

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, July 22, 1958.

The Council assembled at 2.15 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY PRESIDENT.

The Clerk having announced that, owing to the unavoidable absence of the President, it would be necessary to appoint a Deputy President,

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) moved that the Hon. Sir Frank Perry be appointed to the position.

The Hon. F. J. Condon seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT took the Chair and read prayers.

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor intimated by message his assent to the following Acts:—Appropriation (No. 1) and Supply (No. 1).

QUESTIONS.

HOME CONSTRUCTION.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave to make a statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In this morning's *Advertiser* appears a statement by the president of the Master Builders' Association (Mr. Brimblecombe) regarding the setting up of a committee consisting of representatives of the Building Trades Union, the Institute of Architects, the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufactures, together with a Government representative, to carry out a policy of constructing homes without deposit. This proposal is on all fours with one submitted by members of my Party in this and the other House two or three years ago. In view of the urgency of home building, will the Government appoint a representative to that committee?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I read the press announcement with some interest, and realize how easy it is for someone to decide upon something if someone else puts up the money. There is a project in view to make it easier for people to own their own houses, but I would prefer to get the complete information before replying to the honourable member.

EAST-WEST ROAD.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I ask leave to make a statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—At a recent meeting of the Federal Graziers' Council held at Alice Springs the Federal Minister for Territories (Mr. Hasluck) is reported to have informed the meeting concerning the Federal Government's road construction programme, including an East-West road. Further, at a meeting of the South Australian Region of the Australian Road Federation held in Adelaide the chairman (Mr. Fooks) mentioned that the South Australian Highways Department intended to build a highway to Western Australia. Can the Minister of Roads say whether the Eyre Highway is included in the Federal Government proposal for additional finance towards national road development, and if so, to what stage has the project advanced?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The position is that the cost of construction of roads in the outer council areas, through which the Eyre Highway passes after it leaves Port Augusta, is contributed to jointly by the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments, and as far as I am aware no further approach has been made by the Commonwealth Government with a view to an arterial highway being constructed on the same route as the Eyre Highway.

SITTINGS OF THE COUNCIL.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Can the Chief Secretary say whether, on completion of the Address in Reply debate, the Council will adjourn or will new legislation be introduced here?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—As is customary, when the Council completes the debate on the Address in Reply it will either proceed with legislation that can be appropriately introduced here or adjourn until such time as the Address in Reply debate is disposed of in another place. The legislation ready for introduction will be reviewed so that whatever is considered appropriate can be introduced here to enable sittings to continue.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:—Blanchetown bridge, Croydon boys technical high school, and augmentation of the water supply in the Encounter Bay water district.

RAILWAY DERAILMENTS.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (on notice)—

1. How many derailments occurred between Murray Bridge and Goodwood from January 1, 1956, to date?

2. What were the causes of such derailments?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The replies are:—

1. From 1/1/56 to 18/5/58 there was one derailment per 137,000 train miles operated over the Goodwood-Murray Bridge section of the railways. This compares very favourably with other railways. The Railways Commissioner reports that the South line between Goodwood and Murray Bridge is in a better physical condition today than he has ever known it to be.

2. Derailments are caused by either track defects, rolling stock defects, uneven loading of freight cars, faulty train operation, or a combination of two or more of these factors. It is believed that the recent derailments at Goodwood and Blackwood were caused by the effect of dynamic braking on long freight trains moving at slow speeds through junctions. Steps have been taken to obviate this hazard.

NORTH TERRACE-KING WILLIAM STREET INTERSECTION.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to take action, if necessary by amending legislation, to prevent trams and/or buses turning from King William Street into North Terrace, or *vice versa*, except when commencing or terminating a tour of duty?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The trust's conversion scheme aimed at the reduction of right-hand turns in the city area to an unavoidable minimum, and in particular at the abovementioned intersection. After July 20, 1958, right-hand turns at this point will be for one regular bus service only, compared with three regular tram routes. In addition, there were a considerable number of trams making this turn when cutting in and out of traffic to and from depot, which has been greatly reduced under bus operation, for which other roadways are utilized. The question of the Paradise-Springfield bus service turning at the intersection in question was given much consideration, but the route was finally decided upon as best suiting public convenience and a proper distribution of routing. Both the Adelaide City Council and the Police Department raise no objection to the movement, and the Government does not propose to take any action.

