

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, July 30, 1959.

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

QUESTIONS.**ENLARGEMENT OF HARBORS BOARD PERSONNEL.**

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In October, 1950, Harbors Board officials—the chairman (Mr. Crawford), Mr. Manuel, and the late Mr. Andres (then Chief Designing Engineer)—submitted evidence to the Public Works Committee concerning 20 projects estimated to cost about £20,000,000 over a period of years. Those schemes are featured in today's *Advertiser*, but the names of Messrs. Andres and Manuel are not mentioned and I therefore desire to place on record the fact that they were both held in high esteem by the Public Works Committee for their work in this connection. In view of the immensity of the projects and the very large expenditure involved, will the Government consider increasing the number of commissioners from three to five by appointing a representative each of the Waterside Workers' Federation and the shipping interests?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I shall certainly have pleasure in taking up the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Marine.

CEILING HEIGHTS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Last week I asked a question regarding ceiling heights under the Building Act. Has the Minister a reply today?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—This matter was the subject of a report by the Building Act Advisory Committee some time ago, but at that time the Government was reluctant to act upon it as it was felt that it might tend to reduce building standards. However, since the question was raised again I have obtained a further report from the advisory committee and will refer it to Cabinet forthwith. My own opinion is that the height should not be reduced by more than 6in., say, from 9ft. to 8ft. 6in.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July, 29. Page 221.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—I join with those who have preceded me in this debate in expressing goodwill to the more recently elected members of this Council. I also subscribe to the congratulations offered to the mover and seconder of the motion. The debate has been most interesting and I have no doubt that it will continue on that plane until its termination. We have had the advantage of listening to the four newly-elected members as well as the distinction of hearing a most interesting address by the first lady ever elected to this Council. It has been interesting also by reason of the wide variety of matters dealt with. I was reminded of some lines of Kipling when, in referring to a gathering where there were numerous speakers, he said "It was a case of everyone proclaiming of the things they knew the best." Mr. Potter prefaced his remarks by saying that he experienced some degree of humility in the task before him of addressing himself to this Council for the first time and also on being elected as a member of it. I, too, a little later in the proceedings, experienced some sense of humility; indeed, I experienced mixed feelings on hearing the recitation by Sir Arthur Rymill of the academic achievements of our new members, and they included both envy and anxiety.

The anxiety was caused by my consciousness of my own lack of qualifications and I wondered just how I, and perhaps others in the same situation, might compare with our learned friends; I suffered envy because circumstances did not permit me to reach a high plane in educational attainments. However, I found some consolation in the fact that throughout the ages history has given ample evidence of men and women of quite lowly origin who have reached great heights in the general schemes of men. I remembered that Abraham Lincoln was born in a log hut in Kentucky, that Henry Ford entered his field of applied mechanics by making push bikes in his back yard, and on his own admission Sir Winston Churchill never attained very high academic qualifications. Lord Nuffield is another who started from very lowly beginnings. Coming nearer home we have the instance of our own Premier who, I understand, was educated in a very humble primary school in a country district and I believe his term of education was of very short duration. He certainly did not get very far in the arts

and sciences. Nevertheless, there is no need for me to mention the extent to which the Premier has succeeded. I do not want it thought that I discount the academic qualifications of our good friends. Indeed, I am hopeful that they will be a valued asset to us in our deliberations.

The entry of women into the field of politics appears to be universally accepted throughout the community, and there seems to be a consensus of opinion that they will fill a worthy place in our deliberations. I venture the opinion that our own good lady member (the Honourable Mrs. Cooper) and Mrs. Steele in another place are the forerunners of others who will be seeking Parliamentary nomination at elections to come. It is all to the good that women should sit in Parliament these days when they are peculiarly associated with so many problems that confront us. I am sure they will be a great asset to us.

I want to pay my tribute, too, to His Excellency the Governor and Lady George for their unselfish service to the people of this State. They have associated themselves with all efforts directed towards the well-being of the people and have taken an interest in the general communal life of the people, not only in the bigger centres of population but also in the far-flung areas where they meet the people and share with them their everyday life. When His Excellency's term of office expires he will go away leaving behind grateful memories of his association with the people of South Australia and a sincere regard for him and his good lady.

I join wholeheartedly in the expressions of regret at the absence of the Honourable Mr. Rowe, the Attorney-General. With other members I sincerely hope that he will soon be restored to his normal health and strength and be fit to carry out his duties as Minister and his duties which he so ably discharges in this Council.

His Excellency the Governor's Speech has proclaimed an era of prosperity. I shall not split hairs trying to define to whom the credit belongs or who has been responsible for it. I heartily agree that that credit belongs to the whole community—the Government, the Executive, the members of Parliament (who, after all is said and done, have the last say as far as governmental expenditure is concerned) and the community generally, from whom we do not for one moment exclude those engaged in industry.

