

Mr. Quirke: They still remember it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Government tries not to remember it. They now have another face on the matter. The Premier also dealt with the matter of four weeks' annual leave for New South Wales public servants. I would have thought that, even after only seven weeks in Government, the Premier would have learnt the lesson that we in South Australia, who are away from the main markets in this country and have the handicap of high transport costs, often cannot afford what can be afforded in other States. It is irrelevant for him to contrast what may be done in New South Wales with what can be done here, because the markets are in or near New South Wales. In this State it will cost, on his own estimate, \$1,750,000 annually to finance this proposal. This is not our estimate: it is his estimate given after mature consideration and at the second try. Another \$1,750,000 has to be carried by the finances of this State for little

return in work. In South Australia we are in a quandary and it does not matter whose fault it is. At present, business conditions throughout the State are slack and, as a State, we have fewer natural resources than other States have. We do not really know what to do about the quandary in which we find ourselves.

Mr. Shannon: The people know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They may know politically what to do at the next election, but that does not solve the problem.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The people of Unley know what to do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No doubt, and I am encouraging them to vote the right way. The main aim of any State Administration is to develop the State's resources, but we do not seem to know what to do now. What can we do to improve the position in this State? We have problems of fuel and water resources. We have to take stock of the resources we have in this State, and make sure that every advantage is taken of them. Yesterday, I spoke about the Supplement to the *Treasury Information Bulletin* on investment analysis, and suggested that it was about time that we adopted the principles contained in that document. I do not pretend to understand all of them, because they are matters of fairly complex economics. However, I understand enough and have been told enough to know its value to the State, and to know that the Commonwealth Government has made it clear to the States that, unless the principles of investment analysis set out in the document are followed, it will be difficult for the States successfully to ask the Commonwealth Government for funds for developmental projects. I illustrate by quoting the introduction, which states:

Over the past 30 years or so techniques have been devised for assisting in the evaluation of public investment decisions. The broad technique is known as benefit-cost analysis; it incorporates the basic principle of the discounted-cash-flow technique now coming into increasing use in the private sector, but of necessity goes beyond it in defining the flows of benefits and costs resulting from an investment decision.

That is sufficient to show to lay people what it is all about. In the conclusion the document states:

It is within this changing environment, then, that benefit-cost analysis becomes of major interest as a tool for assisting in assessment. Increasingly, Government departments or other bodies putting forward proposals for this or that expenditure of public funds must expect to have to justify them, first on their own merits, and secondly against the relative merits of competing proposals coming forward from

other quarters. It is all the more important, therefore, that so far as possible some relatively agreed body of doctrine as to methods, etc., should exist and be in general use. That, in one sense, is what this paper has been about. I do not know whether the Premier is aware of this, and whether he realizes that the Commonwealth Government has stated plainly that these principles of the analysis of investment products have to be followed in future in this State. We have come to the cross roads, and these are the things that have to be done before we get money's from the Commonwealth Government for development. Will they be done? We have squabbled in this place about who has caused the mess in South Australia. The Premier indulged in it today with relation to who first thought of having a Director of Industrial Development, and whether the Leader of the Opposition in some devious way (and this was the only implication one could glean from what he said) had found out what the Premier was doing. These things do not matter.

We are South Australians: we have to think big about these matters and abandon our political loyalties if we are going to get anywhere. Broadly, I believe that a survey of human and material resources of this State should be made by an outside independent body so that it can present to the Government and the people a blueprint for the future development of the State. International bodies throughout the world can do this, and it will be necessary to bring in experts. It will not be a short or a cheap job, but it is the only way to continue the development of this State rationally. I refer to A. D. Little and the Battelle Memorial Institute in the United States of America and Europe as examples of two of the bodies that can do the job.

Has anyone thought of the social and economic consequences for the people of this State as a result of the use of natural gas? Will there be a shift in population; will it mean a difference in the pattern of living habits; is it going to bring automatically other industries and, if so, what will they be and how can we encourage them to come here? These matters should be considered, but we cannot do it ourselves. An outside international organization is necessary to do the job. This suggestion should be followed up and, I hope, as I am a South Australian, that this will be done by the present Government. It is in our interests that this should be done, so that we get help and guidance. We must proceed rationally and, in some proper way, continue with the development of South Australia—not in the fitful, haphazard way it has

been done lately, but on a properly planned basis. That can be done only by going outside.

I hope, indeed, that the Director of Development, when he assumes office, and the Council of Development that the Government says it will set up will look at this matter because, on my advice, it is essential, and it is being done in other parts of the world. It is essential to have planned regional development of this nature, and unless we have something like it and think big in this way, I am afraid South Australia is doomed to remain what it has become in the last few years, that is, a backwater in Australia. I challenged the Premier, during his speech, on the question of migration to South Australia in the last 12 months. He said he looked at the figures from time to time. I was aware of the trend but, having just been handed the figures, I point out that they show a significant decline in the numbers of migrants coming to South Australia. For the calendar year, 1965, the figure was 22,567; for the nine months to the end of September, 1966, it was down to 16,397, and the estimated figure for the 12-months period is only 20,000 which shows, as I say, a significant drop in the figures.

Mr. Clark: Have you the figures for the other States?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I know the member for Gawler is trying to come to the aid of his Leader.

Mr. Clark: No. I'm just interested to know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I asked the Premier whether he knew what the figures were in South Australia, because he was giving other statistics to show how well we were doing at present.

Mr. Clark: I fancy the figures may be down in the other States, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My main point is that, in future, we must have some proper blueprint prepared by experts. There must be a comprehensive blueprint for the development of the State and, unless and until we have that, we shall continue to be in the quandary in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I never cease to wonder at the way in which members opposite, whenever they rise to speak, attempt to attack the Government's actions. Indeed, it seems to me that the member for Mitcham has a personal vendetta against the Premier; whenever he rises to his feet it is always to niggle or to make a frontal attack on the Premier. The honourable member is given facts (not untruths, as the member for Rocky River said

last night) time after time, but it still does not satisfy him.

Mr. Langley: It's a sign of weakness.

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member today said that people were in a quandary, and he attempted to distort the whole situation. All I can say is that, after listening to the honourable member, it is no wonder that people are in a quandary, because one just cannot follow his argument. I think 80 per cent of the time he took to speak to this debate related to nothing constructive, whereas the other 10 per cent was on to the right track (I enjoyed listening to him). Then, the honourable member ended on a dull note. It does not impress me that he should revert to this type of tactic. Indeed, his attitude will not benefit the State that he is trying to set up as a pinnacle in comparison with the other States.

The member for Mitcham was the member of a special committee that was set up in 1960, when he was the chief advocate for the establishment of an Industrial Development Department, answerable to the Premier. He cannot deny that because he was the one who suggested it, as a member of the special committee. However, the honourable member's Leader (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) did absolutely nothing about the final report of that special committee that was tabled in the House in, I think, February, 1964.

Mr. Shannon: He brought industries here.

Mr. CASEY: We know that the member for Onkaparinga was for years the hatchet man for the Playford Government, and I venture to say that Sir Thomas Playford and he ran the Government of this State for many years.

Mr. Shannon: I am happy to have that honour bestowed on me.

Mr. CASEY: We hear all sorts of accusation about what the Government (which, after all, has only been in office for just over two years) has done. It takes time to do these things. We set up a Premier's Department, which is what the member for Mitcham wanted. Indeed, the honourable member asked his Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) to do that, but was refused. The member for Mitcham gives us no credit for what we have done in this regard; he simply accuses us of not immediately doing something else. I said in the House 12 months ago that a Director of Industrial Development should be appointed. It does not matter to me whether that appointment was made 12 months or only a day after I said that it should be made.

However, the point is that members on this side of the House were considering such an appointment. It should be understood that matters such as this must be examined carefully and, in this case, the right man appointed. Eventually the right man was found. I commend the Government for all it has done regarding this matter. In fact, at a later stage I will move an amendment to the motion to that effect.

A special committee was appointed to examine development industrially and otherwise in South Australia. One of its most important recommendations was that a Director of Industrial Development be appointed. The member for Mitcham was a member of that special committee, although he did not say so this afternoon. The Labor Government introduced that measure and was supported by Opposition members, although the measure was not treated quite so well by Opposition members in another place.

Mr. Quirke: It was improved in another place.

Mr. CASEY: I do not think it was, as I think the honourable member would find if he did his homework.

Mr. Nankivell: It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. CASEY: Yes. At the conclusion of his speech, the Leader was floundering and the member for Gumeracha had to come to his aid to boost his arguments. However, the member for Gumeracha was carried away in what he said about the gas potential in this State. The honourable member said that from the time when gas was discovered in the North of South Australia he was absolutely convinced (as was everybody else) that it would be wonderful for the State. I think honourable members will agree that, with the discovery of natural gas, South Australia is on the verge of a new era of industrial development. The member for Gumeracha said that at present no drilling was being carried out in the Great Artesian Basin. I shall give the facts about that and about the other fields in South Australia. The Gidgealpa field has seven wells, five of which are producing. A conservative estimate of production is about 460 billion cubic feet. A little farther south is the Moomba field where wells Nos. 1 and 2 are both producing. Wells Nos. 3 and 4 were non-producers and the latest well to come in, well No. 5, is a good producer. The estimated production from this field is about 400 billion cubic feet (that figure includes production from the latest well to come in). The Natural Gas Pipelines Authority has decided that the gas supply in

the area is sufficient to meet requirements in South Australia, particularly those of the metropolitan area. Therefore, no reason exists why the project cannot go ahead as soon as one major problem has been ironed out. Contrary to what the member for Gumeracha said, a rig is operating at Kalladeina in the Great Artesian Basin. For the information of the member for Mitcham particularly, that is not far off the Birdsville track and is east of Mirra Mitta.

Mr. Coumbe: It is 45 miles from Moomba.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, in a north-westerly direction. The member for Gumeracha said that his Government (he called it the Playford Government) had always done everything in its power to see that as many holes as possible were drilled in an area. He said that, if he was in power, there would certainly be drilling taking place in the Far North and in the Great Artesian Basin. However, I know that, when the honourable member was Premier, on numerous occasions drilling contractors, who had been drilling in the Far North, left to go into Queensland; they did this after they had struck gas at Gidgealpa. I do not know who the honourable member was trying to hoodwink. Of course, private enterprise companies cannot be pushed around: they must be satisfied, as they are investing much money.

Mr. Millhouse: Your Government tries to.

Mr. CASEY: On the contrary, I think the Government has done an exceptionally fine job in this regard and everything is signed, sealed and ready to be put into operation. However, we do not want statements that are designed to confuse the public about the true facts.

Mr. Quirke: What are the true facts?

Mr. CASEY: I have just given them. With your permission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move to strike out all words after "House" and to insert:

the Government is to be congratulated on its initiative in industrial development in—

- (a) setting up a Premier's Department for this purpose;
- (b) having appointed a Director of Industrial Development; and
- (c) having announced its intention to create an Industrial Advisory Council and its support for an Industrial Research Foundation and an Industrial Design Centre.

I commend the Government for what it has done. What has been done was advocated not only by this Party when it was in Opposition but also by people of the calibre of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), who supported it when he was a member of the Industries Development Special Committee. It

took the Labor Government to implement this for the benefit of the people.

The appointment of a special oversea body to examine the resources of this State, as has been suggested by the member for Mitcham, is not necessary. All this information can be collated by the newly-formed Premier's Department from information supplied by Ministers and their departments. As an example, if a member asks a question about some of the mineral resources in this State, an answer can be obtained from the Mines Department within a few hours. The Premier's Department will come to the fore by being able to obtain information from all departments and make it available to the Director of Industrial Development to help him to entice people here, if we may use that word, and to help the establishment of new industries in this State.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Do you think the Minister of Agriculture will help?

Mr. CASEY: The Minister of Agriculture could supply any information for which he was asked by the Director. The creation of industrial advisory councils will enhance the future development of South Australia no end.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): Nothing gives me greater pleasure than to second the amendment. In the last few weeks, the Leader of the Opposition has endeavoured to claim all the credit for the idea of having a Department of Industrial Development. I paid particular attention to what the member for Frome said about remarks that had been made by the member for Mitcham and to my colleague's apt reminder that the member for Mitcham was a member of the Industries Development Special Committee appointed by this House to inquire into the decentralization of industry. Although the committee took about four years to bring down a report, the time was well spent, because the valuable information collated during that time has been of much benefit to members, particularly those on this side.

One suggestion made at that time was almost identical with the terms of the Leader's motion. I took the opportunity to look up the evidence presented to the committee on this matter. For the information of, perhaps, younger members, the Industries Development Special Committee was appointed to report to Parliament on decentralization. I am not referring to members young in age but to members who have not served for a long period in this House. I say that for the benefit of the member for Victoria and I also say for his benefit that the members of that committee were not unanimous in all their decisions, but that they

were unanimous in one recommendation, which I shall read. That committee, of which the member for Mitcham was a member, commented about various States and, regarding New South Wales, said:

In New South Wales a Division of Industrial Development was set up within the Premier's Department in 1958, with the development of country industries as one of its prime objectives. This division has accepted responsibility for decentralization as enunciated at the conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers in 1945 to which reference has already been made in this report.

I should have thought that even at that time the then Premier would have been familiar with what was discussed. Otherwise, the report would not have referred to what was enunciated at a conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers. If the Premier was not there, one of his Ministers would have attended and brought back a report. The report states about Victoria:

In Victoria a similar arrangement is in force, in that the Premier's Department contains a Division of State Development, which has evolved from an amalgamation of the staffs of the Central Planning Authority, the Latrobe Valley Development Advisory Committee and the former Decentralization Committee in 1950. In the past six years the division's operations in the industrial field have been broadened to embrace the establishment and expansion of both oversea and local industries in the metropolitan area as well as in country districts.

The report contains this comment about Western Australia:

In Western Australia a Department of Industrial Development has been established. Its functions are to assist the expansion of existing industry, foster the establishment of new industries, encourage exports, organize exhibitions and to conduct investigations and research into the commercial possibilities of using indigenous raw materials for industrial purposes.

The committee reports this about Tasmania:

In the Premier and Chief Secretary's Department an Industrial Development Branch publishes a Regional Planning Atlas and Industrial Index containing details of the economic resources of Tasmania.

The committee made this comment about the Commonwealth Government:

In March, 1950, a Commonwealth Division of Industrial Development was formed and attached to the Ministry of National Development.

The committee must have been impressed by what had been done in other States, because it devoted much space in its report to the importance of a development committee, but its recommendations were completely ignored by the former Government. The member for

Mitcham signed the report but did nothing further, yet he is now advocating the creation of a Department of Industrial Development.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't the Walsh Government do it?

Mr. HUGHES: That Government did something about it immediately it assumed office. The member for Mitcham signed his name to a report, which stated:

The committee believes it to be desirable that industrialists have some definite point of contact with the Government which can give information on the various aspects of the State's industrial and economic forces, and assistance on the various technical aspects of choosing and operating from a particular location. This can best be achieved by setting up a special department or branch of a department to promote country industrial expansion and, in association with local committees, publicize the natural advantages which certain locations may possess. Such a department could provide a most valuable service to industry generally and to decentralized industry in particular. The committee does not propose to set out in this report its views on the scope of the functions of such a department, but it believes that the head of the department should have direct access to the Premier and that it should be staffed by personnel—administrative, technical, public relations and accounting—to give a service to industry and to publicize the advantages of South Australian locations in general and, where applicable, of country locations in particular.

