

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, July 31, 1958.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**MEDICAL RESEARCH.**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—On Monday last a statement appeared in the *News* under the caption “Visiting United States Professor says our hospitals lack research facilities.” The gentleman in question is Professor Maxwell Wintrobe, a blood specialist from the University of Utah in the U.S.A. This is what he said:—

Most Australian hospitals give little opportunity for research. The doctors’ time seems to be almost entirely occupied with caring for patients.

Can the Minister of Health say whether that statement applies to either the Royal Adelaide or Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and whether sufficient research facilities exist at those hospitals?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I do not know the position in other States. Members are aware that some years ago the pathological section of the Royal Adelaide Hospital was transferred to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, which was then established as a private organization and supported by the Government, and since then it has been continually developed. It is now carrying on research work not only with regard to the problems of medicine but with veterinary work. I would think that any trouble that we have is not so much in the provision of facilities but the lack of people who have chosen the field of research as their life work. At the Queen Elizabeth Hospital quite a generous provision has been made in the special pathological section, and there are also facilities for research by the honoraries working in that institution. Considering our population, I would think that we are comparable with other countries and well up with the leaders with regard to the provision of research institutions.

SEALING OF STURT HIGHWAY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I ask leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—My question concerns the grading and sealing of the Sturt Highway between Paringa and Renmark, a distance of approximately 1½ miles. In answer to my previous question in this Chamber, the Minister of Roads said that attention would be given to this work when the North of the River Road through Morgan was completed. As that work has now been completed, can the Minister give me the following information:—

- (1) Are plans in hand to commence the project at an early date?
- (2) What is the approximate cost of the work to be undertaken?
- (3) Will the necessity to rebuild flood damaged bridges in the Renmark area have any effect upon the Minister’s previous decision.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—A somewhat similar set of questions has been directed to my colleague in another place, and a report has been prepared. I will make that report available later in the day.

FRUIT FLY ROAD BLOCKS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked last week with regard to fruit fly road blocks?

The Hon. LYELL McEWIN—The Minister of Agriculture has supplied me with the following report by the Director of Agriculture:—

The matter of road blocks designed to prevent introduction of fruit fly from other States is under constant review and our policy is guided by an assessment of relative risks presented by various highways. The most dangerous routes whereby infested fruit could be introduced are the Sturt Highway and Eyre Highway, and 24-hour road blocks are operating at Yamba and Ceduna. In the case of the Duke’s and Prince’s Highways from Victoria, risks of fruit fly introduction are much less because we are afforded substantial protection by Victorian road inspections aimed at fruit brought into that State from New South Wales. A recent approach by the citrus industry to the Commonwealth Government has suggested that quarantine barriers be established closer to the endemic fruit fly areas in New South Wales to protect areas of that State which are now fruit fly free, and, incidentally, the neighbouring States of Victoria and South Australia. This proposal will be considered by the Australian Agricultural Council in the near future and if it leads to positive action, risks to South Australia will be reduced greatly, particularly via the Duke’s and Prince’s Highways. Fortunately risks of fruit fly introduction are at lowest level in winter and we are given time to consider fully what action should be taken next summer in respect of the two southern highways from Victoria. Such action will be guided by an assessment of relative risks, which in turn will depend

upon the extent to which Victoria and New South Wales strengthen their quarantine barriers around fruit fly areas. In the meantime, data is being secured by the Department of Agriculture on the volume of traffic at various points on the Duke's and Prince's Highways.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 30. Page 205.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—Mr. President, in rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, I should first like to join other members in some personal references: first of all, to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Mellis Napier. Sir Mellis is a very great lawyer and a very great South Australian and I am sure we are proud of the way he carries out his duties as Lieutenant-Governor. I should like to congratulate the Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore on the notable speech that he made in moving the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. He restated some fundamental principles and I, as a junior member of this House, was very grateful that he did so because that restatement—necessarily short of course, because of the time involved—will act as a guide to me in so far as Sir Collier had time to refer to the matters with which he dealt.

Sir Collier very modestly said that in a sense his knighthood was an honour to the House rather than to himself. It certainly was a great honour to this House but I should like to say that I believe it was an honour directed not to this House, but to the wonderful and distinguished services of Sir Collier over 25 years to the people and the State. In common with other members, I am extremely sorry that Sir Collier has announced his proposed retirement from the House. I know that he has had an illness, he has fought against it as he has fought for his principles in this House and he seems to me to have lost none of his old fire. His leadership has been a great experience to me and I much regret that I for one am to lose that. I am sorry also that the House is to lose his unique personality. It will be a different place without him. All I can say is that it has been a great privilege to me to serve with him here for (it will be by the time he retires) three years. I am very happy to have had that experience because, if I am spared to carry on—and it can only be in a minor way, not comparable with his work—then the experience I have had with him will be, I am sure, of inestimable benefit to me. We

all wish him the very best in his retirement and a long life and happiness.

