

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, May 26, 1955.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION.

QUALITY OF SUPERPHOSPHATE.

The Hon. J. H. DENSLEY—Has the Chief Secretary a further reply to my question of May 19, with regard to the alleged poor quality of superphosphate?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I have a reply from the Minister of Agriculture as follows:—

1. Inspectors of the Department of Agriculture regularly test at two-monthly intervals samples of superphosphate from the three manufacturers in this State. During the past 12 months, all samples tested have reached the required standard.

2. Mr. Sims, of the Land Development Executive, informed the Chief Agricultural Adviser that the necessity for the department to re-sow any area on Kangaroo Island was not due to poor quality superphosphate but to unsatisfactory seasonal conditions. The Land Development Executive has no complaint regarding the quality of superphosphate supplied to it in recent seasons.

3. Two or three years ago there were widespread complaints regarding the mechanical condition of superphosphate owing to the fact of it setting very hard and having to be broken up on the farms before it could be used. That trouble was claimed by the manufacturers to be due to the type of rock phosphate which they were receiving from overseas. No complaint on this score has been made recently.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

(Continued from May 25. Page 56.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the motion and, like previous speakers, wish to pay my tribute to the late Hon. Reginald Rudall, and I endorse all the kindly references regarding the services he rendered to the community whilst a member of this Council and a member of another place. I also associate myself with the sentiments expressed regarding the late Mr. Steve Dunks, the member for Mitcham in another place.

I compliment our new member, Mr. Story, on his maiden speech. I listened to him with rapt attention, and I am sure that he presented the case for the section of the community he represents ably and well. Although we are of different political parties, I think it is commonly

agreed here that whatever matter which is in the interests of the people comes up for discussion it has the support of all members irrespective of Party. I look forward to Mr. Story taking a prominent part in the debates in this Chamber and giving members the benefit of his experience and knowledge in connection with the industry in which he is engaged.

I join with the Leader of the Opposition in his support of the work of the waterside workers and workers generally in South Australia. The workers form 95 per cent of the population of this State, and they are the producers, and it is quite unfair that there should be this barrage of criticism in the press against a section of the community which is playing such a prominent part in the economic development of the State.

I also compliment the Attorney-General, the Hon. C. D. Rowe, on his elevation to the Ministry. He has, since his advent to this Chamber, always enlightened our debates and placed his legal knowledge at the disposal of members, and I am sure that in his new sphere he will continue to act as he has done hitherto.

I would like first to deal with the question of the better relationship between worker and employer. The Address in Reply debate affords an opportunity for members to discuss practically any matter and vent any grievances. However, I do not propose to do that, but simply to discuss the merits of foreshadowed legislation and express the views of the Opposition in the hope that the Government will agree to some of our proposals. I am reminded of the fact that from the day the pioneers assembled under the Old Gum Tree at Glenelg and heard the reading of the proclamation of the State of South Australia, the State has steadily grown in prosperity, as we constantly read in the press and as was expressed even in the Lieutenant-Governor's speech. Just as those courageous people who were the pioneers of South Australia had faith in the vision of the future that was conjured up before them so we, their successors, through good times and bad, have never lost faith in South Australia's destiny. This is exemplified in the following report in this morning's *Advertiser*:—

Canberra, May 25.—South Australia is now vying with Victoria for the fastest rate of industrial growth in Australia, according to a survey of manufacturing activity released tonight by the Minister for National Development (Senator Spooner).

The Hon. L. H. Densley—That is a nice compliment from Canberra.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is a portrayal of actual facts. The article also states:—

The survey says that Australian factories are now producing a greater quantity of goods than ever before, and that the demand for Australian-made products is being well-sustained.

Later in the article the following appears:—

Points made by Senator Spooner included:—

There was a record volume of production during the half-year.

Fortunately for the man in the street, the largest price increases have been in investment goods rather than items entering into every day consumption.

The Australian manufacturing industry appears to be settling down at an increasingly high rate of activity and although costs have risen so far, they are not halting progress.