This report, presented to the previous Government in 1964, was completely ignored, but today the Opposition advocates what was recommended in that report. The committee had been appointed because of pressure brought to bear on the previous Government by the then Opposition. The late Mr. O'Halloran, when Leader of the Opposition, wanted a Royal Commission appointed to consider this matter. His frequent requests were refused, but because of the publicity throughout the State the then Premier became nervous and, without meeting all the wishes of the Opposition, he decided to go half way and appointed the committee. Its final report was referred to many times whilst we were in Opposition and when we asked the Government to implement the recommendations. Now, Opposition members are saying that this proposal was thought of during the last two or three weeks. In fairness to some Opposition members, if at least three of them (two of whom were Cabinet Ministers) speak against the amendment, they will do so with tongue in cheek. They are sensible men even though they are associated with the Opposition. I have the greatest admiration for one of them because, as a Minister, he did everything he could for

my district. I am speaking of the previous Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson). During the 10 years I have been a member of this House—

Mr. Rodda: Are you coming back next year?

Mr. HUGHES: After the compliment I paid to the member for Flinders I am sure that he would not appreciate such a joke. He knows that I am sincere. When I was an Opposition member, at a public meeting in my district I gave him credit for what he did. Should the need arise in the future, I will do so again.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I agree with what the honourable member has said.

Mr. HUGHES: I know the honourable member appreciates what I have said, because he is as sincere as I am. Before I was rudely interrupted by the member for Victoria I said that during the 10 years I have been a member I have seen many tactics used by Opposition members to try to gain political advantage over the great Australian Labor Party. The member for Gumeracha (when he was Premier) was a shrewd tactician; one would never find him presenting something to the House that had not been given prominence in practically every newspaper in the Commonwealth. I believe that the honourable member was largely responsible within his Party for the election of the present Leader of the Opposition.

How terribly disappointed Sir Thomas Playford must have been last Wednesday when the Leader decided to proceed with his motion, directing the Government to do something it had already done. Every member knows that, with a motion such as this one, it is usual for a member on this side to move, at the end of the debate on a particular day, that it should be adjourned to a date to be fixed by the mover of the motion, unless there are some unusual circumstances that require the debate to proceed. That did not happen last Wednesday because of one of two things: either the Leader of the Opposition is too busy running around the country in an endeavour to regain some of his Party's lost ground (which is becoming more and more evident wherever one goes), and because of that running around he has lost touch with the affairs of the State; or he had the motion placed on the Notice Paper merely in an endeavour to gain political kudos, which apparently back-fired on him, anyway. Last week the Government Whip was ready to move the adjournment of the debate, when the member for Gumeracha rose to speak.

Mr. Nankivell: That's a lot of rubbish!

Mr. HUGHES: It is not.

Mr. Nankivell: It was arranged.

Mr. HUGHES: It was not; it is the truth. Our Whip was ready to move the adjournment, when the member for Gumeracha rose to address the House. I am not worried about what the Opposition Whip says, because it is the truth.

Mr. Nankivell: It is not the truth: I arranged it!

Mr. HUGHES: It is the truth, and it is hurting the member for Albert.

Mr. Nankivell: Are you calling me a liar?

Mr. HUGHES: No.

Mr. Nankivell: You're implying it.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not. I am simply telling the truth.

Mr. Coumbe: Don't you usually tell the truth?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and I challenge the member for Torrens to name an occasion when I have not told the truth in this House. Nobody will distract me, because I intend to tell this story.

Mr. Nankivell: What about gas?

Mr. HUGHES: I am coming to that, and the honourable member will wish I had not come to it when I have said what I intend to say. Indeed, the Leader and the member for Gumeracha will not thank the honourable member for reminding me about the subject. The Opposition is trying to make fun of the natural gas project. I will prove that some members opposite are doing their utmost to frustrate certain people in their attempts to obtain natural gas.

Mr. Coumbe: You're going to do a lot of proving!

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, I do not care whether I have to continue with this debate next Wednesday. As I was saying, the Government Whip was ready last Wednesday to move the adjournment of the debate, when the member for Gumeracha rose to address the House. In so doing, however, the honourable member was departing from normal procedure in the House, for there has always been an honourable understanding about this matter.

Mr. Coumbe: This is a motion, not a Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I realize that. Apparently, the member for Gumeracha sensed that the Leader, as a result of the remarks he made and, indeed, the foolish motion he endeavoured to debate, would not get much publicity from attempting to claim credit for what the Government had done. The action of the member for Gumeracha in this instance was merely an attempt to draw a red herring across the trail:

he was endeavouring to cover up for the weak attempt made by the Leader of the Opposition. He endeavoured to draw members right away from the motion by introducing into the debate things that he had accomplished during his term of office as Premier. The member for Gumeracha in a very fatherly way tried to help his Leader, and by so doing he exposed his insincerity. If the Leader was sincere and if he considered this farcical motion of any value to the State, I challenge him this afternoon to say why he did not press for a vote on this urgent motion last Wednesday: it was entirely in his hands. It was his motion, and the normal practice in this type of debate was not adhered to. The Leader could have pressed for a vote to be taken.

Mr. Hall: That is simply not correct. You are off the track.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not off the track. It was your motion. The member for Gumeracha rose in his place to address the House. When the Government Whip was prepared to move for the adjournment of the debate, the member for Gumeracha rose in his place to address the House, as the Leader knows, and this broke the practice observed in this House ever since I have been here. It does not matter what the Leader says: this courtesy has been extended by the Opposition over the years, and because this practice was broken it gave the Leader an opportunity last Wednesday to press for a vote to be taken. It turned out that the Leader's speech on this subject was only a squib, and the attempt by the member for Gumeracha failed to dry it out.

I always listen attentively to what the member for Gumeracha says because he has had years of experience and he knows this State from A to Z. He knows other States also, and he can be very helpful to any member. However, he was not very helpful to his Leader last week because he went right away from the motion and spoke about things that he had brought to this State during his term of office as Premier, and I don't take any credit away from him for his achievements.

Mr. McKee: He could not justify it?

Mr. HUGHES: That is true. I guess he wished that the Leader in his wisdom had risen earlier and had had his motion discharged, in view of what had already been done.

Mr. Burdon: What wisdom!

Mr. HUGHES: It appears that every time the Government intensifies its drive for further industrial development in this State the Opposition, purely for political purposes, tries to jump on the bandwagon. We do not mind

their doing this, and I am sincere in saying this. We are pleased to have them if everyone is working in the common interest of the State.

Mr. McKee: Instead of decrying the State.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. However, the approach by the Opposition towards the problems of this State has not been very helpful; in fact, it has been the very reverse of helpful. About 13 months ago, when it was known that the Government was doing everything possible to arrange with the Commonwealth Government for funds to enable the building of a natural gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, and when negotiations were proceeding with a world-wide authority on pipeline routes and costs, what happened? The member for Gumeracha tried to embarrass the Government by moving:

That in the opinion of this House a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into and report upon what steps should be taken to expedite the construction of a gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide and matters incidental thereto.

The member for Adelaide on that occasion very effectively answered the member for Gumeracha, so much so that younger members of this House (and I do not mean "younger" in terms of age) were horrified to learn that the member for Gumeracha could twist the truth. I want to refer to that episode this afternoon to show how the Liberal and Country Party machine works to frustrate and embarrass those who stand in its path to power. I quote from 1966 *Hansard*, page 833; the member for Gumeracha said:

Apparently, the Government is not prepared to take the Opposition into its confidence about this project. I remind the Premier that when natural gas was first discovered at Gidgealpa I extended to him an invitation to visit that place, and personally conducted him on that visit so that he would be fully acquainted with what had taken place. I deplore the fact that now a new field has been established a similar courtesy has not been extended to the Leader of my Party.

It would appear that on that occasion the member for Gumeracha wanted the House to believe that he had voluntarily extended an invitation to the Hon. Frank Walsh (as Leader of the Opposition) to accompany him on a trip to Gidgealpa and that he had taken him into his confidence regarding the whole matter. Then, in the same breath he criticized Mr. Walsh for not extending a similar courtesy to the Leader of the Opposition. I shall now look at the truth of the matter and examine the invitation extended to the Hon. Frank Walsh

when he was Leader of the Opposition. In 1966, the member for Adelaide, when speaking to a motion dealing with natural gas, made the following remarks about this supposed open invitation to the Hon. Frank Walsh:

I checked the minutes of the meeting of my Party on this, because my recollection of what happened does not conform with the statement made by the honourable member the other day, and to make sure that I do not mislead this House I have had the minutes copied word for word. Those minutes disclose that on July 29, 1964, the Leader of our Party reported that the then Premier had advised him that a party of international oil experts would be arriving in Adelaide on the following Tuesday and would be visiting Gidgealpa, and that the Premier had been requested to accompany the party. The then Premier asked our Leader whether he (the Premier) could be granted a pair. That was the report from one of our meetings. The decision our Party made was as follows:

That the Leader advise the Premier a pair would be rendered, but this Party is also very strongly of the opinion that the Leader of the Opposition should also accompany the party.

We decided to give the then Premier a pair because he thought the matter was of some importance or value to the State. This enabled him to go up there and do the job, yet now he has the cheek to say that his Party considered whether or not it would object to our Premier going overseas to study natural gas developments. We said we would grant the pair but that the then Premier should also extend an invitation to our Leader to accompany him. The former Premier claims the credit for extending an invitation to our Leader, but I point out that the invitation was extended only after our Party had strongly urged that this be done.

From that, it can be seen that the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) did not give an open invitation to the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Frank Walsh) to accompany him to Gidgealpa. An invitation was made only after consideration of the suggestion conveyed to the then Premier from a Labor Party meeting. Because of misrepresentations contained in the speech made by the mover of the motion (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) on that occasion, the member for Adelaide, with his persuasive eloquence, influenced the House to accept the following amendment to the motion:

By striking out "a Select Committee should be appointed" and inserting "The Government should be congratulated upon the action it has already taken in appointing a committee".

This goes to show that when the truth is twisted to suit an argument, as it was on that occasion, it backfires. The House accepted the amendment which was to the credit of the

member for Adelaide who made a great speech on that occasion.

Mr. Rodda: What has this got to do with the motion?

Mr. HUGHES: It has everything to do with it. Apparently the honourable member is not capable of following this line of thought.

Mr. Millhouse: Neither am I.

Mr. HUGHES: We would not expect the honourable member to follow it. To show honourable members how insincere are members opposite when they speak about their concern for further industrial development in the State, I will refresh their memories about another stunt put up in this House last year by the member for Torrens. My only real regret at his play-acting on behalf of his Party was that he (and those who supported him) dragged the good names of a number of top public servants through the mud. On that occasion he proceeded to excuse three members of the Public Service but, because he had become so enthused at being selected to do this on behalf of the Opposition, he failed miserably to do his homework. That is nothing new for the majority of members opposite.

When the member for Torrens moved 12 months ago "that in the opinion of this House the work of the Premier's Department in attracting new industries to this State has been ineffective", he was unaware that the Industries Assistance Branch had been part of the Premier's Department since its inception. He had not even bothered to find out the personnel of the department nor was he familiar with the excellent work done by these officers. However, I have always been certain that had the member for Torrens been aware of the personnel of the Premier's Department before he moved his motion he would never have done so. He knows as well as I do the excellent qualifications and reputation of one man in particular to whom I am referring. He knows the great contribution this man has made to industry in South Australia. I realized the member for Torrens did not know that the Industries Development Branch had been part of the Premier's Department since its inception, because he suggested in his speech on that occasion that it should be made part of the Premier's Department. This is a case where an expert set himself up to advise the Government to do something it had already done. The real sham of the escapade can be seen in the contents of the motion and in the time that elapsed before it was put to a vote. The member for Torrens moved and debated the motion on July 13, 1966.

Mr. McKee: He picked a bad day.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. A vote was taken on the motion on March 22, 1967. The motion was on the Notice Paper for about eight months. I want to read the motion to honourable members this afternoon so that they can judge for themselves how utterly ridiculous and insincere was the motive of the mover when he had the motion placed on the Notice Paper. This is how it read:

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

I emphasize the words, "and that as a matter of urgency . . . be set up without delay". Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that thousands of people hold Parliament up to ridicule when the mover of a motion that is alleged to be of such importance allows it to remain on the Notice Paper without taking any steps to have it tested by honourable members?

Mr. McKee: For eight months.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. It was so urgent, according to the mover, that something had to be done without delay.

Mr. McKee: It was kept there for political publicity.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course. I know that some members will say that towards the end of a session Government business must take precedence over private members' business. That is quite true, and it has always been that way. However, the honourable member had ample time in which to do something. If honourable members look up *Hansard* they will find that he had several months in which he could have had his motion tested in this House.

Mr. McKee: The present motion is designed to do the same thing.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I hope that the Leader has more sense than the member for Torrens, that he has learnt from the latter's mistake, and that he does not leave the motion on the Notice Paper for months. I say again that the motion was moved for political purposes, and that the mover had no intention of putting it to a vote until he was forced to do so. Yet honourable members opposite call themselves genuine representatives of the people. I now turn to a recent report on industry which was compiled by Sir Thomas Playford and which was recently read to this House.

That report stated:

Liberal and Country Party Governments have been singularly successful in establishing industries in South Australia. Probably the most important factor to be considered before an industry is established in any country is the question of stability, both political and economic. The L.C.L. Government provided South Australia with this to a unique extent. Over a period of 27 years there was a balanced Budget, with low taxation and economic prosperity. The price structure was held the most consistently of any State in the Commonwealth, housing was provided at economic rents, costs of public utilities were kept at the lowest possible level, and financial reserves maintained to provide services for all expansion.

In the country, housing was guaranteed for the workers in any new secondary industry being established. In the city, housing was made readily available for all skilled workers required for the establishment of any new industrial undertaking. In both the city and the country steps were taken to provide electricity, rail services, water, roads, and if necessary, land, for the establishment of new enterprises. If justified, finance was made available at low interest, and factories were built. Special legislation was provided to make possible almost any type of assistance necessary to foster the establishment of a new industry.

I do not wish this afternoon to decry any of the achievements of the Playford Government; I want that plainly understood. I consider that every dollar invested in this State is our gain. However, the remarks that followed the reading of the report struck me as being very funny. The speaker (honourable members will know to whom I am referring) read the report in order to bolster up what the L.C.L. Administration under Sir Thomas Playford had done. His intention was to convey to the public the impression that every avenue had been explored whereby new industry could be established and existing industry expanded. However, the reader of the report, again because of his inexperience, proceeded to undo all that he was trying to achieve, because he went on to say:

We believe our State offers further opportunities for industrial development, and when our Party is returned to office it will devote a great deal of its energy to the promotion of industrial activity. This will include: obtaining advice from industry and commerce as to its needs and capacity; assistance to expansion by the provision of technical advice and necessary services.

It can be seen from what I have quoted that over the 27 years covered by the report the Leader read out there were many things that the Playford Government should have done, otherwise why did the Leader try to tell the people what he intended to do?

Mr. Burdon: He was 27 years too late.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Although the report boasted about what had been done in the 27 years, the Leader virtually admitted that many things had not been done.

Mr. Curren: He had just woken up to what was needed.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course; he realized immediately that he had to add something to that report in order to get his own members to support him in his motion. To me, the quotation from the Leader's speech is an admission that more could have been done under the Playford Administration. It is only since the Labor Party has been in office that the Liberal Party has realized there were many things it could have done to promote a greater degree of industrial development in this State. If that is not the position, why is the Leader advocating the very things which the present Government has been fostering and which will soon be evident to the people of South Australia?