HILTON BRIDGE.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice)—

1. What is the actual cost to date of repairs to the Hilton Bridge?

2. What was the estimated cost of the project?

3. By what amount is the cost likely to exceed the estimate?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE:—The replies are:—

1. £20,169 to 31st May, 1958.

2. £18,890.

3. £2,529. The excess of actual cost over the estimate was brought about by the high cost of structural steel which, in view of the urgency of replacement, had to be purchased interstate from various firms. An excess of £4,474 was incurred on this account.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech:—

May it Please Your Excellency—

1. We, the Members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present Session of Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we shall give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the Session.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—It is my pleasure and privilege to move the adoption of the Address in Reply to the speech with which the Lieutenant-Governor opened this session. The position is a little unusual because this is the fourth session of this Parliament. Generally we have only three but we had a special one last year to commemorate the centenary of the State. His Excellency is, of course, acting for His Excellency the Governor who, I am sure we are all glad to know, has gone for a holiday. We trust that his holiday will do him good and bring him back fit to carry on as splendidly as he has done in this State in the past. I am sure I am speaking for every honourable member when I say how pleased we are at the additional honour bestowed upon His Excellency the Governor by Her Majesty the Queen in the Birthday Honours.

We were pleased when last year His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Lady Napier were able at last to have a real holiday. They had an extended tour, and I am sure we are all very much alive to the fact that no-one deserved a holiday more than they. I have pointed out before in this Chamber that Sir Mellis Napier, as Lieutenant-Governor, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and Chancellor of the University, has done magnificent work for this State, and I feel that the State owes him a great debt of gratitude.

Since His Excellency's speech in this House the State has suffered a severe loss in the death of our great friend, Sir Wallace Sandford. Sir Wallace was a member of this Chamber for 18 years, from 1938 to 1956. He did great work for South Australia and its citizens. We all know that he was very active in the Chamber of Commerce in his time. In addition to his 18 years' service in this Chamber he was for 16 years a member of the Adelaide Hospital Board and one of the trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia, and we all know that he was a member and chairman of the Wine Overseas Marketing Board and also a member of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. He was also a Commissioner of Charitable Funds and various other things. I have said enough to show that he was one of the outstanding South Australians of our generation, and we regret very much his sudden death which has deprived us of one of our leading citizens.

I mentioned earlier that this was the fourth session of Parliament because last year we had a special session to celebrate the Centenary of this Parliament in its present form of two Houses, or the bi-cameral system. I mention that because I will refer later to the importance which I attach to the present system. In mentioning the centenary of our present system of Parliamentary Government I am rather awed by the fact that the President, whose absence we all regret today, the Hon. Frank Condon and myself have been here for approximately one quarter of the century. I entered this Chamber in 1933, and therefore have some responsibility for what has happened during that time. We are the only three members of that Parliament who are still here. One of the others who came in with me in 1933 and who has since died, to the great regret of us all, was my friend Mr. Oscar Oates who represented Central District No. 1. He was a great character and did

great work in this Chamber. We all remember the year when Mr. Condon was absent and Mr. Oates was the Leader of his Party in this Chamber, and how well he performed his work and what a real assistance he was in all our deliberations by his friendliness and his willingness to work in with all members.

The Chief Secretary, the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, came in, I think, the next year. In what I may call that outstanding Parliament of 1933 you, Mr. Deputy President, and Messrs. Melrose and Anthoney were elected to another place. I hope I am not boring members with these reminiscences. I mention them for a very set purpose, to show that although the personnel of this honourable House changes all the time and must go on changing the traditional attitude of this Council towards legislation does not alter. As one lot goes out others come in, but this Council has always taken a serious view of all matters laid before it, and I am sure it will always do so.