I should like also to congratulate the seconder of the motion, the Honourable Mr. Bice, on his excellent speech and also to express my regrets that he will retire from the House. He too has given yeoman service to this House and the State of South Australia. I should like to mention further the proposed retirement of the Hon. Mr. John Cowan, who has also given good service. All these gentlemen will be a great loss to the House which will be a different place without them. Both Mr. Bice and Mr. Cowan come along in a proud family tradition of State service. We shall all miss their presence very much. I should like to make the same expressions for their future as I did in relation to Sir Collier.

Members have paid tribute to the late Sir Wallace Sandford. I should like to join with those tributes. I did not serve with him in this House; actually, I took his place instead. I knew him well. He was a man of great charm, kindness, poise and capability. Other members have expressed very fully the sentiment that I feel, but I should like to pay my own tribute to him.

The retirement as a Minister of the Crown of Sir Malcolm McIntosh has also been mentioned. I should like to join in the expressions of regret. Sir Malcolm was a man not only of tremendous experience both in years and in other ways, as has already been said, but of wonderful knowledge and memory—I refer to him in the past only as a Minister. He could always be so helpful in any of one's problems relating not only to his portfolios but to Parliamentary matters generally. He always went out of his way to help me, and particularly when I first became a member of this place he was one of those who helped me find my feet. I am most grateful for that and hope that he will be restored to health in the near future.

Reference has also been made to the appointment as a Minister of the Honourable David Brookman (as he now is). I should like to join in those expressions and to say that I feel sure that he will apply himself to his work. He is a thoughtful man and should do a really good job in his ministerial position. I have known him for many years. He, too, has come along in a family tradition of service to this State. Members have recalled his father, the Honourable Norman Brookman, who was a member of this Chamber. I was not a member when Mr. Brookman was here but I think I can

claim that I have known him longer than some of his colleagues have because it so happens that I was a page boy at his wedding.

I think it was the Honourable Mr. Wilson who referred to the visit of the Queen Mother. I should like to join with him in that reference. In the Queen Mother we have an illustration of charm and graciousness at its very zenith. I feel sure that her visit not only has been an inspiration to us older people but also must act as a wonderful help and guide to the younger people coming along. To see a woman of her charm and graciousness must show them what those sorts of things mean and give them something at which to aim in their future way of life. I believe that such a visit can do nothing but the utmost good.

Mr. President, the Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore very ably dealt with the role of this House, as a House of Review and otherwise, and also referred to the franchise of the House. The Honourable Mr. Condon referred to this matter and said that it was time that we introduced adult suffrage. I interjected, as he will recall, "Why is adult suffrage a religion?" Mr. Bardolph also made reference to the same matter and I said to him by way of interjection, "Why 21 and not 20?" In other words why is this adult suffrage so right and everything else so wrong? It seems to me that the Labor Party has always let its tenets of belief become dogma and almost a religion. I express the view that there is no such thing as a perfect franchise, and there cannot be one. "One vote, one value" is the parrot cry. Whether it is a South African or Mexican parrot I am not certain, but I would like to pose this question. Why should the age be 21, if this is the dogma, and why not 30, as Mr. Condon interjected in a different sense, or 20 or 18, or 14 or some other age? Why should 21 be the religion? I do not want to go too deeply into this matter because it is something upon which one could dwell at length, but I repeat that there can be no dogma about the franchise. It is a matter of opinion as to what is the correct franchise for a place. In some places, in my opinion, the franchise should be different from what it is in others.

Mr. Condon asked how many years it had been since we had altered the franchise, indicating that it was many years. I differ with him in that because I believe, and I think I can prove it, never has the franchise been more altered than in the last 10 years. It has been done by non-intervention. Because of the

decline in the value of money and this non-intervention, the franchise has been widened about three times. Where it was necessary to own land of a value of £50 at the end of the recent war, that same land is now worth £150 on the three times principle which is so often adopted now. That means that to own land now worth £50 a person has to own land only one-third of that value as it was at the end of the war. Sir Collier Cudmore put it admirably when he said that the suffrage for this House was a household suffrage. That means the heads of the family, and to that has been added the returned soldier vote on the very proper principle that those who were prepared to give their lives for their country should have a stake in it and be entitled to vote. I think it is a wonderful franchise. One cannot imagine a more responsible or generous franchise for a House of review.