In the speech he made last week the Leader accused this Government of adopting a "don't care" attitude to a natural gas supply to Spencer Gulf ports. Recently, on one of his roundabout trips, he accused the Government of turning its back on country areas in connection with the reticulation of natural gas. All members know that I answered that accusation in the Address in Reply debate and supported my answer by correspondence that became distasteful to certain members opposite because I would not tell them where I got the correspondence until I had finished reading it. I intend to prove again this afternoon that the Leader himself is a past master at making accusations that cannot stand up to investigation.

Mr. Hurst: What is the common term you would use for it?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not prepared to use that. I am not in the habit of using those words. The Leader said:

It is about time that members for districts in which the Gulf ports are situated fought for this amenity.

I say, for the benefit of all members, that every member representing a district in which any of the Spencer Gulf ports is situated has fought to have the pipeline built from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. Other honourable members representing those districts are capable of speaking for their own districts, so I shall refer only to the District of Wallaroo. The member for Port Pirie is capable of looking after his own district and you, Mr. Speaker, have proved

beyond doubt by the outstanding period during which you have been a member that the people are confident that you look after your district. Time would not permit me to tell the House this afternoon about all the steps I have taken to have gas made available at Wallaroo and to have a nitrogenous fertilizer works established in that area.

Mr. Lawn: Wallaroo is well represented.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, the people think so.

Mr. Lawn: That is all that matters.

Mr. HUGHES: I have had private interviews with the representative from Jackson, U.S.A., of the syndicate that has purchased land at Wallaroo and on the last occasion when he was there I spent four hours with him. I have had six interviews with the Australian representative of the syndicate. I have had one deputation to the Minister of Mines and four deputations to the Premier on this matter. On several occasions I have met the Wallaroo council and I have met the executive of the local Chamber of Commerce. I attended a public meeting in the Wallaroo Town Hall. I also attended at Port Pirie a combined meeting attended by the Minister of Mines, the Director of Mines and representatives from Port Augusta and from Port Pirie. I do not wish to weary the House by speaking further about what I have done in this matter. However, the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh), the Minister of Mines (Hon. S. C. Bevan) and I were doing all we could to have a supply of gas piped to Wallaroo when it became available, but what assistance did I or this Government receive from Opposition members about that matter or about the establishment of this industry? We were told many times when a natural gas supply was being advocated that this would be a great thing for South Australia and that it was above Party politics. The emphasis was laid on that. The Opposition was giving no assistance at all. The former Leader of the Opposition was doing everything he possibly could to prevent a suitable arrangement being arrived at by the parties concerned.

Mr. Lawn: He tried to sabotage it.

Mr. HUGHES: He went behind my back. I make no secret of that. The honourable member is listening to me. He went behind my back to have talks with civic leaders in an endeavour to gain political advantage.

Mr. Lawn: The Liberals stab people in the back, don't they?

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. When he thought the time was ripe he tried to ridicule me in a speech in this House. He cannot deny that.

What he did not know was how much work I had done to get an assurance from the Government that Wallaroo would receive a priority.

Mr. Hurst: You did the job well.

Mr. HUGHES: The people of Wallaroo think I did, and they have said so. If anyone likes to look, he will find many references in the local press.

Mr. Lawn: Next year they will again show how they think, too.

Mr. HUGHES: I have not finished speaking about this matter. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) tempted me into this in a sarcastic manner this afternoon. He is not in the House at present. However, I warned him at the time that, as he had tempted me, I would tell the truth. Up until now I have withheld telling what I know was done behind my back. It is not very commendable to a member of the Opposition.

Mr. Ryan: They are running true to form.

Mr. HUGHES: The former Leader or some of his cronies (the Leader may have instigated it) had circulated in my district a speech that the former Leader made in the House for a particular purpose. I am glad that the member for Albert is back in the House, because if he has any more funny interjections I shall take them up, too.

Mr. Nankivell: You withheld the truth. You admitted that.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not say that I withheld the truth: I said that I withheld making the statement to the House. If the member looks in *Hansard* he will find that is what I said.

Mr. Hurst: He is just trying to twist it around. The Opposition is afraid of what you are going to say.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. The member for Albert tried earlier and, because he came off second best, he retreated to the Speaker's Gallery. I was referring to a speech that the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) had made. The result of circulating the speech in my district was the reverse of what was intended. The speech did me much good. If the honourable member makes any more speeches, I shall be pleased if he sends them up to Wallaroo, too.

Mr. Casey: The truth prevails at all times.

Mr. HUGHES: The truth will prevail. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) tried to make fun of me this afternoon.

Mr. Casey: He has a habit of doing that.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I shall tell the whole story now. A limited number of typed copies

of the submissions made to the Prime Minister about finance for a natural gas pipeline in South Australia was made available by courtesy of the former Premier, the Hon. Frank Walsh. Copies could be made available only to certain members because sufficient copies were not available for one to be given to each member. What happened after those copies had been circulated? Within a few hours (I want this to be noted) photostat copies of certain parts of the submission had been forwarded by the member for Gumeracha to Wallaroo.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: For the press.

Mr. HUGHES: No, not for the press. The honourable member knows to whom he sent them. When I challenged him on this at the end of the corridor outside this Chamber (which he will remember very well), he tried to get out of it by saying that the grizzling Mayor of Wallaroo had asked him for a copy. Those are the words he used, yet he sent the photostat portion to Wallaroo. He did not say that in the House; he said that to me.

Mr. Hall: Don't bring conversations outside the House into the House!

Mr. Lawn: The honourable member opposite is trying to become another Menzies.

Mr. HUGHES: Certain members of the Party opposite tried this afternoon to ridicule me and made fun out of gas. I am telling the whole truth this afternoon. I have withheld it until now but, because of the foolish interjecting from the opposite side, honourable members are now hearing the truth—and they are objecting to it.

Mr. Coumbe: What are you going to tell us?

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Gumeracha said that the grizzling Mayor of Wallaroo had asked him for a copy, and he had told him that he had only one copy for himself—and what did he do? I do not know whether he had it all photostated but there were certain parts he wanted to emphasize. That is how this thing goes on. I say this afternoon that it is not correct that the "grizzling Mayor of Wallaroo" asked him for a copy.

Mr. Nankivell: "Grizzly bear" or "grizzling Mayor"?

Mr. HUGHES: It was not a correct statement that the member for Gumeracha made, because of the time factor involved in the photostat copies reaching Wallaroo. The member for Gumeracha knows that only too well. It was he who contacted the Mayor of Wallaroo.

Mr. Ryan: Shame on him!

Mr. Lawn: And then called him a grizzling Mayor.

Mr. HUGHES: Not the Mayor, because the Mayor would not have known what was in the typewritten copies.

Mr. Nankivell: Not unless he sent them to him.

Mr. HUGHES: He did, and they were in his hands within a few hours of the copy getting into the hands of the member for Gumeracha.

Mr. Nankivell: I call that service.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not call that service.

Mr. Quirke: Somebody has to look after the district.

Mr. HUGHES: I am looking after it very well indeed. That is what members opposite call politics; this shows what they will stoop to in an endeavour to tip a member out.

Mr. Lawn: How low can they get!

Mr. HUGHES: But don't worry: the people in my district know of the report that has been read out; they know that the Liberal Government was in office for 27 years.

Mr. Lawn: On sufferance.

Mr. HUGHES: It was on sufferance but during that time I did not see any industries coming to Wallaroo. I have seen a few taken away, and the Playford Government was responsible for one of the best industries leaving Wallaroo. It was one of the best because it employed young people. The people of Wallaroo have never forgotten this. The money necessary for the industry to leave was advanced by the former Government (the Liberal Government) for that purpose. No-one can deny that. It was a tragedy. We had a thriving industry at Wallaroo but for political purposes money was made available to transfer it to Elizabeth. If the member for Albert likes to refer to *Hansard*, he will see where I asked questions on this matter in its early stages before the industry was transferred, and I was given an assurance by the Premier of the day, when I was a member in Opposition, that it would not happen.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think the industry should be closed down at Elizabeth and returned to Wallaroo?

Mr. HUGHES: Have you got any more funny ones like that?

Mr. Millhouse: What about an answer?

Mr. HUGHES: That industry has gone; that is by the way. There is nothing we can do about it. It is at Elizabeth. It is our loss, thanks to the Liberal Government. The proposal for a fertilizer works is the first opportunity to get a real industry to go to Wallaroo—and what happens? The Leader of the Opposition goes out into the country and stabs the Government in the back by saying

that it is letting the Spencer Gulf towns down because it is turning its back on natural gas in country areas. That is the sort of co-operation we get.

Mr. Hurst: Industrial sabotage.

Mr. HUGHES: I can forgive the member for Gumeracha for doing some of the things he has done; I can forgive him for that because I have a forgiving spirit, but one can stand only so much. Now, when the people at Wallaroo have their hopes raised (they may not all be supporters of the Opposition) what happens? The Leader of the Opposition goes into the country and says the Government has turned its back on natural gas for country areas. That was the worst statement that could have been made, because we do not know now whether that statement has gone to the United States. I explained earlier in this session that I was told in the presence of the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) by a representative of the company that it was having newspaper cuttings referring to natural gas sent back to the parent company.

Mr. Clark: And this could be damaging to the State.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, of course, but it is not only a loss to Wallaroo: it could be a great loss to the State.

Mr. Lawn: It is stabbing South Australia in the back.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. This is not a tin-can opener affair. The Liberal Government once tried to make a list of industries that had opened up at Elizabeth. One was employing just four men.

Mr. Quirke: Which one do you want at Wallaroo?

Mr. HUGHES: The one that we are hoping we shall get, which runs into a \$10,000,000 industry. I mentioned it in this House recently.

Mr. Nankivell: You need gas for it?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and you are not helping us to get it. I said in my speech on the Address in Reply that I was hoping the Government and the Opposition could speak with one voice where industry was concerned.

Mr. Hall: We can't if you don't fight for it.

Mr. HUGHES: Rubbish!

Mr. Quirke: Why not start an industry at Jamestown as the pipeline runs alongside that place?

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Burra helped me in his speech on the Address in Reply. I hope I don't have to criticize him.

The Opposition has done a grave injustice to the State, and its Leader is responsible but, from the funny remarks of Opposition members, it seems that they agree with his actions. Is that what they think of industries in this State? The foolish interjections leave no doubt in my mind that his Party supports him.

Mr. Coumbe: You interject sometimes.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, but not foolishly. All I hope is that no damage has been done and that the industry will be established near Wallaroo. If it is, it will be a great asset to the State and thousands of farmers, with whom the Opposition professes to sympathize, will benefit. Opposition members should think that over when they face their electors. I commend the mayor and councillors of the Wallaroo council for their hard work in assisting me in my efforts to make a supply of natural gas available at Wallaroo.

Mr. Quirke: You don't need a pipeline.

Mr. HUGHES: We do. I further commend the Wallaroo council for its help in our association with the United States syndicate, and for its part in the negotiations. I hope that the foolish remarks of the Leader of the Opposition made throughout the State will not cause Wallaroo to lose this important industry. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LAND EXCHANGE.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the proposed exchange of portions of freehold section 216, hundred of Glen Roy, and section 406, hundred of Hynam.

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

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 654.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill with the utmost relish. The passage of this Bill will set another brilliant gem in the glittering tiara of Labor achievements (and I do not intend to continue at that level). Opposition to the Bill, both in and out of the House, is neglecting to remember that this measure was part of the programme put to the people of this State in the Labor Party policy speech in 1965 and overwhelmingly endorsed by the people.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The references in that policy speech were very limited.

Mr. JENNINGS: I realize that any successful political Party claims a mandate from the

people to introduce any measure that was contained in its policy speech, even though perhaps 100 or more other matters contained in the speech might have been exercising the minds of the people when they voted. However, that is one of the spoils of victory. We certainly cannot have it said that this measure was not mentioned in the policy speech, and it is not insignificant. It was prominently mentioned in the policy speech; it was an important measure in the speech and was treated so by my Party at the time and, I might say, in subsequent election publicity. The matter was regarded as important by our opponents in this House and by that section of the business world that was rather afraid of this legislation. It was vehemently opposed by the then Liberal and Country League spokesman in South Australia who was a much greater and more respected political publicist than the anaemic shadow we heard leading the Opposition in the House last Thursday.

My Party, therefore, can clearly claim a mandate for this legislation and would be little less than recreant to our trust if we did not introduce it and proceed with it at the earliest opportunity. Earlier in this Parliament we became used to the last Labor Party policy speech being quoted in the House by members of the Opposition. The present Minister of Social Welfare (the former Premier) was proud of the fact (and rightly so) that more passages from the policy speech he delivered on behalf of the Party were quoted in *Hansard* than any similar document in our history, and all of these quotations were made by Opposition members. These references to our policy speech were intended to embarrass us and to draw attention to the fact that the comprehensive plan that we put before the people (and had accepted by them) was not all accomplished in the first six months of government. We were not embarrassed at all; we were flattered by the publicity given by our opponents to the policy speech. We knew we had one full term of Parliament in which to implement the things we had promised. Now that so much has been achieved we no longer hear from members of the Opposition that this matter was endorsed by the people and that they were still waiting for it to be introduced. On the contrary, all we get now from the Opposition are bitter attacks to the extent that they are capable of bitter attacks, but certainly any lack they suffer in this respect is not in their intentions. They have bitterly opposed us now for introducing matters that were mentioned in our policy speech and

endorsed by the people. We have heard considerable criticism during the last few months of the last session and the early days of this session.

Surely there is nothing unique about this legislation. Its proudest advocates can scarcely claim that it is trail-blazing. It merely seeks to bring this State up to the level of all the other States in this sphere, just as this Government has had to bring this State up to the level of the other States in so many other spheres in the limited time it has been in office. Government Insurance Offices have been established in all other States, irrespective of the political complexion of their Governments, and some of those offices have been in operation for a considerable time. A few years ago, when nationalization was a prominent subject for political discussion in this country, and in Britain in particular, there was a current saying, "You cannot unscramble eggs." This meant that, if a Socialist Government such as ours went to the lengths of nationalizing an industry, a subsequent Conservative Government could not do anything about it.

In this debate the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to something along these lines. He, in common with many other speakers on the other side, became involved in arguments that were not germane to the subject matter before the Chair. He at least said that in other States where State Government Insurance Offices have been established, it became impossible for subsequent Governments to sell, sacrifice, or do anything else with the offices that had been established. I think the reason behind this was that the Liberal Governments that succeeded Labor Governments in other States were more impressed by good Government than by political theories, so they kept the State Insurance Offices. Nobody can convince me that if a sovereign State wanted to (and if it was so impressed by the sanctity of private enterprise that it felt it should) get rid of a State Insurance Office it would find it impossible to do so. Of course it would not: there is nothing in the world to stop it. It is significant that nowhere in Australia have Conservative, Liberal or Nationalist Governments (or whatever names they have used) succeeding Labor Governments tried to get rid of Government Insurance Offices.

Of course, the establishment by Labor Governments of State Insurance Offices in other States did not mean that insurance was nationalized. In most instances, it meant that the offices merely fitted into the general frame-

work of insurance. We have seen non-Labor Governments continue them, encourage them, and watch them flourish to the tremendous benefit of the State concerned. The non-Labor Governments have not continued Government Insurance Offices in order to serve political ideologies. As I have said, they have continued them in the interest of good Government. That is why this Government, which has been responsible for so much good Government in the two and a half years it has been in office, intends to introduce a State Insurance Office to cover all aspects of insurance. This covers all the reasons we have, because surely good Government is so widely embracing that it covers everything we could possibly want from a State Insurance Office.