That brings me to this point: all the adverse criticism levelled against the workers, all the advocacy for an increased working week and for a lowering of wages is given the lie direct in this statement made by Senator Spooner after a nation-wide survey of the industrial conditions in Australia. I remind honourable members that in his opening speech His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor said:—

A feature of the Australian economy however which gives special concern to my Ministers is the strong pressure to increase interest rates. Merchants, manufacturers, and financiers—in particular, those engaged in financing hire purchase transactions—have entered the loan market seeking large sums for the extension of their businesses, and, in a number of instances, are offering high rates of interest. At the same time there is an unprecedented demand for loans by semi-governmental authorities in the eastern States. While the loan money available this year is sufficient to provide for all Government works for which men and material can be found, there is a serious risk that if the pressure on the loan market is not relieved, Governments may be unable to raise sufficient money for next year's requirements.

The pioneers had faith in the destiny and future development of South Australia, so it is the responsibility of the custodians of our economic conditions today to see that progress is not halted by lack of finance. I remind members that when this country was facing one of its greatest crises in the war it was not a question of money but of manpower and materials—money was a secondary consideration. To successfully prosecute the war to maintain our democratic way of life it was necessary to find money, and it is equally necessary now to develop the peace economy for our financial resources to be made available and utilized not only in South Australia but in all States.

F

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Have you been converted to Douglas credit?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No. My honourable friend always attempts to draw a red herring across the trail. Every member in this Chamber knows that the present financial resources are controlled by the Commonwealth Bank, and that after the defeat of the Chifley Labor Government the Commonwealth Bank Board was reconstituted. It does not act now, as it should, as a national or central bank, but determines what Loan money shall be made available for the future development of industry in South Australia. That is done under the auspices of the Government led by the Right Honourable R. G. Menzies, to whose policy my friend opposite subscribes. It is not a question of Douglas credit. If these things can be done during the war they can be done equally well in peace so as not to halt our progress.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—But you could not go on borrowing indefinitely.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I do not suggest that. Where a programme of Loan works is being carried out for the future development of this State, which in many instances will be reproductive, the borrowing of money would not mean borrowing indefinitely, but would be for a period of years and industries would gain by the carrying out of that programme. That would not mean a series of mad borrowings until we reach the end of the road. There is no need for the present financial restriction laid down by the Commonwealth Bank Board which, in effect, as the Lieutenant-Governor said, will place all Governments in a peculiar position in carrying out their Loan programmes.

His Excellency mentioned the claim made by the Government for the development of industries in this State. One claim was made that the Government has pursued all avenues and has been successful in developing and making available the sulphur necessary for superphosphates, but every honourable member knows that it was not the Government that was responsible. The responsibility of the Government began and ended when it guaranteed a loan to Nairne Pyrites and the four superphosphate companies.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Did you say "began"?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I said it began and ended when the Industries Development Committee made a recommendation to the Government that loan money be made available for Nairne Pyrites. No credit can be claimed

by the Government in this matter as was claimed in the Lieutenant-Governor's speech. That money could not have been made available without the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee, after which it had to be voted by Parliament.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Do you say that is where it began?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I say it began and ended when that report was submitted to the Government.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—That is where the honourable member does not do himself justice.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am only stating facts. The Chief Secretary cannot claim any of the glory, if you can call it that, or any of the kudos that the Government is claiming for all these things that are done by respective committees and then by Parliament.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Did the Industries Development Committee have the bright idea without any reference from the Government?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—We have many bright ideas but they do not always receive the support of that committee. That could not have been brought about without the co-operation of the workers in industry, which was happily availed of by the Government. That applies to every Government undertaking—to the Leigh Creek coalfield, the Mannum water scheme, forestry and other major projects the Government has embarked upon. The Leaders of the Government should study assiduously the Labor Party's policy. From time to time on its developmental projects it has followed Labor policy. Labor has not had the opportunity of being in Government to implement these projects. As a consequence all these things have been taken from Labor policy and brought in and when Labor representatives in this and another place attempt to point out the fact that the proposal emanated from them, we find the credit is being claimed by this Government. The worker has played a most prominent part in all this progress and development.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Nobody denies that.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I read in the press recently that a large company here made a profit of £5,000,000. I am not denying them the right to make a profit, but without labour being applied to that money, that capital investment would remain the same in five, 10 or 20 years' time. It is by the application of labour that these profits are made,

and those who help to make the profits should share in them. However, they have to get it through very arduous ways such as the Arbitration Court, and it is very grudgingly given in some cases and is not very much. This question is not a parochial one. It is exercising the minds of the leaders of people such as the Director-General of the International Labor Organization. This Government subscribes to sending representatives to meetings of that body as does the Commonwealth Parliament and every Government in the world. Representatives of the employers and employees attend the yearly convention in Geneva during June. I have some facts which coincide with the views I have held throughout my years in the Labor movement. As the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday it is futile to have a whipping post in industry and when something goes wrong through lack of managerial planning to beat the underdog. This question has now reached the stage where it has been taken up by the International Labor Organization. The *I.L.O. News*, a copy of which I have here, contains the following:—