I would like to refer to the price of wool because it is something that affects all of us. Although Australia might not be so dependent upon wool values as she used to be on account of our higher industrialization, nevertheless the old adage that Australia lives on the sheep's back is still true. I recall that in the years before the war the wool price got as low as £10 a bale. When one quotes the price of wool one quotes a bale of roughly 300 lb. At the beginning of the war when the British Government took over the Australian wool clip the price was fixed at 13½d. a lb., which is about £17 a bale, which everyone here thought was a very good price. It was a considerable rise on what it had been previously, and subsequently the 13½d. was raised to 15d. a lb., which is roughly £18 15s. a bale, and the producer thought he was made because he was then able to make some progress. Since then we have seen wool rise to over £200 a bale. We have seen it come back to what might have been regarded as almost standard for several years, with fluctuations, to about £100 a bale, but recently it has dropped to £60. On the three times principle I mentioned, if we multiply £18 15s. a bale, which was the 15d. a lb. price, by three we get £56 5s. a bale, which is very near the price of roughly £60 that has been currently quoted. In other words, if wool has come back to the field and it seems on present prices to have come back, on this rough calculation there is merely a reasonable profit. If wool remains at the present price then the financial honeymoon is over. As we all know, the wool market is volatile and unpredictable and no-one

can tell whether it will stay where it is, or fall further, or whether it will rise.

We saw the other day, at the beginning of the Middle East crisis, the future's market take a rise and this sort of thing can affect the wool market overnight, so it is impossible for anyone to predict with certainty what the market will be. Again, the future of the wool market depends on the statistical position, which is good. There is not a great surplus of wool in the world. The quantity of our wool production is predicted to be lower, which should help the market in the way of price, and the price of wool is now more than competitive with the price of man-made synthetics. I do not want to paint a gloomy picture. I think the current price of wool is probably still on the profit-making side but not to a great extent. If it falls lower I think one should be wary of the future of the economy.

I would like to make this observation in relation to the price of wool. Where would we be if we had had a governmental board in control of wool after the war? Their thinking, I believe, would be attuned to wool at 15d. a lb. If there had been a body like that controlling wool, would we have seen the price rise to 14s. a lb.? I for one cannot believe that their minds would have been so fluid or that they would have been so astute on a non-free market as to realize the full value of the wool on a competitive market. If that did happen, and my prognostication had been right, it might have saved Australia from a lot of economic difficulties, but we would not have seen the surge of prosperity in this country that has taken place. We would not have seen such great and rapid development. Rather, it would have been stifled. That is why I believe in free markets wherever possible and honourable members will realize from these remarks that I am not a great believer in boards of control. They achieve some popularity when there is a seller's market with rising prices, but it seems to me that on a falling market they are largely ineffective.

We have seen the recent example of the dumping of eggs all over Australia. I know for a fact that Victorian eggs were dumped in South Australia. I am told that South Australian eggs were dumped in New South Wales and that Victorian eggs were dumped there. It is a most extraordinary thing that we should have eggs dumped here when we are in a position to dump them in New South

Wales. I believe that unless the board, and particularly a board regulating the internal economy as opposed to an overseas market, has some magic wand to wave—and I do not know what magic wands they have today—the administrative costs of the board must surely do one of two things, or possibly both of them—that is, increase the price to the consumer or reduce the price to the producer because the product is weighted with the cost of the administration of the board.

Recently I tried unsuccessfully to buy eggs in a country town, although I knew that some of my neighbours were big egg producers. Then suddenly one could buy Victorian eggs, and this at a time when South Australia was dumping eggs in New South Wales. Surely that is not good for the market. The same applies, I think, to potatoes. I had the idea that I might grow a few potatoes on my little property, but decided I would not, because I was not going to be told by a board when I could dig them or when I could sell them. After all, I am only a week-end farmer and possibly would not be able to dig them at the time the board told me. I wonder how many others would not grow potatoes because they did not want to be under a board.

These boards are remnants of our war-time economy. I am not criticizing their administration, their representation, or the manner in which they are set up. I believe they are being run quite as well as boards can be run, but I am questioning the efficacy of the principle of boards. We have this curious spectacle of having an Egg Board and a Potato Board, ostensibly, and I think producers think this, to keep prices up, whereas on the other hand we have price control for the purpose of keeping prices down, particularly on cost of living items. Two of the chief items in this category are eggs and potatoes. I must confess that it is beyond my comprehension why we have boards to keep prices up on cost of living items and at the same time have price control to keep prices down. I have expressed my views so often on price control that I will not weary honourable members at this stage with a further exposition of them, but I should like to read this extract from the *Sunday Mail* of May 10, 1958, under the heading, "End of Era. Beer is Free":—

An era in the history of Bavaria came to an end this week when the State Government abolished its 500-year price control on beer.