At this stage I should point out that, while a Government compels citizens to insure in any sphere (as they are compelled with regard to third party insurance and workmen's compensation), it is the obligation of that Government (and nothing less than an obligation) to provide a Government Insurance Office to accept that insurance. Of course, that has been recognized by Governments of all political complexion in Australia. Our opponents would like the Government to accept only insurance that is likely to be unprofitable and to preclude it from accepting insurance that is likely to be profitable. Of course, that is in line with their general attitude. I believe most members of the House have noticed that the horrid word "Socialism" (about which we are hearing so much lately from members opposite, such as the member for Light) is invoked only when a Government intends to enter a field where it might perchance make a profit—where it enters some lucrative field of endeavour. The word "Socialism" is never invoked if a Government has to provide services that may not be profitable or are likely, by their very nature, to be unprofitable. This is not Socialism then—it is merely the Government accepting a governmental responsibility.

These are the unprofitable fields in which private enterprise is not interested, because the profit motive is absent. Private enterprise, as it is so erroneously called because there is nothing private about it, is actuated by the profit motive and nothing else. The public interest may be considered as a means to an end, but that is as far as it goes. It is obvious from its very nature that private enterprise cannot put the public interest first.

Why should public enterprise not take some of the cream off profitable enterprises in the interests of its shareholders, the taxpayers?

We believe that it should do so, and this is why this Bill has been introduced: it provides for a Government Insurance Office to compete in all insurance fields with private enterprise. We know that insurance can be very profitable, and members on this side have given instances of Government Insurance Offices in other States that are very profitable. I wish to give some information that members on this side already have, anyway, because they have studied this matter for a long time.

Mr. Hurst: It may do members opposite some good.

Mr. JENNINGS: Possibly. I never despair that we may break through, although I sometimes become disconsolate; there is much work to be done in this direction. I wish to refer to the situation in New South Wales in 1926, and what applied then is just as true today. Indeed, the arguments raised by the Opposition against this legislation are the same as those raised 40 years ago against this type of legislation.

Mr. Nankivell: So are yours.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mine are not. My arguments in favour of the Bill are just as good now as similar arguments were then. I shall not detail the arguments advanced in favour of Government Insurance Offices 40 years ago because it is unnecessary to justify them now: their successful record justifies them. In 1926, in New South Wales workmen's compensation insurance for all employees, as well as other classes of insurance for Government departments, semi-Government departments, Government employees and contractors, was introduced. In 1942 the powers were considerably widened to include all classes of general insurance and life assurance, the policies being guaranteed by the Government. Later in my speech I shall read an interesting extract from New South Wales *Hansard* in connection with the debate that took place in 1941.

Let us see what the New South Wales Auditor-General had to say in his report for 1965-66, which is not 40 years ago but just over one year ago. According to that report, the net surplus in general insurance for that year was \$2,543,954. In life assurance, from 1961-62 to 1965-66 there was a progressive increase in each year under all of the following headings: premium income, other income, total fund, number of policies, and sum assured. By 1965-66, the number of policies

had increased to 11,269 and the sum assured had increased to \$18,116,433. The effective earning rate, as reported in the Auditor-General's report, was 6.36 per cent, which I think honourable members will agree is very satisfactory. Certainly it is vastly different from the figure given to this House by the honourable member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson).

In Queensland, the State Government Insurance Office conducts general business. Workmen's compensation is, of course, entirely in the hands of that office. In Western Australia, the State Government Insurance Office covers fire, marine and general insurance risks for the State Government instrumentalities and semi-government and local government authorities. It also conducts some classes of insurance for the general public, the principal ones being workmen's compensation and comprehensive motor vehicle insurance. I point out here that in Western Australia there is a Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust which covers third party insurance in that State. Since an amendment to the State Government Insurance Office Act in 1958, the office has engaged in personal accident insurance in respect of schoolchildren and students under a policy which indemnifies a parent or guardian against the cost of medical and surgical treatment and funeral and other services.

In Victoria, the State Motor Car Insurance Office deals with third party and any other kind of motor car insurance. The State Accident Insurance Office, constituted under the Workers' Compensation Act of 1914, deals with workmen's compensation. At the end of 1965, it had in the general reserve \$6,000,000, in the building reserve \$74,600, and, in the Bonus Equalization Scheme, \$1,700,408. As at the end of that year, claims paid amounted to \$5,372,000, and the profit for the year was \$794,000. Members can see from those scant figures that in the States I have mentioned State insurance is extremely big and profitable business.

Mr. Casey: Do other insurance companies operate in those States?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, about as many as operate in this State. Some time ago I received from the then Premier of New South Wales a letter about State insurance in that State and I shall read an extract from that letter for benefit of the House. It states:

The operations of the Government Insurance Office cover life assurance and all forms of general insurance. Financial advantages to the State are that (1) from the profits of the office an amount in excess of £700,000 has been paid

to a special account for hospitals at the Treasury, (2) payment to the Treasury of the equivalent of income tax in respect of operations for the year ended June 30, 1963, will approximate £500,000, and (3) the Government Insurance Office renders valuable assistance to local government authorities in making Loan funds available to an amount approximating £2,500,000 per annum.

When our Premier mentioned this aspect of State insurance in his second reading explanation, it was attacked by members opposite as being something for which a State Government Insurance Office is not expected to provide. Of course, we see that it is being done very successfully in New South Wales. The Premier of New South Wales went on to say:

Other advantages are that the Government Insurance Office provides the people of New South Wales with an alternative and competitive market for insurance, particularly in respect of those forms of insurance which are compulsory—workers' compensation and motor vehicles (third party). To this extent, it plays a significant part in stabilizing insurance costs generally. The office is also in a position to act as insurance adviser to the Government.

I have another letter from the present Premier of Tasmania, who is an exceptionally good Premier and has been in office for a long time without having a gerrymander to support him. The first paragraph of that letter answers some of the queries that were raised the other day by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). This extract reads:

The office commenced underwriting in 1920 under the authority of a special Act, the Tasmanian Government Insurance Act, 1919. As the £20,000 capital authorized by the State Treasury at the commencement of operation has never been drawn upon, it can be said that the venture was a success from the start.

An amount of \$40,000 was made available for the use of the office but has not been drawn upon. The letter continues:

However, the main concern of the Government of the day was not the reduction of premiums but a restraining effect on insurance charges, as the period was one of inflation with a rising spiral in prices throughout Australia. At the present time the office still possesses that influence of restraint on rising premiums for all types of insurance except life, the General Manager being a member of various underwriting premium committees which, by agreement with the underwriters that no increases will be effected without discussion and the knowledge of the General Manager, maintain stability . . . Besides administering the Act, which includes two compulsory Acts of legislation—Worker's Compensation and Motor Vehicle Third Party—the office administers, on behalf of the Government, the Compulsory Hail Insurance Act for the insurance of damage by hail to apples and pears. The office

also has in operation and controls its own hospital and medical benefits organizations which are open to all members of the public. The present contributions total £120,000 from 18,000 contributors.

I think that letter from the Premier of Tasmania will allay any genuine fears that members of this House may have about the probable success of a Government Insurance Office in this State and will show that really there is no monetary burden on the State in the establishment of such an office.

What have we heard from members opposite in this debate? First, that this office will be a drain on the taxpayer even though the evidence in all the other States points to the contrary. Secondly, we are being told that it will provide unfair competition in the insurance field. Nobody has gone to any trouble at all to point out how this competition will be unfair. On the one hand, this office will provide unfair competition; on the other hand, it will be a drain on the taxpayer. Of course, in the middle it is quite unconscionable anyway because it is Socialism. It is a very peculiar form of Socialism but it is a form of Government activity more likely to be implemented by a Labor Government, with the welfare of the people at heart, than by an anti-Labor Government.

Mr. Clark: This has not always been the case.

Mr. JENNINGS: True, but I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition must have realized that he was getting on to dangerous debating ground when a more responsible member of his Party than some others who spoke mentioned Socialism, because he said, "It could be said that the Playford Government engaged in Socialism when it nationalized the Adelaide Electric Supply Company".

Mr. McKee: That is different.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think that is Socialism, anyway.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Members opposite attribute anything they please to Socialism.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but that venture into Government enterprise by the Playford Government was certainly as much Socialism as is this scheme, which will compete with private enterprise.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Playford Government took over a monopoly.

Mr. JENNINGS: But we on this side of the House are not at all impressed by arguments about the political ideology of the Playford Government and things that it did and did

not do. The fact is that the Playford Government was always a bastard form of government. It never confined itself to any form of political principles. It would be difficult to find any principles defined in its policy. The only policy of the Playford Government was political expediency: the only thing that actuated that Government was political expediency, and how its proposals would suit the situation at an appropriate time. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had nothing to fear from his half-hearted admission that the Playford Government had embarked on some sort of Socialism when it took over the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. It was peculiar to hear the Deputy Leader resort to the old cry of Socialism, about which some of his junior members made a great fuss. I cannot understand how Opposition members think they are getting anywhere when they make this claim about us.

I do not know one member on this side who would not proclaim from the rooftops that he was a Socialist, as we have done on numerous occasions. When the Deputy Leader was speaking, the Minister of Works interposed and said that he was proud to be a Socialist. The member for Flinders said that the Minister was honest to make this admission, but that his colleagues did not do so. For some time Opposition members have tested us about our political ideology, but I do not see how they are doing us any harm by telling us and the public that we are something that we are quite prepared and proud to admit. This type of thing reminds me of a person telling another not to have anything to do with Mr. O'Reilly because he is a Catholic. Mr. O'Reilly takes Mrs. O'Reilly to confession, and on Sunday they take all the young O'Reilly's to Mass, but someone would say that people should keep away from Mr. O'Reilly because he is a Catholic. It is the same as someone telling another person to keep away from Mrs. Jones because she is a Salvationist, who goes to the service in her uniform and beats the drum. What possible damage it does people to be accused of being something that they admit themselves I have never been able to fathom.

Mr. Rodda: Are you speaking for yourself or for everyone?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am certainly speaking for myself but I do not expect to make much impression on the member for Victoria. I think on this matter I am speaking as much for my colleagues as for anyone.

Mr. Hughes: Hear, hear!

Mr. JENNINGS: The Leader also talked about Socialism and nationalization (as though nationalization had anything whatsoever to do with this legislation), and he even quoted from Mr. Calwell's book in which the former Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition said that if he did not support the principle of nationalization he could not continue to be a Labor man. The Leader of the Opposition read into this a sinister meaning of some kind of executive control by the Labor Party over Mr. Calwell, so that if he did not continue to believe something he might be kicked out. However, the following sentences (which were not quoted by the Leader) made it perfectly clear what Mr. Calwell meant, namely, that his conscience would not enable him to remain a member of the Labor Party if he did not continue to support the principle of nationalization in certain instances. The member for Mitcham entertained us to about half an hour of complete irrelevancies.

Mr. Clark: Whom are you kidding?

Mr. JENNINGS: He made a great issue of the fact that he had arranged with the Premier to see the Public Actuary about the cost of establishing a State Insurance Office. He also said that when he got to see the Public Actuary he found that the officer was not prepared to speak to him until he had spoken to the Chief Secretary. He could have saved himself a little time, surely, if he had realized that the Public Actuary, of course, is under the control of the Chief Secretary and that, obviously, the honourable member had to speak to the Chief Secretary before he had any right to have a confidential talk with the Actuary.

Mr. McKee: You could hardly expect him to know that!

Mr. JENNINGS: I think all members on this side of the House know quite well that the Public Actuary is under the Chief Secretary's control.

Mr. McKee: He probably got lost in the building.

Mr. JENNINGS: He was in there an hour, and what he told us of the discussions surely could not have taken more than five minutes.

Mr. Clark: I don't think he made it very clear, though.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the Public Actuary would have had the job ahead of him there. In any case, the member for Mitcham finally contacted the Chief Secretary (which he admitted took only a few minutes, anyway) and no doubt when he said, "I have discussed with the Premier my having a talk with the

Public Actuary', the Chief Secretary, of course, said, "Go ahead my boy."

Mr. Clark: He is a helpful man.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think anybody who is co-operative with the honourable member must be a very charitable man. He told us that he discussed matters with the Public Actuary for an hour, and he told us the result of that hour's conversation in about three minutes in this House. Some of the things he told us were of great benefit to all members of this House in assessing their attitude to whether or not we should have a State Insurance Office, because the honourable member pointed out that some of the financial responsibilities that the Government Insurance Office would have to accept before it started its business would be concerned with office furniture. I should not think one would have to go to the Public Actuary to be told that the Government Insurance Office would have to have furniture before it could open its doors for business. I thought for a while that the member for Mitcham was going to say that the office would need red carpets, which would have been reminiscent of the days when he told us that he had gone to the Trades Hall and had walked into it over plush red carpets. We know there is not a carpet anywhere in the hall. The member for Mitcham said that another expense the Government Insurance Office would have to bear before it could begin business was the cost of telephones. It is going to have telephones! It is going to be an up-to-date place; no more smoke signals—they are out, and the pigeon post is just for the birds.

This information was gained by the member for Mitcham after an hour's discussion with the Public Actuary. I, along with most other members of the House, thank the honourable member for this information, because it has convinced me that I should vote for this Bill, as I consider we should have a Government Insurance Office (with office furniture and telephones). The member for Onkaparinga, who is Chairman of Directors of a company that is closely associated with insurance, said that his firm had offices in all the other States, which also have Government Insurance Offices, and that they did quite well, and that he did not see that the Government offices were doing much harm. The member for Burra, who is a self-confessed financial genius, said that he did not care very much whether or not we had a Government Insurance Office, although formally he had to oppose the Bill.

I now deal briefly with a case that has recently been referred to me. It is no different from the many other cases I have had over the years and, no doubt, all other honourable members who do their job properly have had similar complaints. The only thing different about this one is that it is current: it came to my notice very recently. It deals with a claim under an accident and sickness policy. This man came to me, and I spoke to his legal adviser, who told me he thought that this man had been badly treated by the company. The solicitor thought that the man would benefit by taking his case to the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, his client had reached the stage where he did not have any money to do this. This is not unusual.

When the man involved came to see me he told me that his doctor, an orthopaedic specialist, had said to him, "Well, you should get your accident policy paid all right, but I am not too sure really, as I find that there are complications in about 75 per cent of these cases". I rang the doctor the next day and told him what his patient, my constituent, had said, and asked him whether in the circumstances it would be fair for me to mention what he had said. The doctor, a prominent specialist in Adelaide, said that what he had told my constituent was substantially true. The only reservation he had was with regard to the percentage of cases (whether it was 75 per cent, 70 per cent or 80 per cent) in which there were complications through legal difficulties. However, he went as far as to say that there was a high proportion indeed. As I told the doctor that I would use this information in the debate, he knew for what I wanted it and therefore did not speak loosely on the subject. I have the following submission of my constituent's lawyer:

I have had the opportunity of reading the submissions dated December 6, 1966, and respectfully agree that probably the main issue in this matter is the meaning of "accidental . . . means" as contained in the insurance contract. The main premise of the argument is that there is a distinction in the meaning of such words as "accidental" and "accidental means" and in looking for such distinction what appears to be the common error of considering such words have a specific legal meaning is made. This approach leads to confusion and inconsistency which is readily apparent on reading the cases, including those cited.