A call for an international discussion on ways to create a more effective relationship between workers and employers is contained in the annual report of David A. Morse, Director-General of the International Labor Organization. Mr. Morse declares that the very survival of civilization depends on the ability of people to learn to live and work together in peace. He calls the I.L.O.'s efforts in the field of labour-management relations a 'practical and realistic' approach to this problem. Mr. Morse has invited the representatives of the Governments' employers and workers who will attend the I.L.O.'s annual conference opening in Geneva, June 1, to discuss and help formulate a programme of work for the I.L.O. which would assist countries in all degrees of industrial development to solve problems of industrial and human relations. The report raises questions for the delegates to discuss rather than trying to present any ready made blue print of projected plans. It suggests that new industrial relations problems are likely to result from further technological development in industry. It goes further but it coincides with my views and those of other members of the Labor movement when it says that we have reached the stage in our industrial development where capital on the one hand and the worker on the other are the two integral parts of industry. Unless there is that recognition of the part played by labour there will still continue to be this industrial friction and other matters which are complained of from time to time. An interesting point raised in the report is that although 60 per cent of the earth's population still earns its living from

hunting, fishing and agriculture, from two-thirds to four-fifths of the workers in the more advanced countries are now engaged in non-agricultural pursuits. Then the writer quotes America, which is identical with Australia to a degree, as follows:—

Agriculture, forestry and fishing in the United States now employ only 12.5 per cent of the population. The percentage of unskilled workers in industry also has declined considerably in the past 50 years, particularly those engaged in heavy work.

There is a general shrinkage of labour on our farms. Mr. Wilson yesterday advocated more migrants coming to Australia to follow rural pursuits. With all the industrial expansion which is taking place and the mass production that is being carried out in industry, it is quite feasible that there is a shrinkage of labour in rural areas, and there will be until such time as Labor policy is implemented with regard to providing smaller holdings on which farmers can produce sufficient food for those who are working in industry. The world's economists have told us that we are reaching the stage where there will be not enough food produced for the needs of the population. The Government, in concert with other Governments throughout Australia, is charged with the responsibility to see that the land is not denuded of its labour and to see that facilities will be available whereby people who desire to go on the land will have the opportunity to do so.

The Lieutenant-Governor in his opening speech stated that the Housing Trust proposed to build 3,000 more homes in the next financial year. I do not criticize the Housing Trust but I have said before that the Playford Government is basking in the reflected glory of the efficiency of the Housing Trust, and I repeat that. What I say is that the present legislation under the Advances for Homes Act only permits the State Bank and other lending authorities under the control of State legislation to advance the amount of £1,750, which is not sufficient to permit a young married couple or a man with a family to acquire a home of his own. The gap between the deposit and the cost of the home is too great in view of increased building costs operating today. Therefore I submit that the Government should review the present limitation on loans for home building and allow, if not £1,000, at least another £750, bringing the total to well over £2,000 for those who desire to build homes. I am reminded of the fact that the greatest contentment that can be enjoyed in any State or nation is assured by the greatest