Twenty-five years ago I had the privilege of moving the same motion that I am moving today, and I think it is interesting to compare the position as it was then and now. In 1933 we had passed through a depression and been through a tough time. We came in with a new Parliament, as you, Sir, well remember, and it is rather interesting to see where we were then. At June 30, 1933, the population of South Australia was 580,000, but in December last it was 886,000, a very great difference. In 1933 the number of children attending State schools in South Australia was 88,000. In 1956 the number was 139,000, and we are told in His Excellency's Speech of the great increase that is ahead of us.

We find that the Loan Estimates for 1932-33 were £2,088,000, and for 1957-58 they were £24,900,000. The Budget of this State in 1933 totalled £11,244,000, and last year it was £71,615,000. I realize, of course, that in quoting monetary figures we have to take into account the unfortunate decline in the value of money. But, even so, the difference between 1933 and 1958 in this State is phenomenal. No one can deny the marvellous progress which has been made and the great prosperity which the State has enjoyed. Of course, one has to mention that for the last 10 years we have had wonderful seasons. Things are not as good now but those wonderful seasons have contributed.

All this advancement and prosperity in this State has happened in spite of a world war and, in case my honourable friends on my left

overlooked it, I point out that during this time of progress and prosperity we have enjoyed the privilege of a Liberal and Country Party Government.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What about saying what the Chifley Government did to assist the Government?

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—I had a rough idea that the bait I was using would produce a bite, knowing what sort of flies to use in this Chamber!

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Tell us about Mount Gambier.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—Turning to the particulars of the Speech, I must refer first to the personal losses and gains set out, particularly the losses. Forty-six years ago, a young man named Malcolm McIntosh became a very valued member of the staff of a firm of which I was a partner and since then I have worked with him in many spheres and capacities. We are all very sorry to hear that Sir Malcolm McIntosh was so ill that he had to resign his portfolio. We hope that, having gone further now, and announced his retirement from Parliament, with all those things off his mind, his health will greatly improve.

In that connection, I also note the welcome announcement that has been made since and desire to congratulate the Honourable David Brookman on joining the Government. He is the son of an ex-member of this House whom we all dearly loved, and I should say admired, for his work for everybody in the country. It is therefore most fitting that his son should become Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Deputy President, I mentioned just now the centenary meeting of this Parliament and drew attention to the fact that even at that first meeting of this Parliament one hundred years ago attention seemed to be centred on the Murray River and the importance of Murray water. Then it was considered from the point of view mostly of navigation. Subsequently, we have made wonderful use of the water for other purposes but it is interesting to note that in this speech of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor the emphasis is again on water. It is not surprising because such a large area of this State has a particularly low rainfall.

When I was on the Land Settlement Committee, we used to have a plan showing how much of the State had a reasonable rainfall, how much of it was dry, how our pioneers in spite of that went out into the really dry country and how they are still

using country which has less rainfall than much country in the other States which people will not look at. But the two outstanding things in this Speech about the Murray are the Snowy River scheme and the Mannum pipeline. I congratulate the Government because last year, which was a remarkably dry year, we could never have got through with the big population in the metropolitan area of Adelaide unless we had had the Murray water available. With all the factories and new buildings, water is essential, and it is a great credit to the Government, that, whereas water restrictions operated in other States enjoying a much better rainfall close to the cities, we had none.

The other point is the persistence of the Premier and his Government in protecting our rights under the Snowy River scheme. I am sure that every honourable member is delighted to know that, since His Excellency opened this Session with his Speech, agreement has been come to. Although I do not know the details any more than honourable members do, it has been stated that the details are satisfactory to us and I sincerely trust that the Government and the Premier will get sufficient credit for the way in which they have stuck out for and obtained South Australia's rights.

Another important matter that I have noted here as being investigated by the Public Works Committee is the Encounter Bay water supply. I was delighted to see that the Committee's report was tabled today. There is no question of the extraordinary and continuing growth of population in the Encounter Bay district, all still relying on a small reservoir which I think dates from about 1914. It is a serious matter. I hope that the report will persuade the Government to do something about it at an early date.

There are many other matters in his Excellency's Speech to which I could refer. As a matter of fact, it is a wonderful list of achievements but I do not propose to go into their details. I know that the honourable gentleman who will follow me in this debate knows more about the details of them than I do. The record is there—hospitals, schools, railways and so on, and I confidently leave the detailed comments on those to the seconder of this motion.