It is impossible to determine what is meant by "accidental means" without first defining the word "accident". Such a word is not a legal term but is one used by ordinary people every day and therefore must be given its popular and ordinary meaning (but with

reference to legal liabilities) namely, "any unintended and unexpected occurrence which produces hurt or loss". However, it is often used to denote any unintended or unexpected loss or hurt apart from its cause, and is also used to denote both the cause and the effect with no attempt to discriminate between them.

Having established the meaning of the word "accident" the next step is to consider the context in which it appears, namely, a personal accident insurance policy. A person taking out such a policy (and this is a most important phrase) would think that he was insuring himself against fortuitous and unexpected injuries. It is submitted that this is the spirit of such policies as in the present case, which must be foremost in one's mind when interpreting the terms and scope of the policy.

Surely that is really the point. If a person takes out an accident policy he expects it to be interpreted in the spirit that he is given to understand is contained in the policy when it is sold to him. For example, this man had no idea that any legal impediment could be involved in a claim such as this. After his policy lapsed after he had had the accident, a salesman came out to ask him to renew it. He told the salesman to go somewhere (probably down the street) and, when the salesman asked him why he was adopting that attitude, he said that he had had an accident and was not being paid by the company. The salesman said that surely the company would not do that to him—but of course it did. I shall now refer to the following submission made in this case on behalf of the insurance company:

The real matter at issue in this arbitration is whether the injury was caused "solely or directly by violent accidental external and visible means". In the present case, in the light of the authorities, the issue is probably confined to whether or not the injury was caused by "accidental means". The words in question require the claimant to prove not merely that he suffered an "accidental injury" but that the injury was "caused by accidental means". The injury itself may have been accidental in the sense that it was neither foreseen nor anticipated as a result of the act of the insured, but the means may not have been accidental because externally what was done was precisely what the insured intended to do and was done in the manner in which he intended it.

The case reached the arbitrator. This man was a carpenter who had lifted a heavy box of tools into his truck and he slipped a disc, or something like that. Because what he did was what he intended to do and because he did it in the manner in which he had done it every morning for the three years prior to his accident, it was not deemed accidental.

The Hon. J. D. Coreoran: What if he had slipped?

Mr. JENNINGS: If his foot had slipped a couple of inches, that would have constituted an accident.

Mr. Clark: Surely the slipping of the disc was an accident?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes; it was in the sense that it was unforeseen and unexpected, but it was not the result of an accident in the sense that he had done something different from what he normally did.

The Hon. J. D. Coreoran: Who was to say his foot had not slipped?

Mr. JENNINGS: Unfortunately for him, he was an honest man and he told the truth before the lawyers and the arbitrator got at him. Consequently, the company got out for \$640. When the Premier introduced this legislation—

Mr. McKee: This is not an isolated case.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course not; I have come across numerous similar cases, but I have referred to this case because it happened only a few months ago and it was completely cleared up only this month. When the Premier introduced this legislation he pointed out the very dubious practices of some insurance companies. Subsequently, he was attacked by the Opposition with the argument that these practices do not occur; they say that reputable insurance companies do not take advantage of legal technicalities. I think every member of this House who has had to take up cases of this type knows that insurance companies do engage in these dubious practices, and I have just given one very good example.

I now wish to quote from a debate in the New South Wales Parliament in 1941; the Premier, Mr. McKell, as he then was, must have been a very honourable gentleman because he later became Governor-General. He introduced a Government Insurance (Amendment) Bill, and the following is an extract from his second reading speech:

This Bill, as I explained on the motion for leave to introduce, provides for the incorporation of the Government Insurance Office of New South Wales. It is proposed to give the corporation power to enter into all classes of insurance business, and also to vest assets in and to transfer liabilities to the corporation. The Bill also makes provision for the management and control of the office under the direction of a general manager. There is very little to be said in explaining the general principle of the Bill, which is simply that the present Government Insurance Office, which has been in operation now for many years and has been restricted in the scope of its

operations, shall be able to carry on all classes of insurance in the same way as private insurance companies.

The Government Insurance Office started as a branch of the Treasury some years ago, and its activities were extended as time went on. Some ten years ago those activities were severely limited and restricted, and as the result of that restriction and limitation the office suffered a very serious setback. Recently some of the powers that were denied the office were restored to it, but it was not possible, by administrative act, to give to the office that scope which the Government believes it should have. The Bill proposes to give the office that scope, and, in future, if it is passed, the Government Insurance Office will be able to launch out in the insurance world and compete with other insurance offices.

It has been suggested from time to time that there is great need for the Government Insurance Office to enter into the different classes of insurance business. With that suggestion the Government entirely agrees. The office, up to date, despite the limited powers it has had and despite the attempts made from time to time to curtail its activities, has an extraordinarily fine record of public service, and we believe that if it is allowed to enter into the general field of insurance it will become a great asset to the State. We also believe that it will give very fine and effective service to the public. Moreover, the Government Insurance Office will operate as a curb on the activities of the private insurance companies. The measure does very little more than provide for the incorporation of the office which will be empowered to accept all classes of insurance. Mr. Speaker, I come now to the reply from the Leader of the Opposition. In 1941, New South Wales had a Leader of the Opposition who was prepared to accept the will of the people with far more grace than is the present Opposition in this House.

Mr. Coumbe: Who was that?

Mr. JENNINGS: A man named Mr. Mair. He was well known in Parliamentary circles in New South Wales as "night-mair", because he used to get nightmares of frustration at being unable to form a Government and impose a gerrymander similar to the Playford gerrymander in South Australia. I invite members to listen to what Mr. Mair said on that occasion, for it will surely be extremely interesting to members on this side and should be interesting also to members opposite. He said:

Naturally, for more reasons than one, I am very interested in this Bill. In my opening comments I simply take the attitude that it is part of the policy of the present Government, as announced during the election campaign. For that reason, it would be wrong to place a serious obstacle in the way of carrying out a promise given to the electors, particularly when, to an extent, the Government Insurance Office is a necessity and when the statute makes it necessary, or obligatory, to carry some forms of insurance.

That was the Leader of a Liberal Party in New South Wales. I particularly emphasize his words:

I simply take the attitude that it is part of the policy of the present Government, as announced during the election campaign. For that reason, it would be wrong to place a serious obstacle in the way of carrying out a promise given to the electors.

Mr. Mair said more on the subject, and seeing that we have developed such an affection for him I should give him a little more notoriety by having him quoted also in the South Australian *Hansard*. He continued:

I believe that the underlying reason for the birth of the Government Insurance Office was to make provision for workers' compensation insurance. When Parliament passed legislation making it compulsory to insure against certain risk the Government was under the obligation to create machinery to enable that risk to be covered at a reasonable rate of premium. The two factors are integral, and the one must operate to enable the other to be implemented efficiently and economically. With regard specifically to workers' compensation insurance, honourable members know from past experience there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction with the rates charged by private insurance companies. When I was Minister for Labour and Industry I made a thorough investigation of the matter, and I was satisfied that while there might not have been abuses, the rates charged were very close to that element. In other words, I was satisfied that it was necessary to increase the operation and authority of the Government Insurance Office in order to prevent exploitation and abuse, or near abuse. I do not believe in any form of exploitation. The rates charged were a heavy drain on industry and manufacturers complained about the terrific load that they were asked to carry for these risks in New South Wales.

Those remarks were made by the Leader of the Liberal Opposition in New South Wales, who had been a Liberal Minister for Labour and Industry in that State. Let me summarize the situation. The Bill before the House is an attempt to give effect to an election promise that was endorsed by the people. It introduces a genuine element of competition, not another insurance organization that can join an association with all other insurance companies. Because of that, I think it is likely to create genuine competition with the insurance companies rather than the kind of competition that exists now. There is a great probability that the State Government Insurance Commission will operate profitably and that it will benefit the shareholders, who will be the taxpayers of South Australia. As the Premier has said correctly, the commission will provide a source of loans

that will be freely available to semi-governmental instrumentalities in this State. I repeat that I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I oppose the Bill. I do not intend to cover the detail that has been dealt with by other members, but I shall refer to some principles. I have listened to the fulminations of the member for Enfield for about 70 minutes and I think that it is time we got back to the Bill. I, as a captive audience, could not help listening to what the member for Enfield said about what had happened in New South Wales in 1941. He quoted rather extensively about that but did say that the circumstances operating in New South Wales at that time were completely different from those now operating in South Australia. Government Insurance had operated in New South Wales since 1927. What member would have been game to suggest that the Bill be completely opposed? In 1941 the then Opposition was considering a Government amendment, but here we have a completely new Bill to set up an entirely new office. It is futile to try to compare the then Leader of the Opposition in New South Wales with our present Leader; it is farcical, because the Leader and the Opposition here are properly entitled to criticize this Bill, as it provides for a new set-up. Indeed, we would be failing in our duty if we did not criticize it.

Let us look at its details. I suggest in all seriousness that it is not necessary to introduce it if the Government can achieve what I believe it wants to by other means and in a much simpler and quicker way. The Government here is using a sledge-hammer to crack a nut. What did the Premier say when explaining this Bill? He gave two main reasons to justify its promotion:

(a) to keep premiums low; and (b) to ensure by competition that adequate service is given to the public.

It is on those two reasons that he hung the whole of his arguments. A little later he said:

The Government has received complaints, most of which are concerned not with premium rates but with the other matters which I have just mentioned.

Yet the very first point on which he hung his argument was that this would keep premiums low. Once again the Premier was not consistent. He damned his own argument immediately after putting forward his two main reasons for introducing the Bill. He said he was trying to keep premiums low, but he said also that he had received complaints concerned not with premium rates but with other matters.

Let us take away half of the argument and deal with the other half—"to ensure by competition that adequate service is given to the public". This is a point on which a number of members opposite have spoken. I perceive that the member for Semaphore, who has spoken on this matter in other debates, is about to get up in an attempt to justify the Government's action in this regard, because I know he has had experience of this. The Premier then went on to cite some of the things he maintained were causing trouble and about which he was getting complaints. He started talking about the arbitration section of many policies of various types, both assurance and insurance, issued by insurance companies. He mentioned the State Arbitration Act. This is the Arbitration Act dealing not with hours and conditions but with contracts. I interjected then and said:

Can you amend the other Act?

The Premier replied that rather than amend the other Act he would prefer to introduce this Bill. It is competent for us to amend our own Arbitration Acts to take care of the arbitration clauses that the Government alleges are causing trouble. If this is not enough, I remind the House that the point competently made by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) yesterday would cover this matter adequately. Provisions to do this are contained in the Victorian State Insurance Act. The Government could have chosen either method and, by amendment supported by the majority in the House, could have avoided introducing the present legislation and thus causing the expense and trouble of setting up a State Insurance Office. The Premier then explained the type of business to be handled by the insurance office, and said that it would give adequate service to policy holders. Mr. Millhouse interjected and said, "I take it you have had the advice of the Public Actuary?" Much to everyone's surprise the Premier said, "No, but I have had the advice of research students in this field."

Mr. Nankivell: Who are they?

Mr. COUMBE: I do not know, and the Premier did not say. I understood that an actuary was employed by life assurance companies and that it was on his recommendations that most business was undertaken. Such a person compiles the life expectancy table on which premiums were based. The Premier admitted that he had not bothered to get the advice of the State Public Actuary, an expert in this matter. In addition to being a slight to this officer, this action was a grave error.

These students may be doing post-graduate work or they could be a group of undergraduates. Apparently, we are to believe that the Bill is based not on the advice of a highly regarded senior public servant but on the advice of unknown and unnamed research students.

Mr. Nankivell: A few more faceless men.

Mr. COUMBE: A few years ago a delay occurred in dealing with superannuation for public servants because the office of Public Actuary was vacant. Fortunately, the position has since been filled, but apparently this officer has not been consulted about this legislation. Life assurance offices will employ all the qualified actuaries that are available, and this circumstance caused some difficulty in filling a similar office in the Public Service. The companies regard these trained men as being a most important part of their organization. The Premier then referred to funds that the insurance office might have available to invest in the same way as long-established offices (especially life offices) invest their funds in semi-government and other securities. I believe here that the Premier was issuing a threat, and I again quote his remarks from *Hansard* (page 487) as follows:

In other States the Government Insurance Offices have from time to time given much support to semi-governmental loan raising, but we do not have a similar fund available in South Australia to cover any gap that may occur in these loan raisings. Indeed, the Government of South Australia can be subjected to much pressure from large financial institutions which threaten that, unless certain financial policies are followed by the Government, they will not be prepared to assist semi-governmental raisings.

Mr. Nankivell: Can he substantiate that statement?

Mr. COUMBE: No, because the member for Mitcham interjected and said, "Have you had such threats?" and the Premier replied:

I am not going to say anything further than that: I simply say that it is a possibility.

First, the Premier makes an imputation against the State's mercantile institutions and then, when pressed to say whether he has any proof of that, he says that he will say nothing more than that it is a possibility. I believe that is a grave insult to many of our reputable, worthwhile and long-established mercantile institutions. The Premier, by saying that, has done a disservice not only to those companies but also to himself and his Party. A little later he said:

So, apart from the two reasons I have given for the setting up of a Government Insurance

Office, the added fact that at any time there would normally be available from that insurance fund moneys that could be made available towards meeting any gap in semi-governmental loan raisings could be of considerable assistance to any Government in this State regardless of its political complexion. At that stage I interjected and said, "Did you have any trouble filling those gaps before?" and the following passage then appears in *Hansard*:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. As the honourable member knows, recently the Electricity Trust loan was filled in an extremely short period, and investors in South Australia have come forward with enthusiasm to support the loan raisings of this Government.

Mr. Coumbe: As they have in the past.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As they have in the past, because they have confidence in the future of this State . . .

Once again, the Premier is making imputations which, I believe, are unworthy of him and do not support his case in any way. Apart from the two aspects I have mentioned, why is this Bill being considered? The Premier has been talking about profits that will accrue from the measure, but where will the profits (if any) go? Will they go back in benefits to policy holders? Is this to be a mutual undertaking?

Mr. Nankivell: It is in New South Wales.

Mr. COUMBE: I am aware of that. Having closely examined the Bill, I find a specific provision that the profits will go back (and have to go back) to the General Revenue of South Australia; they will not be passed back in benefits by way of bonuses to the policy holders, as is the case in all the mutual companies in this State and throughout Australia. I invite members to peruse clause 3 (3) of the Bill (and this is about the first time the Bill has been referred to by any speaker—certainly tonight, anyway), which provides:

In the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the commission shall be subject to the control and directions of the Government of the State acting through the Minister; but no such direction shall be inconsistent with this Act.

Clause 16 provides:

The commission may invest the moneys in the funds established under and for the purposes of this Act . . . in temporary deposits with the Treasurer upon such terms and conditions as the Treasurer may determine.

This means that the commission, if it wants to invest its surplus, if it has a surplus, will be subject to the direction of the Minister as to where it shall be invested, that is, in the Treasury, and at what rates. This type of

investment is extremely competitive, and for insurance companies to survive they must obtain the best possible rates on their investment. Here we find that the Government Insurance Office will be quoted a rate of investment that will be favourable not to the office but to the State Treasury. Clause 17 (4) provides:

Where at the end of any financial year a profit is disclosed in the accounts of the commission such portion of such profit as the Chairman, the Under-Treasurer and the Auditor-General deem advisable shall be carried to a reserve and any balance shall be paid to the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the extent directed by the Governor.