possible number owning their own homes. This provides one of the greatest barriers against all the isms with which the world is confronted today. I submit these remarks in the hope that the Government will review its attitude towards those desirous of building homes so that they may not be compelled to endure that nightmare search for the £500 or £600 that is necessary as a deposit today. I thank members for their patient hearing and I trust that they will appreciate the fact that I have not introduced politics into this address.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—In rising to support the motion I am truly conscious of the loss that has befallen this Chamber and the State in the death of the Hon. Reginald John Rudall. The late honourable member, who sat in the House of Assembly for 11 years, and in the Legislative Council for nearly 11 years, held high Cabinet rank in this Chamber. From 1946 until the first day of this year he carried the portfolio of Attorney-General, and was held in the highest esteem by everyone with whom he came in contact. He rendered a service to his day and generation that will be long remembered, and to his widow we offer our sincere sympathy. His portfolio in the Playford Cabinet has been taken by the Hon. C. D. Rowe, who assumes his new office with the confident good wishes of every one of his colleagues in this Chamber. It seems only the other day that he entered Parliament and the rapid progress he has made well justifies the hopes we have held in his future. His selection for the position of Attorney-General is particularly satisfactory, for his intimate association with rural activities, in addition to his professional experience, will be of special interest and importance to South Australia at such a time as the present when the State is making such rapid strides in the development of secondary industries.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor referred also to the loss sustained recently in the death of the Chairman of Committees in another place, Mr. H. S. Dunks, who was a very valuable citizen and a well-informed and painstaking Parliamentarian. He had many friends and will be sadly missed, and our sincere sympathy goes out to those whom he has left behind. We have all been privileged to listen with pleasure indeed to our newest member, Mr. Story, and I hope his membership of this Chamber will be as pleasing to him as we know it will be to ourselves.

One cannot easily measure the progress of the State during the last few years that has arisen out of the policy of assisted immigration, for it has been phenomenal. From being so long regarded as essentially primary producers, the recent development and extension of secondary industries has brought about a complete change in our State and its future. When it is remembered that our population in 1938—that is, at the beginning of World War II—was under 600,000 people and that at December last it had expanded to 800,000; that the number of factories in 1938 was about 2,000 and today is over 3,500; that the value of our factory output was £35,000,000 in 1938 and had risen to £265,000,000 in 1954 we can realize the progress that has been made. It was hardly necessary for Mr. Bardolph to endeavour to postulate where the credit should be placed, for if either Capital or Labour developed a too obstructive policy it would be a very sad day for all of us. I do not approve of an endeavour to saddle one side or the other with all the ills that may befall us. The point is that we have to work shoulder to shoulder, and in the kindly remarks Mr. Bardolph made concerning our early pioneers he was only giving them some credit for the splendid work that they had done as is evidenced from what the State has been able to achieve in a little over 100 years.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—They laid the foundation.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—Perhaps they did, but even that needs some examination. A great deal of credit is also due to the people who carried on from that foundation. I think Mr. Bardolph will agree when I say that we work harder, generally, than the generation that immediately preceded us; whether we gain anything in the final outcome is another matter—we hope we will, but there are a great many credits to be handed out before the long list is finished.

I appreciate what the honourable member said with regard to the machinery that has been developed by which it is possible for financial assistance to be given, after careful and expert scrutiny, but much credit is due to the spade and shovel work that the man on the other side of the fence has to do even before he can get some assistance. Without an intelligently controlled management it would not be possible for much progress to be made. Let me illustrate my point by quoting a few figures to indicate the problems with which the management of our State has been confronted during its comparatively

short life. Forty years is not long in the life of any nation but in that period, which might be said to cover the industrial revolution of South Australia, and despite the second world war, the face of our countryside has been in many ways completely changed as the result of the energy and enterprise that South Australians have exerted, and very much of the credit has to be given to the Governments of the State in the intervening years.