There are, however, two things which I must mention, for they are outstanding. They are the steel works and the oil refinery. As has been suggested in the Speech, they will

inevitably, when they get going, involve subsidiary undertakings and enterprises which will create great employment and will greatly advance the general all-round balance of work and business in this State.

In the foreshadowed legislation I notice some very old friends. The first two are, I think, prices and rent control, and I do not think any honourable member or the Government would expect me to alter my attitude on those, but we will have an opportunity to discuss the position when they are brought forward for consideration. I was particularly interested in the reference to the cellulose industry. Honourable members will recollect that in the early part of last session we authorized the Government to take up further shares in Cellulose (Aust.) Limited, and at that time there were vague and indefinite statements about probable arrangements with Australian Paper Manufacturers, the Government and Cellulose (Aust.) Limited for further large development in the South-East. We got no further information about it, but it is stated in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that an agreement has been reached in principle between Cellulose (Aust.) Limited and Australian Paper Manufacturers and the Government, and that the proposal will probably be referred to the Industries Assistance Committee in the near future; also that a Bill to facilitate the operations of the Cellulose Company may be necessary and that this matter at present is being investigated by the South-Eastern Drainage Board.

Later in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech appears the following:—

An amendment of the Industries Development Act will be submitted to you for the assistance of factories in country areas.

If I remember the general procedure early in the war, a voluntary committee called the Industries Assistance Committee was set up, but it went out of existence long ago, and I do not know why the term "Industries Assistance Committee" is used in paragraph 31 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. As far as I know, there is at present only one official committee, which is the Industries Development Committee.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—That is a printer's error.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—I do not think it is, but is loose thinking in all departments, which have got used to talking about the Industries Assistance Committee and still talk about it, but it is wrong. If the Industries Development Act is to be amended,

then I ask the Government in all seriousness to make it certain that the committee has to report to Parliament. The present committee does not, any more than the State Traffic Committee does.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Because these committees get confidential information which they could not divulge to Parliament.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—I know that the honourable member has been a member of the Industries Development Committee and knows much about it. In the early days the Government was attempting to get small Industries on their feet, which is probably quite desirable, but if it is prepared to go into industry in a big way, nothing will persuade me that the proposed arrangement with Cellulose (Aust.) Ltd. and the Australian Paper Manufacturers will not involve it in perhaps hundreds of thousands of pounds. This should not be done without the authority of Parliament, and we should have a report as to what it is all about. When we were discussing this matter last time one honourable member said "Why did not you object to it at the time?"

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—And I repeat that again now.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—The answer is that I called for a division against the whole Bill at the time, and that is more than my honourable friend can say. I object to the general set-up of the Government's going into trade too much.

As this may be my last opportunity in this Chamber to roam at will and talk about anything I like, there are two things I should like to mention. The first is the size of the South Australian Parliament. The last alteration was made in 1936, when we cut down the House of Assembly to 39 members and provided for single electorates, but we did not alter the membership of the Legislative Council. I have already pointed out that at the time our population was under 600,000, but at present it is approximately 890,000. Apart from actual numbers, the work of Parliament has very materially altered. In the old days it dealt with certain financial and general matters, but was not asked to legislate on the size of oranges or the colour of honey and so on. We have had a great extension in the detailed matters placed before Parliament, and that is one reason why I feel we want a larger and more workable Parliament. Because of the increase in all the matters dealt with, additional Ministers were appointed. I am not objecting, as I think it is quite right.

We have very few Ministers compared with ministries in the other States, but in order to be able to select Ministers who will be familiar with the subjects they are called upon to administer, it is desirable that this Parliament should be increased. We are a sovereign Parliament in the matters we have not handed over to the Federal Parliament, and I cannot help thinking that if we had 60 members in the House of Assembly and 30 in this Chamber we would be able to do better work for the State than we are trying to do now. I throw that into the ring for future consideration. I have had it in mind for some years, but as this is my last opportunity to mention it, I put it on record, because I believe we would be able to do better work and have better ministries if we had more members in both Houses.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Would you favour an alteration of the franchise?