The important word there is "shall", which means that this is mandatory, but if the word were the permissive "may", this provision might be workable. However, the word is "shall", so there is no choice. Therefore, if this venture is to be profitable the profits are not to go back to the policy holders in the way of bonuses and relief: they must go to Consolidated Revenue Account. Therefore, it is open to considerable argument that this is also a money-making venture for the Government—a means of getting money into the State Treasury.

Mr. Quirke: Another form of indirect taxation.

Mr. COURCE: Yes, and I point out that, unlike other insurance offices, the State Insurance Office does not pay income tax.

Mr. Nankivell: It pays it to the Treasury!

Mr. Casey: It does pay stamp duty.

Mr. COURCE: Yes, that is because the Government would suffer a loss of revenue if stamp duty were not imposed. It has been suggested by the promoters of the Bill and by subsequent speakers on the other side that this undertaking can be profitable.

Mr. Quirke: Should it be?

Mr. COURCE: I am asking whether it can be? As I said earlier, the mutual societies pay a large part of their profits back to the policy holders by way of bonuses. I suppose that almost every honourable member, either now is, or in the past has been, a policy holder of one or another of the large mutual assurance societies in this State. Policy holders pay their premiums and know what bonuses they will get. When one takes out a policy with a company, one asks the salesman, "What bonuses will I get?" The reply to that question depends on the profitability of the company. I have figures for 1965 which indicate that throughout Australia the amount of surplus on selling insurance and paying out premiums (this has nothing to do with the investment of funds)

was 1.47 per cent. That is a mighty small percentage, and it is hardly likely that a Government Insurance Office would make a large profit. A profit for it later on would depend on its being able to build up a fund and investing it wisely at a high rate of interest. However, as the funds of this office are to be invested with the Treasury, I do not think the Treasurer would pay a high rate of interest at the expense of running down his own fund.

Mr. Nankivell: He can invest in the form of temporary deposits at whatever rate he likes.

Mr. COURCE: The member for Enfield spoke about other State Insurance Offices and quoted some reports. We have heard of difficulties experienced by most companies today, particularly with regard to motor vehicle insurance. In his 1966 report, the Victorian Insurance Commissioner states:

In these days of difficulties in underwriting, most insurers rely heavily on income derived from the full investment of their funds to produce a favourable overall picture, and we cannot expect to be an exception.

The 1966 report of the Tasmanian Insurance Office states:

It appears that we are becoming more dependent on interest from investments than insurance underwriting to obtain a reasonable surplus.

This emphasizes the point I am making that insurance companies today are not making profits from their policies: they make profits by being able to invest the funds they have built up over many years. Thus they have a return and can keep their premiums at a reasonable level. Without this investment income they would surely have to raise the amount of the premiums they require from policy holders. I emphasize that point because the only way to keep premiums down is to have investment income.

Government Insurance Offices in other States have been established for many years, the first being established in 1914. Of course, when these companies were first established motor vehicle insurance (if it was thought of at all) would have been in its infancy. Workmen's Compensation Acts, which are today comprehensive, were quite different in their impact. For instance, compulsory third party insurance was not introduced in Australia until the early 1930's. Of course, this type of insurance has been a drain on companies to this day. Therefore, it could be said that for the first 50 years of their operations, Government Insurance Offices in other States have been able to build up their funds fairly solidly without having

the heavy withdrawals now experienced through motor vehicle accidents and more expensive types of workmen's compensation policies.

I suggest that companies are able to meet the calls made upon them and keep premiums low because of the income received from their investments. Therefore, how can any company starting this year build up reserves in competition with existing companies which have reserves they have built up over many years? How can a Government Insurance Office in South Australia provide a return to its policy holders that they should be able to expect and not run at a loss that the general taxpayer in South Australia will have to make up?

Mr. Burdon: Didn't you people use the same argument against the establishment of a State lottery?

Mr. CUMBE: No; that illustrates the honourable member's complete ignorance on this point. If he carefully reads my speech in *Hansard* tomorrow he will see the point that I am trying to make and which must be made in this debate.

Mr. Burdon: It is the same argument that has been used previously and in every other State.

Mr. CUMBE: I wish the member for Mount Gambier would keep up with the progress of this debate. The fact that insurance premiums are tending to rise is known to most members of this House and to most members of the general public. If they are not rising in the life assurance field, they will certainly rise for motor car third party insurance. In fact, only last week in New South Wales the Government Insurance Officer, Mr. Porter, said that car premiums would rise there, and it has been suggested that they may rise by 25 per cent. We know that increases and adjustments have been made in South Australia, especially for drivers up to 25 years of age, not only in premiums but certainly in the first amount of money that must be paid by the insured in the case of an accident.

I wish to refer again to the matter of an actuary, upon which the Premier did not satisfy us. I was interested to read the provisions of this Bill that deal with reports by the Auditor-General, but nowhere did I find that actuarial reports must be made.

Mr. Nankivell: Research students have worked all this out.

Mr. CUMBE: We have dealt with that, although I am grateful for the honourable member's reminder. I want to see what will happen after the Government Insurance Office is set up; we cannot use research students for

that job—they may have been honorary. I remind members that all insurance companies in Australia except State Government Insurance Offices are compelled by Commonwealth legislation to submit a report to the Commonwealth Insurance Commissioner. The Commonwealth Constitution clearly sets out that the Commonwealth has power to legislate for insurance other than that dealt with by State Government Insurance offices; all other insurance offices in Australia must make an annual return to the Commonwealth Insurance Commissioner which is examined actuarially, but, under the Commonwealth Constitution, State Government Insurance Offices are exempt from this provision if they operate intrastate.

Consequently, there is no provision for an actuary to examine the operations of the proposed Government Insurance Office and to advise the commission. I realize that one of the commissioners may be an actuary or the commission may employ an actuary, but I should like a clause to be inserted in this Bill that provides for an actuarial examination or report. I am sure that the first person who would appreciate such a provision would be the Auditor-General; indeed, I should not be surprised if he insisted on it. In addition, I believe that this Parliament, which will be receiving the commission's report, would appreciate an actuarial report. This Parliament is entitled to see a comment by an actuary on the operations of the proposed Government Insurance Office, if it eventuates.

There has been some comment in the newspapers of recent days about the setting up of a State Insurance Office, especially as it affects the staffs working in insurance offices in Adelaide and throughout South Australia. The first report I saw in this regard was a statement by the Premier that appeared in the *Advertiser* of July 18 (yesterday). Part of that article, headed "Job Threat Denied", is as follows:

The Premier said: "The Insurance Staffs Federation enthusiastically supports the establishment of a Government Insurance Office and has approached me to make that clear."

Mr. Nankivell: I wonder on what authority he made that statement?

Mr. CUMBE: That is what I want to examine. I was extremely interested in this, because in this morning's *Advertiser* there appeared a letter from a Mr. O'Toole of Beaumont. That letter, headed "Government Insurance", is very germane to this argument, and I commend Mr. O'Toole for the way in which he prepared it. The letter is as follows:

The Premier is reported (18/7/67) to have said: "The Insurance Staffs Federation enthusiastically supports the establishment of a Government Insurance Office and has approached me to make that clear."

I would like to know on what authority such a statement has been made for no meeting of members of the federation has been called for the purpose of inviting an expression of opinion. Indeed, if a meeting were called for such a purpose I have no doubt that the vote would be overwhelmingly against the establishment of a Government Insurance Office.

Mr. Ryan: He is not sure though, is he?

Mr. Langley: Some people said that about the lottery.

Mr. CUMBE: The letter continues:

If the Premier's statement has been made in good faith and accurately reported, he must be relying upon an expression of opinion which seems both ill-founded and unauthorized. However the statement came to be printed, it is most upsetting to a solid non-political body of unionists who resent the imputation. It is clear that in a matter such as this neither the executive of the federation nor any of its officers is competent to speak for members without reference to them. I, in common with many other members, am contemplating requisitioning a meeting to challenge the authority of whoever told the Premier this.

That letter is signed by A. S. O'Toole.

Mr. Ryan: Apparently he has not read the Federation Journal.

Mr. CUMBE: I then saw in tonight's *News*, which came into this House a few hours ago, a comment by the Premier. This article, headed "Premier's Reply on Insurance", is as follows:

Officers of the Insurance Staffs Federation had expressed "general support for the principle" of a State Government insurance office, the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said today. He was commenting on a letter from a federation member, Mr. A. S. O'Toole, who challenged the right of the federation's officers or executive to speak for members without reference to them. Mr. O'Toole said he would like to know on what authority the Premier has said in Parliament: "The federation enthusiastically supports the establishment of a Government Insurance Office and has approached me to make that clear".

Also in today's *News* is a letter signed by "U Berrimae fidei".

Mr. Langley: He is not game to sign his name.

Mr. CUMBE: I understand that that Latin phrase means "In utmost faith". The letter, headed "Smarting", is as follows:

Insurance staffs generally are smarting at the Premier's apparent maligning of company practices and the industry in general, which, of course, must include the thousands of people directly employed in it. The meagre credit he gives is limited to "satisfactory" service on fire and household insurance.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Honourable members are rather quiet, aren't they?

Mr. Langley: What's the use of commenting? He is not game to sign his name.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders require honourable members to remain quiet while an honourable member is addressing the Chair.

Mr. CUMBE: All the other letters that I have referred to bore names, which I gave. I shall quote this letter and cut it short if the member for Unley wishes me to do so. It reads:

This is pretty rough treatment towards an industry whose total business is founded on the "utmost of good faith". We are probably fortunate that the Bill follows fairly smartly on the Tasmanian bushfire experience, following which insurance companies were applauded by the Tasmanian Labor Premier, Mr. Reece, and in all other places for their efficient and generous attitudes towards claims settlements, otherwise we might have missed any compliment whatever. The Premier is obviously scraping around in the bin for the scruffy little tidbits to lay before members of Parliament in order that he might achieve the directions of his Labor councils.

Mr. Ryan: Read the rest of the letter. He went on about Sukarno.

Mr. CUMBE: I am about to do that. Surely I am allowed to stop and take a breath. The letter continues:

At least when Prime Minister Chifley sought to nationalise the banks, he did not launch a Sukarno-like abuse campaign on an honourable profession. He told the people that he wished to control the banks for the cash value they represented to a Government of the day. The real reason behind the present Government Insurance Bill is aimed in precisely the same direction.

The point of all this is that the Insurance Staff Federation was delighted at the Premier's reception about an entirely different matter, because the executive of the federation went to the Premier with a request that, when the State Government Insurance Commission was set up, the members of the federation would not become public servants and would not be subject to the Public Service Commissioner's direction. A provision covering that has been written into the Bill and that is what the federation is delighted about, as it should be. I am told that the rank and file of the federation have never been consulted about the setting up of the commission.

Mr. Ryan: Have you any authority for that statement?

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. I shall tell the member outside the House afterwards.

Mr. Ryan: An unsigned letter in a newspaper?

Mr. COURCELLE: No. Unlike the member for Port Adelaide, I do not use those methods.

Mr. Ryan: You have quoted two of them.

Mr. COURCELLE: Mr. O'Toole, who signed his letter to the newspaper, was incensed because the organization of which he was a member had been used for political purposes. The executive of the federation gave an undertaking on one narrow point. It was said by the Premier during the debate that no federation member would lose his job in the office he was working in. The State Government Insurance Commission must be staffed by competent officers if it is to get the organization going, build up its funds and give the service that it must give and is expected to give. Where will the commission get its staff?

Mr. Clark: It does not seem that people will lose jobs. It seems that the establishment of the commission will create more jobs, doesn't it?

Mr. COURCELLE: I suggest seriously to the House that the State Government Insurance Office in order to build up its funds will have to attract a large volume of business. That is obvious. It has been stated that Government insurance will be placed with this office. It is certain that semi-governmental undertakings will be requested (if I may use that word, which is polite) to deal with this office. Probably councils will be requested to do likewise, as has happened under a Labor Government in Tasmania, where councils have to insure with the State office. It may happen here. If it does, it will immediately take away much business at present being transacted efficiently by our insurance offices. Yet the Premier has said that no federation member will lose his job in his office. That is what will happen when this new organization gets under way. Members opposite believe that this Bill is a new deal. They have mentioned various cases, such as the members for Enfield, Port Adelaide and West Torrens have experienced, but this will not be the panacea of all ills, or the alpha and omega.

The State office will have to pay out to all and sundry. The only way in which it can work efficiently and compete (as the Premier wants it to) in free competition with other insurance offices is to give as good a service as they give. It will not be able to reduce the benefits it will have to give to the policy holders. If it does, it will find itself smartly in the red.

I sum up by repeating that this Bill is not necessary. If the Government wants to achieve what it says it wants to, it can be done in another way; it can be done simply and with similar results but much more quickly, with much less fuss and certainly more cheaply for the taxpayers of South Australia. It can be done by different legislation from this. This is the wrong way to go about it. The benefits that members opposite suggest will be possible will not be passed on, and the policy holders with the Government Insurance Office will not get the results the Government expects they will. Therefore, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I support the Bill. It is difficult to understand the expressions of members opposite. We have for 30 years or so lacked many facilities in this State. I see no reason why the State Government should be debarred from entering the field of insurance. I shall not refer to figures already cited by my colleague the member for Mount Gambier indicating the advantages of Government Insurance Offices in other States of Australia. The member for Port Adelaide, in supporting the Bill, made a wonderful contribution in presenting the history of the establishment of insurance offices in other States.

Mr. Burdon: Those offices have been outstanding successes.

Mr. HURST: Of course. The member for Enfield did much research, and we were privileged to listen to his outstanding contribution in support of the Bill. Since the Labor Government assumed office it has been inundated with questions from Opposition members trying to ascertain when it would give effect to its policy which was enunciated by our Leader and which was endorsed overwhelmingly by the electors in 1965. I believe opposition to this measure has been caused because the member for Mitcham has forgotten to ask a question about it. Apparently, he overlooked it in his usual haste but, because the Government introduced the Bill, Opposition members decided to oppose it. They were ill-advised, and their action is contrary to the policy of their National Party. Opposition members are parochial: that is why they are in Opposition, and they will remain so because of their attitude to this legislation. Wide-spread support to establish an insurance office has come not only from trade unions but also from many other spheres. Two weeks ago a businessman asked me when the Government would introduce a Bill to establish an insurance office. Many

people are looking forward to it and, like other social reforms, it will receive the overwhelming support of the electors. The Opposition has given the kiss of death to its opportunity to regain the Treasury benches for at least 15 years, and that is not a wild prediction.

Mr. Burdon: Don't you think they are out of step with their colleagues in other States?

Mr. HURST: Of course. In the Brisbane *Sunday Mail* of June 18 this year, Mr. Chalk, the Treasurer of Queensland, who to my knowledge is not a member of the Labor Party (I don't think he has done a switch, but is still the Treasurer in the Liberal Party) is reported to have said:

The State Government Insurance Office provided the best service that could be given and its part in backing loans for the Government was fantastic.

We want similar backing in South Australia. The revenue gained since the commencement of the State lotteries makes it obvious that we should have an insurance office. We were told that it was not opportune to introduce a lottery; according to Opposition members the time is never opportune to introduce social reform for the benefit of the people of the State. I am anxious to see this measure implemented as soon as possible. The member for Flinders, when speaking to this debate, said:

There was a time, probably 15 or 20 years ago, when several insurance companies of doubtful origin appeared in South Australia to canvass for business and at that time strong action was taken to stop this problem from developing.