This reference to 500 years suggests to me that possibly we may even get rid of price control

during the life of the present Government. Passing from the field of primary production into the industrial field, Sir Collier Cudmore referred to the increases in the South Australian population and the Budget figures between 1933 and now. I had occasion recently to take out figures in relation to factories and employment which may interest the House, because by a coincidence I started with the same year as Sir Collier, namely, 1933. In that year, according to statistics, South Australia had 1,700 factories employing 26,000 hands, whereas in 1956 the respective figures were nearly 4,000 and more than 92,000. Wages paid had dwindled from £8,000,000 in 1929 to £4,000,000 in 1933, but in 1956 they amounted to £76,000,000, which is a notable achievement, even when one considers comparative money values. The figures show that wages were nearly 10 times those of the predepression figures and 19 times those of 1933. That is amazing progress. In 1933 the State sheep population was under 8,000,000 and in 1956 it was 13,500,000, which was due, of course, not only to the development of new country, but the improvement of existing holdings, and also, I imagine, to the impact of discoveries in fertilizers, trace elements and so on. It is interesting to note that in 1955 a total of 3,500,000 acres were topdressed, whereas in 1933 there were only 200,000.

At the same time our industrial progress has been even more spectacular than the other aspects of our progress to which Sir Collier Cudmore referred. There seems to be one drawback in relation to the development of a country like Australia in that our wage levels are now attuned chiefly to mass production, although not yet attuned to automation. That is to come, and it is something members of Parliament will have to keep up with in their thinking. Our wage levels are undoubtedly attuned to mass production, whereas previously they were not, and thus hand work costs are so much more proportionately than before this industrial development. Therefore, our industrial development, although wonderful in many senses, is a drawback in another sense, because in a young country which needs so much development as Australia does it is inevitable that there must be much hand work and hand improvisation. This is an inhibiting factor, and I think is one reason why building costs today are comparatively so much higher than they used to be.

I will refer to a few of the developments in our capital city of Adelaide, and first mention parking meters. Honourable members will

recall it was this Parliament that enabled the Adelaide City Council and other councils if they so desired to have the right to install parking meters. The object, although cynics will have otherwise, is to give a turnover of space to those who most require it. I think the meters have been eminently successful in this regard. For the payment of a comparatively trifling fee one can get parking space almost anywhere in the city for a reasonable time. The cynic, as I have said, says that the councils are out to make revenue. That is a happy by-product of the situation, because I can see no reason why the people who use the roads should not contribute, especially small amounts, towards their upkeep. On the contrary, I believe that it is right and proper that those using roads should contribute something towards them, and that is what parking meters are meant to do.

I think honourable members may be interested in some statistics which I have obtained in this regard because I do not think they have previously been published. The Adelaide City Council has now installed or is installing 1,040 meters which cost £48,000. The latest estimate of the annual revenue of those meters is approximately £60,000 per annum. A considerable amount of maintenance is involved with the meters, and the net return is expected to be about £50,000 per annum. That represents about a 2½d. rate in the City of Adelaide's finances, so the motorist is going to help the city whose roads, after all, are upkept for him, and he is going to help the city ratepayer who previously had to keep up the roads of Adelaide not only for Adelaide's population but the whole of the suburban population which is infinitely greater. The City Council has installed and will be installing traffic signals at 23 intersections, and the cost of this is £51,000. These expenses of traffic are not in a minor capacity at all.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—The free parking is very much better, too.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I agree. With the exit of the trams from Wakefield and Hutt Streets there will be further capacity for centre of the road parking. I think there are some developments going on in the city that are worthy of note. Sir Collier Cudmore asked a question not so long ago about trams turning at North Terrace. Members will have noticed in the last few days that the City Council is now about to extend Kintore Avenue through to Victoria

Drive. As long as the situation is intelligently handled, and I have no reason to assume that it will not be, that should more or less solve the bus problem at the North Terrace corner because buses could then be diverted around and through that road and back again which should stop the righthand turn at that very heavily trafficked intersection at North Terrace.

The gardens in front of the University, ever since they were put there as a State Centenary gesture, have always been much admired, and I am happy to say that the City Council has recently passed a resolution to extend them to the Frome Road Bridge, which should be another great asset to the city. There are some exciting ideas with regard to the parklands that the Town Clerk has brought back with him from overseas. It might be premature to give details of them at this stage, and even I do not know them all, but I think we will see some excellent developments of the parklands for the benefit of the people, in other words, developments that should bring pleasure to thousands of the people of Adelaide and suburbs.