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—Certainly not. I doubt whether people generally, even members of this Chamber, know exactly the functions, rights and work of this Legislative Council, and how it protects them by the deadlock provisions of the Constitution. The general public has little idea what the Council is intended to do and what it actually does. There is a feeling abroad that second chambers are of little value. Unfortunately the second chambers in Queensland and in New Zealand have been abolished. One day that will be regretted. Nearly 20 years ago at an election meeting at Northfield I spoke in support of the candidature of Sir Shirley Jeffries. After I had spoken he said he had not previously heard anyone logically defend the Council. That offended me and I said the Council did not need to be defended but to be explained to people who did not understand its functions. I pointed out that originally it was the Governor in Council who governed the State and that subsequently the Assembly was added. My 25 years in Parliament have convinced me of the need not to defend but to assert and explain the worth and usefulness of a second chamber.

I am a great believer in Parliamentary forms, and in things being done in the proper way according to the Standing Orders, for the reason that nearly all the forms and regulations about the conduct of Parliamentary proceedings are designed for the protection of the people. Ordinarily a Bill is introduced in another place, read a first time, ordered to be printed, and a day set down for the second

reading. The fact that that is published—or it should be published—should put the public on the alert. Then the second reading is debated considerably, with a further discussion in Committee. When I first came here I wondered why a Bill was received, the debate on it commenced, and then adjourned until another day. I gradually learned that that procedure enable the people to know what was going on and so that nothing could be put through in a hurry. In South Australia we have a bicameral system of Government. I do not want to go into past history because everybody gets bored when history is quoted, but Cromwell, after he had kicked out the Parliament in England, came back and said that two Houses of Parliament were needed. He said:—

By the proceedings of this Parliament you see they stand in need of a check and balancing power. I tell you that unless you have some such thing as a balance we cannot be safe.

They started with a single chamber in America after the revolution, and then adopted a second one. The same thing happened in France after the revolution. The second chamber entails a second look and allows the people to know what is going on and to have the last say. In a minor way there is an important function of this Council which protects high State officials, such as the Judges of the Supreme Court, the Auditor-General and the Public Service Commissioner. In the course of their duties, particularly the Auditor-General and the Public Service Commissioner, it is necessary, if they find it desirable, to criticize the Government and to suggest that things have been wrongly done. If there were no second Chamber and an unscrupulous Government was in office it could dismiss the Auditor-General and appoint another. In this State that cannot be done because the occupants of those responsible positions cannot be removed from office except by an address to the Governor from both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Two Houses are all right if there is adult suffrage.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—That is the opinion of the honourable member but other people who have thought over the matter for years have come to a different conclusion. In every country where the bi-cameral system has worked effectively there has been some difference between the franchise of the Upper and Lower Houses. That is essential. In some countries members of the Upper House are elected by provincial councils, in the House of Lords it is hereditary and in Canada there is appointment for life. I think ours is the

best system. It is really household suffrage. The person responsible for the running of a house and family has the vote and not the girl or boy of 21 who is earning big money without responsibility. These young folk cannot be expected to have the same ideas of responsibility as the householder with a family. When there is a general election in South Australia only half the Council members retire. This is a compromise, because in some Upper Houses members are either appointed or are hereditary members. They are there for life. Here half the members retire to take the consequences of public opinion, whilst the other half retain their seats. By staying in Parliament these other members are not necessarily influenced by any hectic decision made on the spur of the moment in an election campaign. There is no question of Party politics in this matter. If my friends want it, I will say that it is vitally necessary for only half the members to retire. If there were a Labor Government in office it might get instructions from the Trades Hall people who have nothing to do with the electors and are absolutely unknown to them.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Now you are attempting to tell a fairy tale. You were going well before that.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—The honourable member should cast his mind back to last June when a gentleman named Mr. Bannister said that he had studied all the Parliamentary procedure and had given instructions to every Labor member as to what he was to do.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—He did not say that.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—He did say it, and anticipating a possible loss of memory by the honourable member I have here a copy of what was said. This is what he said:—

Labor members of the State Parliament must completely and uncompromisingly oppose any Long Service Leave Bill that does not conform to Labor's policy.