It seems but a very short time, but it is already 11 years ago that members were taken to Morgan to see the Murray water turned into the pipeline to serve Whyalla and the reservoirs *en route*. On March 31, 1944, the electric power was switched on at Morgan for the benefit of those who live within reach of the pipeline and the thirsty intervening areas that stretch to Whyalla, 220 miles away. This work was brought to a successful conclusion despite the war which called for all the energy that could be directed towards its successful conclusion, for we were all under no illusion as to the weight of the issues involved. Since the day of the opening of that main the imagination of many South Australians has naturally been fired with what may be regarded as a more ambitious project. The metropolitan area, with its population of nearly 500,000 and the lowest rainfall of any Australian capital, and with rapidly expanding secondary industries demanded yet a further source of water supply, and a much more costly and far-reaching one was undertaken. Eleven years later to the very day, on March 31, 1955, the Government invited members and visitors to the opening of the new pipeline which, in its first four months of operation, delivered more than 5,000 million gallons of water from the River Murray to the city of Adelaide and its suburbs. Water through this pipeline is now available through 3,000 miles of mains, serving three-quarters of South Australia's citizens. With an assured water supply serving 80 per cent of the State's population, other big developmental projects can go ahead without fear of a water famine. These things have been brought about because of the energy, intelligence and efficiency of the Government of this State, and in spite of the fact that we have the lowest rainfall of all Australian States, Adelaide was the only capital city that did not find it necessary to impose restrictions upon the use of water during last summer.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—It is a good thing the pipeline was turned on when it was, otherwise we would not have had any water.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—It did not grow up like a mushroom. It is a magnificent job and we are proud of what the Government has done in this respect. Confronted with the degree of aridity that is experienced here, it might almost be said that the service rendered by making River Murray water available has already been incalculable. It would be difficult to over-estimate the debt owed by the people of the State in which we live to our Premier, the Minister of Works and their experts and advisers for the way in which the work has been conceived and carried through. It was a tremendous undertaking with again and again difficulties arising which would have discouraged many, but all carried on until victory was won and an extreme crisis had been averted. We know that the pumping stations are delivering over 200,000 tons of water every 24 hours and that the quantity of electrical power needed for the pumps each week requires 3,500 tons of Leigh Creek coal. The diameter of the pipe at the river end is such that an ordinary sized man could walk upright through it. The amount of water already delivered to Adelaide is almost equal in quantity to the full capacity of the Millbrook and Happy Valley reservoirs. As the Minister of Works has pointed out, the pipeline is building up storages in our reservoirs. There is no doubt whatever that the project will stand for many many years as a monument to all concerned with it. Adelaide must be served with water for domestic uses and for its tremendous extension in industry, so the demand may come up again, but I am sure that our ingenuity will work out how water can be used more than once for industrial purposes.

South Australia, as is the case with other States, has shared in the number of new Australians who have reached our shores and who will undoubtedly make savings and produce capital. It is confidently felt that they will assist in Australia's long term policy of expansion, supplying not only consumer goods for local requirements but helping also to swell the volume of our goods for export.

As is very well known, attention has been directed by bankers and other financial authorities to the shrinkage that has taken place in Australia's overseas funds. Very recently one of the leading Australian banks pointed out that the drain on London funds cannot be permitted to continue indefinitely, as it is one symptom of a community that is commencing to try to live beyond its means. On the other hand, any appreciable fall in the volume of imports might well diminish market supplies

and give rise to inflationary tendencies which would be, of course, another signal that we were over-spending.

When His Excellency delivered his speech at the opening of Parliament all were pleased to learn that economic conditions in this State continue to be satisfactory. At the same time, though, he sounded a note of warning in regard to the strong pressure being felt in the inclination to increase interest rates. This is perhaps in no small degree the swing back of the pendulum from the lower rates when Commonwealth loans were very readily taken up at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. It is very desirable that money for development should be available for businesses, public utilities and so on. Every means of encouraging thrift and savings should be availed of, and attractive rates of interest are factors which make for popularity with the investor. The borrower must, of course, take care that he does not borrow at too high a rate. The lender does not like to see a decline in the value of the unit of money. The general public thinks in terms of rising prices of goods rather than of the diminishing value of money. This may be or has been called a lack of faith, and the warning has been given that if this persists it can have serious effects on governmental financing. If, then, this is the view expressed from the centre of the financial world, how truly will it apply to the outer parts.

As has already been said, the demand for capital by a developing country is necessarily much greater than in what we call the older lands, but the demand must be used with care and invested with caution. The inducement to save can be increased in various ways. We all remember the times when Government loans were free of taxation. Even now there is a loan on the stock exchange list that enjoys a taxation concession and which therefore has a popularity that shows the trend of thought of many investors. A problem that is by no means simple confronts us and we can be sure the Government will give the subject the attention that it calls for.

In speaking to the motion before us, honourable members have followed the plan, to a considerable extent, of directing attention to a few of the clauses rather than dealing with a number of them and I found it quite an attractive way. I think the speech of His Excellency contains more and gives greater stimulus than any previous speech has done in my experience. It is important to note that on more than one occasion schemes and proposals for erection of reservoirs are repeated in this

year's speech. It is very interesting to note that the Eyre Peninsula Uley-Wanilla scheme that a number of us went over to see a few years ago, and where there was perhaps some difference of opinion, has been substantially completed and is now in full operation.