The Town Hall improvements which were commenced in my regime are now nearing an end. Members may have seen an amusing story about that in the newspapers, which is perfectly true: the contractor who is doing the marble work inside was called in by the Town Clerk to explain why he was taking so long about it, and he said: "Sir, you do not understand, this job will last forever when it is finished." The Town Clerk replied: "Yes, I am sure it will; what I am worried about is that it is going to last forever before it is finished".

Finally in relation to Adelaide, I would like to refer to road developments. Trams are on the way out, God bless them; they did us great service, but they are undoubtedly outmoded in the traffic sense and have been at the root of most of our traffic difficulties in recent years. I hope and feel sure that we are going to see great strides made in the layout of our roads in the way of roundabouts and other things of that nature that were not previously possible. It is amazing how when a tramline is taken out of a street how much wider the street looks and, indeed, how much more traffic it seems to hold although it is only the same width. There is something inhibiting to traffic about a tramline in a street.

I am told that the Cheltenham tram is going to finish in October, which will mean that at

that stage only the Glenelg trams will be remaining. I am also told that their depot is expected to be in the Angas Street depot, and thus we will be able to get rid of the tramlines and tram poles in King William Street which is going to be a very great advantage. There will be traffic developments, and I think we will probably have to have a diamond turn, as it is called, in King William Street. There will have to be median strips of some sort to enable pedestrians to cross, and these things are being planned at the moment. All these things add up to progress in the traffic sense.

In relation to this Parliament, I would like to mention something about the Road Traffic Act in general. Members have expressed the view that the policy of this Act is too rigid. I know one of the leaders of the House has mentioned that in England the voluntary code is far more respected than the grab-you-by-the-scruff-of-the-neck code here under which when you commit a minor offence you are brought up before the beak. I am inclined to agree with that. I think we could get much better road courtesy by having a less rigid code, because a rigid code makes you stand on, as I have said before, as well as stop, and it is very hard to find a place for courtesy in a rigid road traffic code.

The State Traffic Committee seems to have the main control over the policy of the Road Traffic Act. That committee is composed of a number of very good men, a lot of them experts in their own spheres. Some of them are experts in one aspect of the Act and some of them in others, whilst some of them think they are experts in the whole of the Act. Whether they are or not, I cannot comment, but they cannot, in my opinion, have the overall view of the Road Traffic Act that a person like a Minister, who has the responsibility of administering that Act and the responsibility of carrying out the Act, would himself have.

I have directed questions in this House on the Road Traffic Act, but I have never known who to direct them to or how to find out because it seems that there are several Ministers each of whom has some function in relation to the Act. I suppose the Chief Secretary is in command of the policing of the Act, the Attorney-General has no doubt some role in relation to it, and the Minister of Roads, I think, has other aspects of the Act under his wing. From investigations I have made I consider that there is no Minister in charge of the policy of the Act, and I am going to

make a very respectful suggestion that one of the Ministers should be placed in charge of that policy. If anyone asked me who that should be, I would think possibly the Attorney-General—but that may be presumptuous of me. I suggest that if one of our competent Ministers (they are all competent) were placed in charge of the policy of the Act, we should get along a good deal better and might be able to bring about some real spring-cleaning of the Act rather than continue the present method of improvisation.

Recently, we celebrated the centenary of the Torrens system which commenced in this State and has become regarded, I think, as the ideal system of controlling lands titles in very many parts of the world, including parts of the old world. I always thought that Torrens was the inventor of the system, but during the celebrations doubts were cast whether he was the originator of the idea. Indeed, another was named as the originator. Once someone has an idea there are many people ready to put it into force, but I think the person who ought to be lauded and praised is he who first got the idea, because it is he who is really worthy of praise. Be that as it may, the fact that we celebrated the centenary of the Torrens system as something originating in South Australia is a credit to this State.

Speeches and references were made during the celebrations. There was one notable omission, as I thought, and that was this. Our present Registrar-General of Deeds is Mr. Jessup. A number of years ago he wrote an excellent book, which is a standard guide to legal practitioners and others in lands titles and conveyancing work, a guide to the practice of the Lands Titles Office. Also, it gives the form of almost every document needed in the conveyancing world. Not only is this a text book in South Australia but I know that some other States of Australia regard it as a great help. In other parts of the world where the Torrens system prevails, it must be of tremendous value. I should like to add to the remarks that were made on that occasion of praise to Mr. Jessup for all that he has done for those engaged in conveyancing work.