No strong action was ever taken by members opposite in regard to any matter affecting the State. Indeed, we have experienced in this State in the 1960's (unfortunately for people insured with the companies concerned) certain companies going into liquidation. People going to the trouble of taking out insurance to cover risks that might be encountered have been unable to obtain payment on claims they have lodged not through the fault of the branches operating in this State but through bad investments made by the branches' counterparts in other States.

Only last year a case was referred to me in which judgment had been given in 1962 for \$10,000, not one cent of which my constituent has collected. It is interesting to note that the person's legal advisers were not above suggesting that the Government be responsible for meeting part of the sum. If it is good enough to refer such matters to the Government of the day, regardless of its financial position, surely it is good enough for that Government

to participate in some of the lucrative returns that are readily available in the insurance field.

Many of us know of the delays and frustrations experienced by people who justifiably claim on a policy (in respect of which they believe they are effectively covered against a particular risk) but who, through some fine legal point, are denied the sum to which they are entitled. Some members on the other side are concerned as to where the staff for the office will be found. The Electricity Trust decided a few years ago to carry its own workmen's compensation insurance. It had no difficulty in obtaining competent officers to administer that department; indeed, it has been most successful. Further, it has not stuck to the minimum requirements in respect of workmen's compensation: it has been paying over the amounts prescribed in the Workmen's Compensation Act and it has been awarding its employees their full weekly rate of pay when they have been off as a result of injury.

That demonstrates that this is a lucrative field, and I know from personal experience as a result of transactions in 1962 with insurance companies that there are many other lucrative fields. This position has been known for many years. Even in the United State of America the trade union movement has realized what a lucrative field insurance is. I know no reason why the fruits of these policies should not be diverted in the direction of improved social services. What can be gained from workmen's compensation and other policies, which are a must in a modern society, could be spent on the promotion of safety and education in industry. This would be a very wise investment, as insurance is generally designed to cover people when they encounter hardship or suffer an injury. It is far better not to suffer disability than to collect insurance benefits, because no sum can compensate a person for an injury he has suffered. I am confident that the Government Insurance Office will be a success and will be another social reform concerning which, in the years to come, members opposite will be scanning the *Hansard* report of this debate to find out how they can construe some of their remarks in order to make it appear that they have supported the Bill. I am sure they will be keen to jump on the band waggon.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I wish to deal primarily with only two features of the Bill. I was surprised and concerned when I heard some of the statements made by the Premier regarding the integrity of the insurance companies in South Australia. From my experience, as Treasurer,

of the insurance companies of this State for about 26 or 27 years, I can say that there is nothing to substantiate the statement made by the Premier regarding the sharp practices of insurance companies here. Our insurance companies have the highest reputation and have given good service to the community. As a matter of interest, members will know that, when the Government introduced compulsory third party insurance on motor vehicles, the Treasurer had the duty of establishing a committee to examine premiums and to see that motorists received a fair deal. If there is one type of insurance that can create difficulties it is insurance of that type. Obviously, no company wants to insure accident-prone drivers of whom, unfortunately, there are many on the roads. However, in over 26 years only two cases arose involving this type of insurance in which I had to take up with an insurance company a decision.

Of course, premiums charged by companies are fixed by a Government-appointed committee of which Sir Edgar Bean (who was for 30 years Parliamentary Draftsman and of whose integrity members are aware) is Chairman. On what grounds does the Premier belittle institutions that have given tremendous service to the State and have loyally supported Government loans? I venture to suggest that no State in the Commonwealth has received such good support from insurance companies as South Australia has received in regard to raising public moneys. Frequently an entire loan is underwritten before it is put on the market. To suggest that more money will be available when a State Insurance Office is established cannot be borne out by facts. In any case, every penny that the Loan Council has permitted us to raise has been raised. Not once, in 25 years, have we had the slightest difficulty in raising the money the State wants. Nor have we faced difficulty in having semi-governmental loans subscribed, and that position has also obtained since the present Government came into office. The Premier had to admit recently that the Electricity Trust loan had been oversubscribed in a short time. This position has come about because all types of insurance company have always stood loyally behind the activities of the State.

What is the real reason for the establishment of a State Insurance Office? The Labor Party platform refers to it indefinitely as a subject that must be considered. It has taken two years for the Government to get around to dealing with this matter, and I believe that

the only real reason for the introduction of this Bill is to raise money. Every honourable member here knows that the Government has already raided the trust deposits in the hands of the Treasurer, that the Government has already raided the Highways Fund, that the Government has already raided the Loan funds to balance the Budget, and that the Government has also called in all sorts of advances that would have been made to industry by a Liberal Government.

In all these things the Labor Government's aim has been to get money. However, the Treasurer is up against the hard fact that he has raised taxation wherever possible; next year he will be confronted with an election, and it is significant that at the same time as we are debating this Bill the Treasurer is hoping that he will not have to raise taxes further this year. The speeches of Government members have dealt lovingly with the suggestion that the Government Insurance Office will make big profits; I believe not only that this is the purpose of the Bill but also that it has been deliberately designed to achieve that purpose.

If the Government was really anxious to look after the interests of people who deal with insurance companies, why did it not do what has been done in so many other instances? Why did it not establish the office without drawing off its funds? Let me outline the provisions that relate to the Government's drawing money from the commission and appropriating it for general purposes. The member for Torrens referred to this matter. Clause 3 (3) provides:

In the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the commission shall be subject to the control and directions of the Government of the State acting through the Minister; but no such direction shall be inconsistent with this Act.

Therefore, the Minister can direct anything not inconsistent with this Act. I shall now turn to some of the things that are not inconsistent with this Act. Clause 16 provides:

The commission may invest the moneys in the funds established under and for the purposes of this Act—

- (a) in any investments on which a trustee is by section 5 of the Trustee Act, 1936-1953, or by any amendment of that section or any enactment substituted therefor, authorized to invest trust funds;
- (b) in temporary deposits with the Treasurer upon such terms and conditions as the Treasurer may determine;

So, the Treasurer may direct the commission to put money into the hands of the Treasurer

on temporary deposit at any rate of interest and under any condition that he likes to determine.

Mr. Coumbe: To his advantage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The Government talks about establishing a commission in the interests of the public, whereas its aim in establishing a commission is purely and simply to try to attract money by subterfuge. The commission is not designed to give service to the community at all. As honourable members opposite know, the Government's idea is purely and simply to try to draw off money to enable it to put into effect some of its ideas which are not financially sound and which could get it into considerable financial difficulty. One or two other provisions in the Bill are equally obnoxious. Clause 15 provides:

Every policy or contract of insurance or indemnity issued or entered into within the authority of this Act is hereby guaranteed by the Government of the State and any liability arising under such guarantee shall, without further or other appropriation than this section, be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Is that not a beautiful play on words? It says not that it shall be paid but that it shall be payable, which is a totally different thing, of course. In other words, if there is anything to take in, the Government will take it in, but the provision is that if there is anything to pay out it shall merely "be payable". Honourable members opposite know that the Bill has been designed with the idea of attracting additional moneys for the purposes of the State, and that it has nothing at all to do with a service that is to be provided for insurance. If the question of the service to the community entered into it, what possible justification would there be for establishing an "assurance" office? At present there are mutual assurance companies which are available to the public and from which all of the accrued profits are ultimately paid out to the policy holders by way of bonuses.

Obviously, "assurance" is included because in assurance business fairly substantial sums of money are held pending, of course, the ultimate pay-out to insured persons. Assurance companies, as a matter of course, have in their possession large sums of money which are actuarially required to meet the obligations arising under the policies they have issued. Assurance is included not because of the desire to give any service to the public but purely and simply in an attempt by the Government to get extra revenues or to attract extra money which it can divert to its own purposes: it has

nothing at all to do with any benefit to the public, which is supposed to be the reason for the establishment of the commission.

I hope I have made myself clear on this matter. I believe this Bill has been introduced as a measure to assist the public in obtaining insurance but that it is not really designed for that purpose at all. I believe it is introduced to assist the Government in attracting some additional money for the purpose of its own policies. Therefore, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I rise with much pleasure to support the Bill. I had been waiting to hear a speech on this Bill from the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford), for whom I have a great deal of respect. However, on this occasion I do not think he earned that respect. Most of those who have followed this debate know that the Leader of the Opposition said earlier that we were going to lose money because of the introduction of a State Government Insurance Commission. Later (and I hope members will correct me if I am wrong in this) another member for whose opinion I have some respect, the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), also suggested that, but it seems that the member for Rocky River differs with his Leader, because he also said that the idea of introducing the Bill was to enable the Government to make big profits before the coming election. The Opposition cannot have it both ways and, when members contradict one another, I cannot have much faith in what they say. I shall not make a choice in regard to their opinions.

I do not intend to make a long speech. I shall regard what I say as a footnote to the debate and in these days, unlike Victorian times, footnotes are fairly brief. It would appear from the remarks of some members that Australia was the only country that had Government insurance. However, that is not so. Government insurance was established in New Zealand as long ago as 1869-70 and many European countries have had Government insurance for many years. It operated in Italy for many years until it was abolished by Mussolini. Most of the States of Germany, and Germany itself when the States combined into one nation, had Government insurance before it was abolished by Hitler. On this occasion, the Opposition in the South Australian House of Assembly agrees with the Nazis and the Fascists. I am not suggesting that this happens regularly, but the Opposition agrees with the Nazis and the Fascists because they do not like Socialism. Of course, although it has been

suggested continually that the establishment of a commission is a socialistic measure, no person can be convinced that the setting up of another insurance organization is Socialism. We are not trying to take over the whole of the insurance business in South Australia. We could not do that even if we desired to do so.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That will come.

Mr. CLARK: The honourable gentleman suggests that that will come, although he must know that it would be impossible because of the provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It has been advocated for long enough by the Australian Labor Party, particularly by Eddie Ward.

Mr. CLARK: I am not suggesting that it has not been advocated. It could be a very good thing. I am simply saying that we could not do it even if we wanted to. No-one is trying to do it and the establishment of the commission is not Socialism. It seems from what Opposition members have been saying that the Opposition believes in free enterprise for everyone except the State Government. Although it has not been easy to follow this debate, I have tried to do so, because State Government insurance is a matter in which I and other members on this side have had a keen interest for many years. During the last few months I have listened to the Opposition prophets of doom, decay, disaster, disillusion and despair. This seems to be the general tactic at the moment: the Opposition is using this Bill as a stick with which to beat the Government. However, it has not raised any bruises so far in this debate or caused any wounds because, as far as I can see and hear, the attack has once again been completely ineffective. This seems to be the ruling and customary tactic of the Opposition these days.

I was given a good example on Saturday of the tactics being used by the Opposition, in connection not only with this Bill but with practically every piece of legislation introduced by this Government, which after all was elected by the people of South Australia with a handsome majority which, I confidently believe, will be increased next March. On Saturday I was bored to the extremities of boredom. I had two friends with me and for once I did not have anything to do on a Saturday afternoon, which is remarkable. So I took the opportunity, with my two friends, of trying to listen to the broadcast of a football match. I will not mention the station

doing the broadcast, but any of my colleagues who have tried to listen to this station will know the one I mean. It concentrates on racing. In fact, it would broadcast the names of the starters and riders and give a running description of a race at Wongadinga dam or Woop Woop water hole, if there was a meeting there.

I have become accustomed to this station. I make this point legitimately. Usually, we can be sure that from it we shall get a broadcast description of at least six minutes of each quarter of a football game. On that Saturday, we got only five minutes because we had the doubtful pleasure of listening to election scatters announced over the station as being by Robin Millhouse and Steele Hall. These valuable statements disgust people trying to hear some sporting results. There is nothing very sporting about the announcements they make. The effect on everybody I have spoken to about it has been the reverse of what they wanted. Nobody on a Saturday afternoon wants to hear the member for Mitcham and the Leader of the Opposition pedalling their poison to the unsuspecting public.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: We are getting enough poison from over there.

Mr. CLARK: As a matter of fact, as regards the type of propaganda going out, let me illustrate how blind the Opposition is to public opinion. This week information was sought on an article written by a schoolboy or schoolgirl (I do not know which).

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I do not know, either.

Mr. CLARK: The honourable Leader of the Opposition was writing himself down. Surely this is simply a sign of (I do not know quite how to put it) fatuous egotism and blind indifference to public opinion. Exactly the same thing happened in this debate. I am convinced, because of the many queries I have received, that most people in South Australia want a State Insurance Office established here.

Mr. Millhouse: Surely you don't believe that.

Mr. CLARK: Of course I do. I particularly thank the member for Port Adelaide for reminding me of the debate in 1924, 43 years ago, when a Bill was introduced to set up a State Insurance Office. It did not reach the Committee stage in another place but it passed this Chamber. That would be in the pre-gerrymander period when Opposition members were smarting and snarling because they had lost the divine right to govern.

Mr. Shannon: Do you remember what happened the following year?

Mr. CLARK: Only too well. That was in the days of democracy when a Party would win one election, but if it lost the confidence of the people it would lose the next. In 1927 the Labor Party lost, but I think it returned to Government in 1930. This illustrates what happened in pre-gerrymander days.

Mr. Nankivell: Were they covered by insurance?

Mr. CLARK: Some Opposition members need not worry about taking out insurance for the next election, particularly the member for Albert, but he may well be advised to procure seat belts for some of his mates. I like the member for Albert, and I shall miss him if he were not here: perhaps a Government member may take his place. I say that with the greatest respect to the honourable member. I thank the member for Port Adelaide for drawing my attention to the 1924 debate, which was most interesting, because it proved to me that in South Australia, at least, leopards do not change their spots. Although I thought the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) made a good contribution to the debate this evening, I agreed with hardly anything he said. We have heard only two main arguments from Opposition members, and possibly the hint of a third. One argument, or which few would take notice, is that they oppose the measure because it is socialistic. Secondly, it is the wrong time to implement this legislation and, of course, we are doing it the wrong way! It is interesting to note the comments made by some Opposition members when speaking to a similar Bill in 1924 (and I think one may be pardoned for thinking that these extracts are taken from the current debate). I shall not mention the names of the speakers concerned as the honourable gentlemen concerned are no longer with us. However, one gentleman said:

I am strongly of the opinion that insurance is not a function for State enterprise.

Mr. Jennings: That could have been the member for Mitcham.

Mr. CLARK: Later, another speaker said:

The ultimate objective is to bring about a monopoly by forcing private companies out of the business. Also, I believe this is the wrong time to attempt this.

I do not know who that could be.

Mr. Ryan: The member for Alexandra!

Mr. McKee: Rocky River!

Mr. CLARK: It could well have been.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think it quite proper to put words in other members' mouths or to suggest that they have said things that, in fact, they have not said.

Mr. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I bow to your ruling. I will not do that; I do not mean to be insulting to members of the Opposition, and I think that they will realize that. I was merely using these quotations to illustrate the fact that in 1924 the basic arguments advanced by the Opposition were practically identical to those advanced today. Later in the 1924 debate another honourable gentleman said:

The policy of the Party behind the Government is to obtain the control of all industries. Another speaker said:

The State's money should not be utilized in such a manner; it appears to me and to every other unbiased critic—

I ask members to note the word "unbiased"—that this is a matter of the socialization of industry.

How on earth the introduction of a State Insurance Office can mean the socialization of industry, I just do not know. Another former member said:

I know the object of the Socialists is to take possession of all the enterprises of the State. Even now some of the leaders of the socialistic movement in South Australia are dissatisfied with the slow progress made by this Government.

Although the present situation did not exist at that time, that sounds to me like another reference to the faceless men—how many were there?