The Hon. Mr. Bardolph asked for an extension of assistance to householders and I fully expect even without great emphasis being impressed upon the request, that it is bound to have a very cordial reception. The great number of houses that the Government has erected in the last few years and the almost universal satisfaction that has been given to the tenants and buyers are the best measure of the general satisfaction that this State is carrying out its job of finding houses and making homes available under difficult circumstances. This must be one other item to be credited by the South Australian public to the Ministry, that not only are big undertakings satisfactorily undertaken but also the provision of homes. This is something that secures the real enthusiasm of the people for the Government of this State. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—Since the prorogation last session we have seen some changes brought about by the untimely death of the late Attorney-General, the Honourable Reginald Rudall, and Mr. Stephen Dunks, an esteemed member of another place. I would be failing in my duty if I did not join members in offering condolences to Mrs. Rudall in her sad loss. I feel that the State is the loser in the untimely passing of Mr. Rudall. My actual political associations are not the same as were those of these two members, but over the period I was associated with Mr. Rudall I found him on all occasions very courteous and wherever possible very helpful and always ready with advice and assistance. Not only this House but the whole of the State will join members in mourning our loss. With regard to Mr. Dunks, I, along with the secretary of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, was with Mr. Dunks at the time of his death, and it was an unenviable experience. Mr. Dunks was always a very friendly member and he gave members the benefit of his vast experience. It is indeed very sad to meet here again without these gentlemen.

It is said that every cloud has a silver lining. I would like to tender my congratulations to Mr. Rowe on his elevation to the position of Attorney-General. It has been my privilege already to consult him in his official capacity, and if the result of that consultation is an

example of what we may expect from him, I feel sure that we will get the fullest co-operation, help and assistance from the Attorney-General at any time we may have occasion to approach him on any problem. I also congratulate Mr. Story, firstly on his election to this Chamber and, secondly, upon the most able speech he made in moving the motion now before us. If that speech is any criterion, this House will benefit from Mr. Story's contributions in the future. We know that on such an occasion he could be excused for being rather nervous, but his contribution to the debate was such that we can look forward to hearing some very fine speeches from him. Mr. Densley also surpassed himself with his contribution towards the debate.

The Lieutenant-Governor outlined the programme of the Government for this fourth session of the 34th Parliament, and I will refer to some of the clauses outlined. As pointed out to us by Sir Wallace Sandford, South Australia has over the last few years made rapid advances industrially, resulting in greater demands upon services such as water, power, roads, sewerage and housing. I feel that the various Government departments are meeting the demand upon their services admirably. Clause 9 of His Excellency's Speech refers to investigations being continued into the vital question of our water supply. It is proposed to complete South Para reservoir and to build new reservoirs at Myponga and Clarendon. We have heard considerable comment with regard to the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, and what a great asset that pipeline is and will be in the future. I am sure every honourable member and all residents of the State will agree with those sentiments.

The Government prides itself on the fact that no water restrictions were introduced during the last summer months, and claims that this was the only State where no restrictions were imposed. It claims that this was because of good management, but if we are sincere we must admit that our water supply was dangerously low, and that the Murray supply came just in time. The Minister of Works told us at Mannum that the pipeline had already cost £9,000,000, and, as we all know, it is nowhere near completion. It will therefore cost considerably more by the time the scheme is completed. Sir Wallace this afternoon stressed the importance of this pipeline and stated, though perhaps not in identical words, that credit and praise must be given to the Government for

this remarkable piece of engineering. I feel that in the building of the pipeline too much praise cannot be given to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and to the workers who, by their efforts, built that pipeline and made the Murray water available to us. Perhaps the actual planning in the first instance could be credited to the Government, but I say that in the implementation of that plan the credit goes to the department and its employees.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—The Public Works Committee recommended it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yes. May I draw members' attention to the fact that in 1939 experts gave evidence before the Public Works Committee suggesting the building of reservoirs at South Para, Myponga, and on the Onkaparinga River. They stated that if this were done sufficient water would be conserved to supply the needs of the metropolitan area until 1969, by which time it would be necessary to look further afield to augment our storage capacity. They suggested that it would then be necessary to tap the River Murray at Mannum and bring a pipeline to Adelaide. Had the advice of the experts been adopted by the Government at that time, when ample supplies of manpower and materials were available, we would not have had to rush all our resources and available manpower in a race against time to bring water to the metropolitan area over the last summer months. The building of the reservoirs suggested at South Para and Myponga, and a holding reservoir on the Onkaparinga River, including main trunk lines to the city, would have been completed at an estimated cost at that time of approximately £2,500,000. A considerable sum would have been saved to the State, and if the reports of the experts at that time had proved correct it would not have been necessary to tap the River Murray until 1969 in order to augment the metropolitan water supplies. Therefore, when members wax eloquent about the marvellous achievements of the Government and the great credit due to it we should also consider that it actually took a near water famine to force the Government to implement something that should have been commenced in 1939.