I read in the paper recently a suggestion by Mr. W. S. Kelly, who is well known to us I think, about trees in the countryside. As you well know, Mr. President, the beauty of trees in the countryside is great but that is not their only value. They are most valuable for shade, even for stock feed and

other purposes, and I imagine that they could well increase the value of farms and other holdings. Our Forests Department has a stock of many trees that are provided at reasonable prices for those who want them. The department also has an excellent catalogue of trees. Mr. Kelly referred to these things but he suggested—this is what I regard as the crux of his suggestion—that what was needed in South Australia was a qualified officer with a secretarial staff to give a lead in the planting and care of trees. I understand him to mean by that that superimposed on these excellent prevailing services there should be someone not only to provide information about the trees but to encourage people to use them, to instruct people, to go round telling them the virtues of planting trees, how they should be planted and where, and what value they could be. Such a move could well alter the look of the countryside, and also be of great value.

It is only less than 12 months ago since I was invited to open a show at Willunga in the south. I remember that one of the things I mentioned in relation to that glorious plain, some of the finest land in the State, was that the only thing it lacked was trees. Most of the red gums have been taken out to make way for agriculture. I suggested then that there were hundreds of nooks, crannies and corners where beautiful trees could be planted. If a move such as that suggested by Mr. Kelly could be developed, perhaps starting in our nearer areas and spreading out into the country, it would be of great benefit to the State.

The Hon. J. L. S. Bice—I might tell the honourable member that 20 years ago I endeavoured to get olive trees planted—

The PRESIDENT—Order!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I referred previously to the changing times in which we are living and mentioned that it behoved every one of us to try to keep up with the extraordinary pace of the discoveries and developments going on, how they are changing present standards and making an impact on our way of life, and how we ought to keep pace with them in our planning.

Recently, in giving an address to the Liberal and Country League, I made a research into the old Liberal Party of England and found that one of their aims many years ago achieved was equality of women with men. I noticed in the paper only a day or two ago that certain life peers were being appointed in England. I was surprised to note that if

the appointee was a man his wife was to be known as "Lady So-and-so" but that if the appointee was a woman her husband was to be known only as plain "Mr." That seems to me an unfair discrimination and it suggests to me that the day will come when we may be struggling for the equality of men with women!

We shall have soon the advent of television in South Australia. We all know what tremendous changes that has made in the lives of people elsewhere in the world. Opinion has it that even in those places the full impact of television is only in its infancy. There was a certain word of warning sounded the other day that I thought I might retail to members for their own benefit. A doctor in Philadelphia, U.S.A., reports in an American medical journal three cases of thrombosis in the legs of patients who had been watching television for prolonged periods while sitting in awkward positions. Two of these patients were elderly—aged 79 and 68 respectively—and the third was 39. So it encompasses every member of this House. "It has long been recognized," said the doctor, "that prolonged sitting in one position may induce thrombosis in certain individuals. It is therefore recommended that television viewers should get up and move about at least once an hour, in addition to moving the legs frequently." I make no apology for mentioning that, because it may be of great assistance to honourable members later.

In conclusion, I should like to congratulate the Government on its excellent programme, as contained in His Excellency's Speech. There are several outstanding features of the administration of the Playford Government. One is the way it has protected, and is always ready to protect, the interests of the people of South Australia. We hear talk of unification and so on. I think that we do very well under the Federal system as it exists with a strong State Government, which sees fair play to all, whether they be large or small. It is easy to say that we are all Australians, but one knows from one's youth what the big brother can do. The Snowy River Scheme is a very good example of how our Government is always on the *qui vive* to protect our interests. Members of the Labor Party seemed to alter their views on the matter from time to time. I remember that when Sir Thomas first started to fight in this regard it was said to be an electioneering stunt.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—No. In the Assembly we supported his move.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—That is correct. Some honourable members said it was an electioneering stunt and the Commonwealth authorities said it was a stunt. It has turned out to be very much different from that and I am sure that when the details are announced, because Sir Thomas has expressed satisfaction with what has been arrived at, we will be all extremely happy and grateful for his intervention in the matter. This is another grand job he has done for the State. The second thing is the continued progressiveness of our Government. It has always been on the lookout for new things and new industries, and progress. Everyone is familiar with the proposed oil refinery and the new industries at Elizabeth and Whyalla, and I only mention them as illustrations of continued and great progress. Sir Thomas's present visit to America also appears to have very definite relationship to the progress of the State.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Does not Parliament get any credit at all for these things?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—Yes, Parliament has its share, but someone must start these things.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—We must have leaders.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—That is so. Not only the Premier but also the other members of his Cabinet are to be commended and congratulated. The other outstanding feature of the present Government is the value it has always got for the money it has spent. We can go to other cities to see what has happened and I do not think that anywhere will we see such good value obtained for every move, as has been the position in South Australia. I believe that in the other States money has been wasted on many projects. Here it seems that no project has been started that will not be finished, and the projects are finished within reasonable time and at the best possible cost. The programme in His Excellency's Speech indicates that all this will continue in a big way, so I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—In the brief period available I take this opportunity of associating myself with much of what has been said by members in this debate. First, I want to refer to your brief absence from this Chamber, Mr. President. We have become so used to your regularly directing the affairs of this Chamber that we almost thought you were on semi-invalidity when you were away for those few