That was reported in the press as being a ruling given by the President of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party at the meeting of the State convention. That is the position, and that is why I say how important this Chamber is.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What about your people on North Terrace and the way they instruct you?

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—If the honourable member looks at *Hansard* of October 4, 1938 (page 1669) he will find a

complete statement and apologies by the *News* and its writers for having said that the Liberal and Country League gave instructions in the same way as the Labor Party. They apologized in the *Advertiser* and sacked their Editor, and it is all here in *Hansard*. The honourable member, therefore, had better be careful not to say outside what he has said here. I recommend the honourable member to read *Hansard* dealing with that matter.

I mention these things to show the importance of the Legislative Council. Under the Constitution the Legislative Council provides and insists that the people will have the last say. If any Government of any shade gets carried away suddenly in an election and the new Government wishes to pass some law that is repugnant to the people, this Chamber will hold it up for a year and perhaps it will be introduced again the following year. If the Council tries to hold it up after there has been an election on that subject—and section 46 of the Constitution Act deals with this matter—the Governor dissolves the whole Parliament. The people therefore have the final say, and the only way they can do so is by the retention of the Legislative Council, and, I suggest, in its present form. I would like to say from my own experience how important I feel this Chamber is. I think honourable members who have travelled in the other States realize that people say, "Oh yes, you have got on very well and you are on a very even keel in South Australia," and frequently some of them say, "that is because you have got an Upper House that works." That is a fact, gentlemen. We are a House of review and behave as one, and I hope we will do so for a very long time.

Finally, I wish to thank my very old friend, Mr. Condon, you, Sir, Mr. Bardolph and Sir Arthur Rymill for your kind words in connection with the honour Her Majesty was good enough to confer upon me in the last Birthday Honours. My wife and I appreciate very much indeed the good will and congratulations of our friends. Naturally I am gratified at having received some recognition principally because I have realized that it is not so much a recognition of me personally but of what I have tried to do as one of the Leaders in this Council. I am quite sure that the tribute is to the Legislative Council and its work far more than to me. In moving the adoption of this report I feel confident that not only in this session but in many future Parliaments this Council will prove its worth and necessity and will be a great protector,

help, and benefit to the true democracy of this State. I move the motion.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE (Southern)—Mr. Deputy President, it is my privilege and pleasure to second the adoption of the motion. I enjoyed, as every other member did, the address with which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor opened the present session. South Australia in my opinion—and I am sure this opinion is shared by all—has been most fortunate in the representatives of the Royal Family that we have had in South Australia. His Excellency the Governor and Lady George have endeared themselves to all in no uncertain manner. They remind me very strongly of those wonderful people Lord and Lady Norrie. They, too, certainly enjoyed the society and the environment provided by our people in this State. I had opportunities to meet them personally and judge just how pleasant they made the atmosphere of those enjoyable functions in our country areas.

I support the tribute which the Honourable Sir Collier Cudmore paid to the late Sir Wallace Sandford who rendered such good service to this State. I remember when I was unofficial Whip in this Chamber how readily he used to assist the House on financial measures. He never failed to provide that wonderful service which the Honourable Sir Collier Cudmore mentioned in his speech. We are sorry that Sir Walter Duncan is not with us on this occasion. He, too, has been a very great factor in the principles and the atmosphere of this Legislative Council of which we are so proud.

Together with Sir Collier Cudmore, this will be the last occasion that I will have the opportunity to speak on the Address in Reply. Since I was a youngster of 9 years of age I have been actively associated with the politics of this State, with the exception of one very brief period during the 1930's. At that time I felt the tremendous difficulties associated with the period which South Australia was going through. My mind goes back to those difficult periods which the soldier settlers experienced after the first war. They did not face favourable market conditions, but experienced adverse conditions when grain was at an extremely low price as was wool. Although their land commitments were low, they were unable to meet them. I well remember that primary producers at Mount Gambier and other South-Eastern areas at that time received 25s. a ton for potatoes, and 2½d. a gallon for milk. Such conditions make us really sympathetic towards the man on the land and the difficulties with which he is associated.