I feel disappointed that no reference was made in His Excellency's speech to an amendment of the Industrial Code. Legislation was introduced in another place last session by the Labor Party but was, unfortunately, defeated. Publicity was given to a statement that it was the intention of the Government

to appoint a committee to investigate and advise it upon amendments to the Code because it was felt that some provisions of the Code were out-dated; I feel that most of them are in that category as a considerable number of employees cannot avail themselves of the privilege or right of having their conditions of employment and wage rates adjudicated upon by a tribunal because of restrictions contained in the Code.

I commend the Government on its plans to improve hospital facilities. One of its steps has been to extend the policy of subsidizing hospitals. Had the Government not done so many of these hospitals would have been closed, which would have aggravated the shortage of hospital accommodation. Hospitals cannot be built overnight. Their planning and erection involves considerable time, and after their completion they have to be equipped and staffed, but the Government, I feel, is doing what is possible to improve the situation. Hospitals must employ domestic staffs, but employees of subsidized hospitals are debarred under the terms of the Industrial Code from having their wages and conditions dealt with by an industrial authority. On the other hand, employees of Government hospitals have this right, and it is accepted and acted upon by the Government. This discrimination is wrong and on that score at least there is room for an amendment of the Code. Again, section 146 (3), (4) and (5) deals with the constitution of wages boards. Subsection 3 provides:—

Subject to the provisions of subsection 5 . . . representatives of the employees shall be bona fide and active employees of one of such industries or callings.

The same phraseology is used in subsection 4, dealing with employers representatives. However, subsection 5 reads:—

One representative on each side may be appointed who does not hold the beforementioned qualifications, provided that no such representative shall be a member of the legal profession.

I feel that those provisions were drafted for the specific purpose of allowing the representative of an organization, such as a union secretary, to hold a position upon a wages board as a representative of the workers, or a representative of the employers such as the Employers' Federation or the Chamber of Manufactures, but I draw attention to the fact that on the reappointment of a certain board a union secretary who had been previously a member of it was removed and a full-time university student put in his place, evidently

under the terms of subsection 5. I submit that that subsection was never meant to be used to permit a university student to displace a union secretary, and the time has arrived when the purport of section 146 should be clarified.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—That is an isolated instance, is it not?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It may be, and I am not attaching any blame to the Minister, for the incident referred to happened before his appointment. This section has been in the Code since its inception.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—We can look for an alteration now.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I hope so, but what I am criticizing is the absence of any reference in His Excellency's speech to the intention of the Government to review the Industrial Code, despite the publication of a statement by the Premier that a committee would be appointed to go into it. If it was the Government's intention to do so it has had ample time.

The home building programme outlined, under the jurisdiction of the Housing Trust, can be appreciated when we consider the demand for both purchase and rental homes that still exists. The trust has done a remarkable job in endeavouring to meet the clamour for homes, and I wish it to be understood that my following remarks are not to be taken as actual criticism of the trust or its officers. Stricter supervision should be exercised on the fulfilling of contracts to build Housing Trust homes, because complaints have been made about the work done by at least one large contractor in the satellite town. I have been told that he has been found wanting in the fulfilling of contracts for building war service homes at Goldlands, and trust homes at Gepps Cross and Salisbury. It appears that the trouble has been caused by the subletting of contracts and the use of piecework methods. The buildings do not come up to requirements; for instance, when architraves were placed on doorways they did not cover the gaps left at the end of the wall and they had to be filled in afterwards. As a result, something had to be done when the plastering was carried out. The gaps were plastered in, but when the doors were slammed the plaster came loose, leaving apertures all around the doors. Cracks also opened over windows and doorways before the homes were occupied, to such an extent that the contractor employed men to follow on after the subcontractor finished to patch up some of his work. I have been told that these matters have been reported to the trust,

but nothing has been done. I feel that an investigation should be made into this, and also consider that the only way to eliminate such things is to create a housing commission, as in other States, with a Minister of Housing responsible to Parliament.