days. We missed you during your brief absence and all members of this Chamber have been unanimous in saying they are pleased to have you back again directing the business of this House. I join with other members in the references to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, which was a good one, and which was very well and audibly delivered. I am sure Sir Mellis Napier deserves the complimentary remarks that have been made about him, not only in relation to his attendances here and the delivery of his speeches, but to the service he has rendered over many years in the administration of the State.

Sir Arthur Rymill referred to the visit of the Queen Mother. I am sure there has never been an experience which has more thrilled the people of South Australia, and nothing has endeared them more to the Throne than the personality of the Queen Mother. She has left behind a memory that will long remain with us. I thank the members of the Council for the consideration they gave in granting me leave of absence during the whole of last session, and in giving me the opportunity to devote my time and attention to matters more immediately concerned with the administration of my department. It afforded me the chance to make comparisons and to see how similar institutions are designed and operated in other parts of the world. Whilst overseas I had a most interesting and busy time. When I sighted land at Fremantle I somehow felt that I was coming back to the country of opportunity, and to a country where we have achieved so much in a comparatively brief period. Whilst we may be critical—and rightly so because if we become too complacent progress ceases—of events in our country a comparison with the older countries will show that we have made considerable progress and have no need to be ashamed of our achievements in a little over 100 years.

Whilst I was abroad I saw many large hospitals, some of them with over 1,000 beds. After looking at the old and the new I can say that we have nothing seriously wrong here, and that our modern development will hold its own with that of any part of the world. It confirmed an opinion I had held for some time that we have the talent here architecturally and professionally to design institutions which are suitable for medicine as practised in our country. Overseas there are many phases of medical practice which are not comparable with conditions in this country and therefore we cannot borrow

a model or pattern from other parts of the world and say that it is ideal for our requirements. So long as we can maintain a progressive approach to these requirements we will continue to hold our own.

I want now to refer to the mover of the motion, Sir Collier Cudmore. No doubt we will be having more to say about him before he finally leaves us. I felt the same lift as all other members felt when Sir Collier addressed the House in this debate. It was not because he intimated that it would be the last time he would move the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, but because of the matter contained in the speech. Its tone was a prelude to one of the best debates we have had. Sir Collier is always worth listening to, and I do not think with more effect than when he is dealing with the Constitution and activities of this House. I feel that it is a matter that is insufficiently paraded before the people. This Chamber has over the years built up a tradition, and it is something that can be claimed as an essential part of an effective bi-cameral system. The Legislative Council has existed during the life-time of a variety of Governments. In the early history of this State some of them did not last very long. This Council has always been what I call the watchhouse of democracy. No matter how wild a Government may become, and accidents do occur even at election times over very small matters, this House gives a permanency to the Administration looking after the affairs of the State. I do not know of a time when Government legislation has not been accepted in principle by this House, provided it had received endorsement from the electors in its policy, even though it may see some deficiencies in it.

Mr. Bevan suggested that this is a House of veto, but that does not do him justice. The best that this House can do is to make sure that the people have the final say. We can delay things, and ultimately any action like that means that the people will decide the issue for or against. To put this House on a common franchise would be the best way to bring about its abolition. Once it became a mere echo of the Assembly, and a Party House as claimed by Mr. Condon, it would completely undo the traditional values it has created over the years. While we have a House constituted as at present I think we can always rely upon a proper approach being made to the legislation brought before it.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Victoria gave the people adult suffrage for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. SIR LYELL McEWIN—That may be so, but I am not advocating it. The honourable member will know that I am not advocating what happened in Victoria, but I am anxious that we might have some appreciation of the difference between our Legislative Council and some others in the Commonwealth. Credit might be given to the Legislative Council that so many overseas enterprises are prepared to invest capital in South Australia, because actually we have not certain attractions such as a large population and certain natural resources, but because of our soundness they are prepared to overlook some of the other advantages elsewhere and to invest their money here.