I wish to refer to the work that Sir Malcolm McIntosh has done and his great service to this State. I remember when he was first elected when he was resident, I think, at Pinnaroo. He and the present Chairman of the Transport Control Board (Mr. McMillan), entered our South Australian politics, and both these gentlemen, with their political experience, have done a tremendous amount of work for the good of this State.

One thing that appealed to me in His Excellency's speech was the prominence given to our agriculturists. I have just referred to the difficult periods which the people in the South-East experienced in those early days. I remember in 1912 a friend and I paying a visit to Kybybolite, when Mr. Colebatch, the then manager of the Kybybolite experimental farm, was endeavouring to do something to show the possibilities of that wonderful area. At that time one paddock of 40 acres adjacent to the railway line was the only paddock in that area that was showing any marked progress with fodder. He was growing a crop of chon moellier on that 40 acres. The only people making any effort to take advantage of the wonderful natural climatic conditions and the soil conditions down there were a family by the name of Schinckel. I was very happy to read of the honour bestowed on Mr. Ted Schinckel. Another gentleman was Mr. Lawrie. They were the two people endeavouring to establish subterranean clover, and Mr. Sid Shepherd also.

They went down to Kybybolite. We tried to learn from a prominent agriculturist just what to do to establish our country but I am afraid that neither Mr. Colebatch nor anybody else at that time was able to give us the real answer about growing crops at Wirrega.

It is a great tribute to the people of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, the Agricultural Department and their officers that we in this State have made such remarkable progress in our primary production. It is entirely due to them that we have been able to discover the only method of handling the primary-producing part of the State and treating soil deficiencies with these trace elements. It is because of those people that we have been able to accomplish such results and get the improved primary production that has taken place in the South-East. It is only in its infancy but I believe that, with the added carrying capacity of these areas and the increased stock-carrying capacity, ultimately the South-East and Upper South-East of South Australia, and Kangaroo Island, will become

one of the real mixed farming areas of the world. It is a shame to see some beautiful country in Australia being neglected and not growing the fodder plants that are grown in this State. I refer particularly to our lucerne-growing properties not only in our north and the Upper South-East, in Tintinara and Keith, but also in isolated patches. You do not see it growing, however in areas similar to those our primary producers have established in other States.

We have made remarkable progress. It has been achieved by our primary producers but has been due entirely to those officials to whom I have referred. I pay them a sincere tribute. I suggest that South Australia must make progress or we shall never be able to cope with that home market which is so important. We can have our export trade but, with the development that is going on in South Australia, we have to look after our home markets. I sincerely commend the Government for the tremendous work they have done in maintaining our rights, as I hope they have, in the Snowy River scheme. My father was Minister for Works when the River Murray Waters Agreement was being discussed, and it has caused me much concern that the three States and the Commonwealth did not discuss this as a joint body rather than let two States and the Commonwealth handle the affair at the outset. That was most regrettable. I pay a sincere tribute to the Government for the way in which they stuck their toes in and demanded that South Australia should have its rights under the Murray River Waters Agreement and that the original arrangements of the agreement should not in any way be departed from. I have said this previously and want to emphasize it. When that Bill comes before Parliament, I shall be interested to see whether those original arrangements are preserved. It is essential that we develop our primary production along the lines of these pasture lands finally becoming mixed farms, as I think they will.

The mover was good enough to say that I would refer to the matters that have been associated with the Public Works Committee in connection with His Excellency's Speech. I do not propose to deal with the individual lines because I think that the last paragraph of the Speech shows that various Bills will be submitted to Parliament. Then we can deal with many of the items set out in the Speech. I want to say how pleased I am—and I am

sure this is generally accepted—that the Government have continued through the Mines Department their search for minerals. In regard to the minerals that have been discovered, the iron ore deposits have opened up a wonderful future. That has resulted from explorations carried out by the Mines Department. What a wonderful future it has created for South Australia! Think of the steelworks that B.H.P. are going to establish at Whyalla. Recently I visited Newcastle and Port Kembla and saw there what a steelworks really meant. Stewart and Lloyds and other well-established factories are sitting there side by side with that steelworks. That shows what a steelworks will mean to this State. I believe that, when that steelworks is established, it will be difficult to foresee the business extensions that will occur in that locality. If coke is sent from Newcastle, it will be very much cheaper than ore being carted across to Newcastle. I firmly believe that our coal resources in Australia will be important. Today is a time when the transportation of oil could easily be upset. I am convinced that we have to look after our coal resources. In *The Coal Miner* of June, 1958, these words appeared:—

From a total of 204,000 tons in 1955-56, overseas shipments rose to 550,000 tons last financial year.