Mr. Lawn: One hundred and thirty-six.

Mr. CLARK: Of the faceless men that are occasionally mentioned (particularly by the member for Light) quite a number are sitting in front of you, Mr. Speaker, and their faces are framed for all to see.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They are pretty good looking, too.

Mr. CLARK: I make no claims about their looks.

Mr. Quirke: Was the attempt to which you are referring made six years after 1921?

Mr. CLARK: No; it was made three years after 1921.

Mr. Quirke: That was when the objective of your Party was formed.

Mr. CLARK: It was said 43 years ago that it was a most inopportune time to introduce the legislation. It has been inopportune for 43 years and it still is, according to my poor misguided friends opposite. I shall give one more quotation from an Opposition member in those days. I agree entirely with the first part of it but not with the latter part: "It is a long, long way to the new Jerusalem of socialization but an opening must be made some time, and this is that opening." The

extracts from the speeches that I have given are true and faithful. The debate took place 43 years ago; yet today one would have thought that honourable members opposite had gone to the trouble (which I doubt they have) of reading the debate that took place then. It seems to me that the anti-Socialist party in South Australia has forgotten nothing and learned even less. In the debate on this Bill, in the main there have been only two points made: anti-socialization, and the timing. I believe that most of the people of South Australia want State insurance.

The following is a completely unbiased example of what happened to me last evening: I left the House after it rose, caught a train home to Gawler, and sat with a friend of mine who usually drives home by car. He is a man who has a fairly high executive position in a very big firm. I shall not mention his name or the name of his firm. I have no idea what are his politics, but I think he could be a supporter of the Opposition. He is a personal friend of mine and, as sometimes happens, I think he might even vote for me. As honourable members know, they sometimes get votes because they are friendly with someone or someone knows them well. During the course of a conversation on Parliamentary affairs, State insurance was mentioned. This man said that as the other States of Australia have State insurance, why could not South Australia have it without all this fuss and bother? I believe that that is the attitude of the public of South Australia, and I do not believe that all the vilification in the world will change the public's view.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What does your other friend say about it?

Mr. CLARK: Unlike the member for Flinders, I have a number of friends.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens (teller), Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Shannon, and Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Hudson. Noes—Messrs. Rodda and Stott.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the second reading debate I referred to the term "counter insurance", saying that so far as I was aware it had no meaning at all. I said then that I would seek information at this stage regarding the meaning of the term. I now ask the Minister in charge of the Bill what "counter insurance" means; unless it has some meaning I think we should strike it out. As far as I am aware it has no precise meaning at all.

Mr. SHANNON: Practically the whole of the speeches from the Government side in support of this Bill have been directed towards the word "insurance", not "assurance". By the omission of the latter word from the speeches in support of this measure, I take it that Government supporters do not want to make a song and dance about this aspect. Obviously the Government Insurance Office will compete in a field in which South Australians are already very well served. If it is intended that it should compete in the life assurance field with the established mutual societies (and with their bonuses), then I do not know how the Government Insurance Office will work. Perhaps public servants may be told, "If you want life assurance, you must take out your policies with the Government Insurance Office." I fear that this may be one way in which the proposed office could be made to work. This would certainly not be desirable or well-received but this Government is not concerned with such questions. I shall not try to amend this Bill. I do not like any part of it, and I hope it is defeated.

Mr. HALL: I am told that the word "assurance" need not be included in this clause to enable the Government Insurance Commission to carry on the business of life insurance or assurance, because the terms are interchangeable. Can the Minister who is in charge of the Bill now say whether this is so?

Mr. Shannon: The term "assurance" is commonly used in the commercial world.

Mr. HALL: That is so. The Government has carefully included "assurance" in the definition of "insurance" with the very real intention, I believe, of entering this field. In fact, it is clear from what the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) said that the Government was considering taking that step. I point out that the Government does not have a mandate for this. It has claimed so often that it relies on the mandate that it

says it gained from the people in March, 1965. However, it did not mention life assurance business in its policy speech before the last election. Of course, that document will soon be best forgotten by the people of South Australia.

I, too, believe that no good purpose would be served by trying to amend this Bill, and I intend to vote against the third reading regardless of the amendments carried. I should indeed be optimistic if I thought I could change the feelings that have been put before us on the basis that Socialism is the cure for all of South Australia's ills. Indeed, under this sort of system I do not think anything was put forward in this debate could change the inflexible attitude of Socialism with which we are faced. If I were trying to amend the Bill I would move to strike out the word "assurance", but I am told on the best of authority that it would be only a token attempt. In any case, that is only one of the facets of this Bill with which I disagree. I strongly object to the setting up of another insurance office, especially one of the type this would be.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I support my colleagues in what they have just said. It is obvious from reading the policy speech of the former Premier that the Government intended to introduce legislation that would cover the usual mercantile insurance, workmen's compensation, motor vehicles and so forth but not life assurance or insurance, as it is sometimes called. Members opposite have emphasized that all other States have State Insurance Offices and that those offices function under legislation that has been placed on the Statute Book in those States.

Nevertheless, the Premier, when explaining the Bill, said that most of the States did not operate life assurance. He pointed out that New South Wales and Queensland offered life assurance but that Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania offered no insurance in that category. Because of that, can the Minister in charge of the Bill say whether the Government will consider excluding at least life insurance or life assurance?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I do not intend to agree to strike out "assurance". This Government has the mandate to include assurance in insurance provisions. It is common practice for many of the State Government Insurance Offices to insure for assurance as well as insurance. Counter insurance is provided for in all the other State Acts.

Mr. Millhouse: What does it mean?

Mr. McKee: You know what it means.

Mr. Millhouse: No. I want to know.

Mr. McKee: It is about time you did know.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am amazed at the honourable member's admission. It means that it allows companies to insure against insurance, one cover to cover another. I shall not try to make the honourable member understand. I ask the Committee to support the clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great deference and respect to the Minister of Works, I do not accept his explanation about counter insurance. What he said is entirely meaningless. To say that one can insure against insurance does not mean anything. If the Minister had in mind re-insurance, the laying off of the risk with other underwriters or the spreading of the risk, I should accept what he said. I say for the benefit of the Minister that counter insurance is a term of which I have never heard, but that is nothing, as members opposite will readily agree.

However, I am reliably informed by those who have been in insurance all their lives that the term is never used and that they have never heard of it. Are we going to make a mockery of this Parliament by putting into a definition a term which does not exist in fact in insurance circles and of which no one knows the meaning? I wish the Premier were here. Anyway, I do not think he would know, because I do not think the term has a meaning.

The Minister does not know what counter insurance is and I suggest that it is wrong for us to include in a definition a term when we are ignorant of the meaning and when we are told that it has no meaning, although I have asked for the information. One could see that consultations were going on with the Parliamentary Draftsman, and then I saw him scuttling from the Chamber, but I cannot accept—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows as well as any other member that reference to the Parliamentary Draftsman is definitely out of order, particularly when made in the way in which he made it. I am going to ask him to withdraw the remark he just made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, certainly, if it is offensive to anybody. I do not see that it could be, but if you want me to withdraw it—

The CHAIRMAN: I accept the honourable member's withdrawal but I point out to him that the Speaker has ruled that references by members to the Parliamentary

Draftsman are out of order. Also, honourable members will not refer to him in the terms used by the honourable member. The Parliamentary Draftsman has no right to speak in his own defence. I have asked for a withdrawal; it has been given and I have accepted it. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you very much. The point I had all but made was that I did not accept the Minister's explanation. Unless he can give an explanation that satisfies me and other members, I suggest we strike it out.

Mr. HEASLIP: I oppose the inclusion of "assurance" in this definition. Members opposite claim they have a mandate for life assurance. The former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) in his policy speech stated:

It appears that as a step forward concerning the implementation of this very necessary provision, a long overdue measure, it will be required that our policy consider the establishment of a State insurance scheme; and a further factor that may also be considered is that whilst it is recognized that workmen's compensation insurance cover for all persons must be provided, it is also compulsory for people who desire to register a motor vehicle to have a third party compulsory insurance policy. Under Government instrumentalities, when things become compulsory I believe that it is reasonable to give consideration to the right of the individual to have a choice of insurance. I emphasize the word "compulsory" in the last sentence. The then Premier said he was in favour of a Government insurance scheme. The word used was "insurance": there is no compulsion to take out life "assurance". There is no mandate for that. The former Premier did not tell the people that he would introduce life assurance, yet this Bill includes it. Whether or not the Bill is amended, I oppose it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister in charge of the Bill has not explained the term "counter insurance". Several meanings of "counter" are shown in the dictionary but none has the slightest reference to any form of insurance. In the absence of a more comprehensive explanation I have no alternative but to move an amendment.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not going to give a further explanation. The words are in similar legislation in every State, and they are necessary in this legislation to maintain uniformity. I regret the statement about the Premier's not being here, because he has an agreement with the Opposition that Ministers may be excused when they are absent from the State on Ministerial duties, and he is at present in another State attending a conference of Attorneys-General.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not reflect on the Premier or on his going to the conference, but it is unfortunate that we should continue a debate when the Minister in charge of a Bill is absent. I move:

In the definition of "insurance" to strike out "counter insurance".

I was fascinated by the Minister's explanation, in which he said that counter insurance was included for the sake of uniformity between the States. That is absolute nonsense. No-one claims that the Bill is uniform with any other State's legislation, nor is it aimed to be. The Premier, when explaining the Bill, set out a table showing details in the various States. It would be pathetic if the Government insisted on including the words "counter insurance", because no-one knows what they mean, and the outside information we have received is that they have no meaning at all. I ask the Minister not to make a mockery of the Committee by insisting on including something that is meaningless.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not agree altogether with my colleague, but it is a strange definition. I have no doubt that the words have been drawn from other legislation but that does not make them any the more sensible. What does "additional insurance" add to the definition? Obviously, we do not need to include those words if the definition is to cover the whole field of insurance.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 3—"The Commission."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

In subclause (3) after "shall" (first occurring) to insert "except for the purposes of section 16 of this Act,".

If the amendment is not carried, the Treasurer of the day will have authority to direct that any moneys of the commission be handed over to the Treasury on a temporary deposit and on such terms and conditions as the Treasurer decides. Although I am completely opposed to the Bill, I do not wish to be accused in the future of not trying to improve a clause which is so obviously bad and which could immediately provide for an improper purpose to be carried out.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Government is prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(5a) No person who is a director of or who is actively engaged in the control of any company conducting the business of insurance shall be appointed as a member of the commission.

A Bill passed by Parliament many years ago establishing the State Bank provided that no person who was a director or on the board of management of another bank should be a member of the board of management of the State Bank. It would be highly undesirable for a director of a company to be also a director of the State Insurance Commission. This would mean he would have a conflict of interests and that, he could be criticized for having a position on the commission.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This amendment is also acceptable to the Government. Amendment carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the second reading debate, I asked a number of questions in my speech regarding the financial aspects of the matter, and expressed the hope that someone in a responsible position on the other side of the Chamber would answer them in closing the second reading debate. Unfortunately, there was no closure to the second reading debate and the questions remained unanswered. I think this is the appropriate clause on which I should repeat the questions, because this is the clause under which the commission is constituted and it is the commission that will carry on the business of insurance. When the Premier was making his second reading explanation I interjected, asking him whether an estimate had been made of the financial implications of the measure. He said that research students of some description had done this work for him. I shall give the exact reference. I interjected, "I take it you have had the advice of the Public Actuary?" The Premier replied, "No, but I have had—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order in referring to the second reading debate. Honourable members know that they must speak now to the clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I accept your ruling, Sir. Who were the research students who advised the Government on this matter?

Mr. McKee: That has nothing to do with this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is that the clause, as amended, be passed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not prepared to let this go. This is the most vital point in the Bill and it is the point on which there has been a tremendous amount of debate as to how much it will cost and whether or not

there will be a profit. We have been told that research students, who are not identified in any way, have advised the Government on the matter. Surely the Committee is entitled to know who these people are and what advice they have given. This is something of utmost importance on this matter. Surely the Minister will have the courtesy to give some information on it.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not in the habit of being discourteous, but I cannot name the people concerned individually.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister give some idea of who they are and what are their qualifications to advise the Government on the matter? Why was their advice taken and not the advice of Government servants (the officers of the Government) from whom, as I understand it, Governments usually take advice?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although other people gave some opinions, Government officials gave advice on the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All I can say is that what the Minister is now telling the House is contrary to what the Premier said in his second reading explanation. He said that the people who had advised him were research students, and no-one else. Now, I know that the Premier is not here and I know that the Minister of Works is labouring under a heavy handicap because this is not his Bill. However, that should not affect us as members of this Committee; we are entitled to this information. This is the most important part of the whole measure: where is the cash coming from? Advice has been given to the Government by research students. The Premier said this straight out. Who are these research students? Why has the Government taken their advice and not that of its own public servants, and what is the advice that has been given?

Mr. McANANEY: Subclause (3) provides:

In the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the commission shall be subject to the control and directions of the Government . . .

So, this commission will have very little power. In New South Wales the Government Insurance Office has had a reasonable amount of success, and it is controlled by a General Manager who is not under the control of the Government; Cabinet has no knowledge of the business of the office at all. The fact that the proposed Government Insurance Office in this State will be under the control of a Minister, rather than a general manager trained in insurance, is socialistic in the extreme.

Mr. QUIRKE: Certain vital information on this clause has been requested by the member for Mitcham, and it should be readily available.

When the Playford Government was in office, I do not think a member of the then Opposition was ever refused an answer in this way. This is an important question and no reply is forthcoming. The Government is using the brutal weight of its numbers to force this measure through this Committee. I suggest to the Leader of the Government *pro tem* that progress be reported in order that the answers can be obtained. How is the Government Insurance Office to be financed? No answer has been given. Who were the advisers? No answer has been given.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What is involved?

Mr. QUIRKE: We have heard about Government insurance and assurance and counter insurance and a lot of other mumbo jumbo, but not a member of the Government Party can explain one clause of this Bill. Will the Government ram it through? The only way it can do so is to ignore genuine questioning and use its numbers, but it is a dreadful thing to do and I have never seen it happen before in this Parliament. Not only for the sake of members on this side of the House but also for the information of Ministers and other Government members, I suggest that progress be reported until genuine questions asked by the Opposition, particularly the question of the member for Mitcham, can be answered. I enter an emphatic protest against this sort of thing.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No one can suggest that a commission of such a nature as this can be set up without considerable expense. As far as I am aware, money

can be provided for this purpose only by means of the Budget or from the Loan Fund. I know of no report that the Loan Council has given the Government the right to have money on a guarantee, and if a guarantee is involved the Loan Council should have to give that authority. I believe the Minister would agree that the Opposition's request that two matters be cleared up is a reasonable one. I have tried to get some idea of what is involved in this, and I have been advised that the amounts of money involved are substantial.

Surely the Government would not consider passing a Bill when no money was available to give effect to it. In the circumstances, I suggest that this matter be held in abeyance until the Government can bring down information on the amount of money involved, where it is to come from, and how it is to be made available. It is a reasonable request, and I see no reason why the Government, if it has this information, cannot tender it to this Committee. If it does not have this information, it should not proceed with such an unsound thing as this until the information is obtained.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I agree that honourable members may be labouring somewhat under difficulties. It is not possible for me to get the advice that is in the Premier's possession, and because the Government wants to be fair and just, if Opposition members give an assurance that they will be able to assist tomorrow in another direction I am prepared to move that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 20, at 2 p.m.