I should like to refer to our friend and colleague, the Honourable J. L. S. Bice, who seconded the motion. He comes from stock well known to most of us. I can remember his father, a former Chief Secretary. He visited my local town when I was a boy to attend a function and I well remember his long beard. I revered him and thought how patriarchal and wonderful he was, and now we have John Bice, Junior, who has followed in his footsteps. All my early wonderment is explained in his son, who has been a member of this Council and of the Public Works Standing Committee for many years, rendering valuable service to this State. I congratulate him on his contribution to the debate and wish him well in his retirement.

During the debate members of the Opposition referred to the prosperity of the State, employment and decentralization. I do not propose to go into the question of employment at any length, because Sir Arthur Rymill has already referred to it. However South Australia can be proud of its employment position compared with that in any other State. The number of factory employees is continually increasing, and that is the answer to any suggestion that the Government's efforts have not brought about confidence and stability to employment. The Government's vital contribution to the attraction of industries revolves around the fact that it facilitates and does not dictate.

I shall indicate some of the ways in which it assists. Let us first consider decentralization. In this direction the Government has assisted in the successful settlement of many returned servicemen in the South-East and on

Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula. One of the fundamental requirements of development in the country is the provision of water. Honourable members may be interested in what the Government has done in this regard. Usually, the mention of water supplies brings to mind some great public project involving a huge pipeline with pumping stations costing millions of pounds. That is the spectacular side of water supply, but there is another method of supply in various parts of the State and this is going on continuously unnoted. In a recent report the Mines Department indicated that from 1945 to 1955 a total of 11,929 bores were completed for various purposes and 1,245,000ft. were drilled, with the result that a total of 81,000,000 gallons a day is provided. A total of 84 per cent of the bores were successful and this enabled increased primary production to be undertaken. Over the years the footage drilled has varied but the highest was in 1953 when 62,000ft. were drilled, representing a total of 86 per cent of bores being put into production with an output of 10,000,000 gallons a day. In 1955 the last year for which statistics are available, the drilling dropped to 47,000ft. and the number of successful bores to 82 per cent with a production of 14,800,000 gallons a day. That is the way decentralization has been assisted in a practical way, enabling country which was previously handicapped to be developed and stocked.

In the field of secondary industry perhaps the work of the Mines Department has been of even greater importance. Its research and development branch provided basic information which resulted in the establishment of Radium Hill and the treatment plant at Port Pirie. It also did much of the research for the Rum Jungle field and carried out work in connection with the Mary Kathleen field, including the designing of plant. The department also assisted in the search for iron ore deposits on Eyre Peninsula, and thus was able to provide valuable information to justify further expenditure in the production of steel.

In the development of the pyrites field at Nairne it was necessary for the department to do preliminary work and prove deposits before the company could be expected to invest in large scale development. This also occurred to a lesser degree in the development of barytes supplies at Quorn. Considerable work was also done by the department in proving supplies of gypsum on the far West Coast, although to date large exports have not resulted. A railway line was built and

other facilities made available so that it will be practicable for the industry to operate when markets become available.

The Government has also met demands in relation to increasing cement supplies for our ever increasing building activities by providing limestone deposits, making it justifiable for both our cement industries to extend their operations. In this way the Government has assisted in providing employment in industry and assisting our housing programme. One could also refer to the development of the Leigh Creek coal field. By its assistance in the distribution of water and electricity and its activities in mineral research, the Government has made a practical contribution to the decentralization of industry. In this way it has also contributed considerably in the development of our capital city and in the general prosperity of the State. Now the Government is busily engaged in assisting in the search for oil. It can therefore be said that the activities of the Government, and particularly through this key department, have been always forward, looking in anticipation for some new mineral or some new discovery that will assist in expanding the already prosperous condition which has been created in industry. I have appreciated the debate which has taken place. More than two-thirds of the Council have taken part in

the discussion and made valuable contributions, and I thank them for the part they have played in giving expression to their thoughts.

Motion for adoption of Address in Reply carried.

The PRESIDENT—I have to inform members that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor will be pleased to receive them for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 4 p.m.

At 3.55 p.m. the President and honourable members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 4.14 p.m.

The PRESIDENT—I have to report that, accompanied by honourable members, I attended at Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor the Address in Reply adopted by the Council this afternoon. His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:—

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the present session of Parliament. During this fourth session of the thirtyfifth Parliament, I am confident that you will give full and careful attention to all matters placed before you and I pray that God's blessing may crown your labours.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 12, at 2.15 p.m.