His Excellency referred to the mineral wealth of this State, to the advancement of the Leigh Creek coalfield and Radium Hill, to the activities of the Electricity Trust and of our forestry and timber milling departments. Immense strides have been made in all these departments and I have no adverse criticism to make, because credit is certainly due to the Government. If we continue it will not be long before a coal briquetting plant, similar to that existing in Victoria, is established here. I recently had the opportunity to inspect the plant in Victoria and found that the advancement there, not only in the working of the coal deposits but also in the manufacture of briquettes, is immense. I feel that perhaps the time is not far distant when we will have established in this State a briquette factory because of the demand being made on us for the supply of Leigh Creek coal. Such a plant apparently produces a more marketable commodity than the coal in its natural form.

We can all appreciate that new undertakings must take some little time to become established, but because of the huge advances made in State undertakings, the time has arrived when we should be utilizing some of our iron ore deposits, so the State should establish steel works. I see no reason why a State-controlled steel works should not advance as rapidly as has been done in other State ventures. We have raw materials and all the facilities except steel works. There is an acute shortage of steel for industry, so much so that we must import it from overseas.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Where do you think the Government would get the money to start a steel works?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Ever since I have been associated with Parliament in this State and anything similar to this has been brought up I have always heard the same thing asked. This applies to other States, apparently, but if we visit them we find that they are making such rapid advancement that we are being left behind all the time.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—Did the honourable member read this morning's paper?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am quoting what I had the pleasure of seeing recently.

Tasmania, the smallest State in the Commonwealth, is finding money for these projects to such an extent that South Australia is left in the shade. Victoria has such vast State projects in operation that we cannot appreciate their size until we see them. These things have all been done by Loan moneys, yet we have no money in the State to do anything! We had no money for the Electricity Trust. For years we had no money for establishing afforestation. The same thing applied to Leigh Creek, but it was undertaken and achieved, and if the Government wishes a steel works could be established.

Although I advocate the establishment of a State steel works in South Australia, I do not want it taken to mean that I advocate repudiation. There is mineral wealth in this State, and because of this the State can establish steel works in the same way as it established other ventures. I feel that perhaps there is just a little insincerity about this matter. This Government, because of a unanimous resolution carried in another place, has been committed, but it will be interesting to see how far its commitment will go.

I now wish to mention the proposed industrial development at Burbank.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—It is rather interesting, after talking about not making progress, that the honourable member should then talk about progress.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It has often been said that when you go fishing you use the type of bait suitable for the fish you desire to catch. If it is a small fish, perhaps you use cockles; if it is a big fish, you use a different kind of bait. You always use the bait that catches the biggest fish. My bait must be pretty good. Early last session the Government introduced in the House of Assembly a Town Planning Bill which contained provisions for co-ordinated town planning. Nobody but the Government can be blamed for the considerable delay in the passage of that Bill. It was introduced early in the session but, due to the action of the Government, was placed lower and lower on

the Notice Paper. Finally it reached this Chamber very late in the Session. Honourable members do not need reminding what happened to the Bill here. As far as I am aware it is still in the pigeon hole. Now we find there will be considerable industrial development of a suburb known as Burbank. Much publicity has been given in the press to the erection of a spur line that will link with an interstate line, in order to serve the industry to be established at Burbank, but there is no co-ordinated plan. Apparently we will just go ahead and the industry will utilize land and build factories on it, a spur line will be erected, and then homes. I suggest that the Government should reintroduce the Town Planning Bill to provide a co-ordinated plan, not only for Burbank, but for the whole of the city. What is the use of going ahead without any co-ordination? I hope that consideration will be given to the immediate reintroduction of that legislation, so that all members will have ample opportunity to analyse it and the other measures which will come before us, and that where these necessary urgent measures are introduced we will not find what happened previously in regard to this measure. I feel that the forthcoming Session will be a very interesting one, with far-reaching benefits to the State, because of the programme already outlined in His Excellency's speech. I am looking forward to the Session, and I hope that my criticisms this afternoon have been of some use to honourable members.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS secured the adjournment of the debate.

NEW TOWN NORTH OF SALISBURY.

The PRESIDENT laid upon the Table the progress report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on water and sewerage schemes for the new town north of Salisbury, together with the minutes of evidence.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, May 31, at 2 p.m.