This shows that these coal deposits are important not only to Australia but also to Japan. With the development of our Leigh Creek coal resources and the cheapening effect that it has on the supply of electricity to our customers and on the pumping costs of our Mannum-Adelaide water supply (and also on many other water supplies that will require pumping), to have our source of power manufactured from a mine in the centre of our State is important, and we should do our best to give every assistance to maintain that supply of coal. The building of the railway line on the western side of the Flinders Range has been a great factor, and it has considerably lessened the cost of supply of our fuel to manufacture that power at Port Augusta.

I say without fear of contradiction that, as time goes on, our Mines Department, from the way they are making their searches throughout the State, will find minerals at present not dreamed of. For instance, the recent discovery of uranium deposits has built up our financial position by saving us dollars when uranium has been exported to America and England.

Another mine which caused some concern in this Parliament in the early days was the Dome Rock copper mine. There is another mine in the centre of the Flinders Range—the Oraparinna Mine—and, as time goes on, we shall find further mines that will be profitable to South Australia. I have an idea—I may be wrong—that perhaps in the future many of our metropolitan railway lines will be converted to electricity. I know that diesel oil vehicles play a prominent part in railway administration today, and the costs are cheaper, but the Public Works Committee (I think it was in 1954) recommended the duplication of the Henley Beach line and also the electrification of certain of our metropolitan lines. The engineer who took the place of Mr. Harrison was not altogether in favour of electrification of our metropolitan lines at the time. Therefore, it was not proceeded with because it was felt that the diesel oil vehicles would give the most satisfactory results. I think it will be found that electricity will eventually have to provide the power for our metropolitan lines, and this will be a very important feature in South Australia.

I pay a tribute to the Housing Trust for the remarkable work it is doing in providing homes for people who could never hope otherwise to secure accommodation. The trust, the Savings Bank, the State Bank and other lending institutions have played a very important part in South Australia's development by providing homes, and it is difficult to imagine how we could have housed our people had these institutions not been given encouragement and support. The progress South Australia is making is truly wonderful. To meet accommodation requirements because of the proposed establishment of an oil refinery at Christies North, the Housing Trust has purchased 2,000 acres on which 4,000 homes may be built. Probably more than 4,000 school children will have to be provided for, and it would appear that at least four schools will be necessary. This is in addition to numerous schools being built in other areas, including Elizabeth where, I understand, six schools are being provided.

Under the administration of the Playford Government South Australia has made remarkable progress, and it must be given full marks for the way it is providing accommodation to meet the population influx. In addition it has overcome the many problems and difficulties associated with providing teachers for our schools.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Does not Parliament supply the money?

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE—Yes, but who supplies the brains to bring these things before Parliament? We can all be proud of our State. Our Chief Secretary has done a remarkably good job in meeting the health requirements of the people. Only recently a committee of prominent local medical men recommended to the Public Works Standing Committee that five additional storeys should be added to a building now in progress at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Some years ago another committee presented a case to the Public Works Standing Committee for the erection of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and advanced the theory that there should be not only the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but also hospitals erected on the west, north, east and south sides of the metropolitan area so that the health of the people could be properly catered for. Our Health Department has played an immensely important part in maintaining the health of our people, and I therefore commend the Chief Secretary and his department for the way they are tackling the problem, which indeed is a very big one. I support many of the comments advanced by Sir Collier Cudmore, and congratulate him on the honour conferred on him by Her Majesty the Queen in recognition of his services to his country. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion so ably moved by Sir Collier.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 23, at 2.15 p.m.