It has been my practice since I have been in this House, when matters come up for consideration and particularly if they are likely to be

contentious, to go back and see just what the previous set-up was. It is both edifying and illuminating at times to read the speeches made when Bills were presented to see what was the reaction of members and what was responsible for their attitude at the time. Recently, I was looking at the speech that Sir Mellis Napier, who was Lieutenant-Governor, made when he opened the session of Parliament on June 26, 1947. Paragraph 3 of his speech was as follows:—

Our problems are the supply of coal, housing and the maintenance of harmonious relations between those engaged in industry. My Ministers believe that if all sections of the community display the wisdom, moderation, and diligence for which South Australians are noted these problems can be solved.

I think that prophecy has been amply fulfilled.

Finance is of course the big problem in Government and a big responsibility of Parliament. It is the keynote of prosperity for, without adequate finance, projects that have built that prosperity could not have been accomplished. I remember that when I came into this House in 1944 the Appropriation Bill presented that year amounted to about £11,000,000. Last year, honourable members will recall, it was about £50,000,000—a lot of money in anybody's language. I mention that because it is such an important factor in what has been achieved over the years, for which, as I say, the whole of the people of South Australia are responsible. Members will readily recall those achievements. We have increased mineral production, primary production, agricultural development and land development. We have built a power station, are on the way to establishing an oil refining industry, and so on. There is still in our minds an appreciation of the advancement that has been made in our prosperity.

Also, our means of production have been developed; fishing, and of course the steel industry have been developed, the latter being an important factor in our economic set-up. Those industries have played a most important part. So that prophecy made by Sir Mellis Napier 12 years ago has been amply fulfilled and the people of this State played their part by their energy and wisdom.

His Excellency's Speech, as the Honourable Mr. Wilson pointed out, covers a wide field. I think 30-odd specific items were mentioned. During the course of this Parliament, opportunities will be given to honourable members to speak on most of those subjects, and especially those where legislation has been foreshadowed. Therefore, I need not speak

at any length today. Further, I understand that arrangements have been made for the presentation of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor a little later in the afternoon. As other members desire to contribute to this debate, I shall not go into detail on what I am going to say, but there are one or two points I should like to make. First of all there is one that I never lose an opportunity of mentioning, and that is the question of roads. It is pleasing to notice that the Federal Government appears to be taking a little more interest in roads and exercising more co-operation with the State authorities on this very important matter, particularly so far as main arterial roads are concerned. I understand there will be an advance this year of about £2,000,000 over what we had made available last year for road construction, and that is something to be thankful for. It indicates that for our roads we shall enjoy more financial help than has been the case in the past. It is all needed because over all the years that I have been speaking on the subject costs of production have been increasing all the time, and we do not now get the same result from £1,000,000 that we got 12 years ago. Nevertheless we are making progress, and I pay a tribute to the Minister in charge of the Highways Department for his zeal, co-operation, help, and interest in doing all that he possibly can with the funds available.

Associated with our road programme is the matter of transport and transport control. I, and other members who have had experiences similar to mine, will agree that transport control is a very sticky problem at the moment. It is one of the matters that country members receive most urgent requests on and, unfortunately, it is one where we can in very few cases get encouraging replies, but nevertheless we do what we can. The Minister who is responsible for the road construction programme does his share and I believe people generally realize that, but in the case of road transport there is a considerable amount of criticism. Again in this matter I made some investigation into the past, and I was interested to read of a Bill that was presented on October 9, 1930, which set up the Road and Railway Transport Act. That Bill was presented in Parliament on that date by the Honourable Mr. Denny. He said, among other things, that the idea of the setting up of legislative machinery, including the Transport Control Board, was to stop the drift or the losses in railway revenue. I am sure we of our own knowledge are now wondering what effect that legislation has had. After

looking at the figures I am inclined to say it has had no effect at all and, in fact, the figures show a bigger drift and a larger deficit, until now the position is alarming.

This is another matter that honourable members representing country districts are continually having brought to their notice. I attend, and I think every country member attends, numerous meetings of organizations and I venture to say that at 80 per cent of them the question of road transport and transport control occupies a very prominent place on the agenda. I am wondering whether the time is not now ripe, in view of all the circumstances, for an inquiry into this legislation and into the system and its ramifications to see whether we are achieving anything by the restrictions imposed by the Act. They have had an effect which was not anticipated originally. If honourable members are sufficiently interested and would like to go further into what happened when this Bill was introduced they will see that some of the prophecies then made have not been fulfilled. I ask, have we reached the time when we should make a comprehensive inquiry into the whole subject to see just where we are going? I feel perfectly sure members of country districts know quite well what goes on under the transport control legislation, and here I want to be quite fair and say that I am not criticizing the administration of the Transport Control Board. That board is administering legislation which has been passed from time to time by Parliament. It must abide by it, but I say from my own knowledge and experience that there could be some elasticity in the administration.

I will give the Council some cases in point. As honourable members know, I have interests on Eyre Peninsula in the western areas of this State. I have had life-long association with transport problems and I know that people often have their costs of production greatly increased because they are called upon to comply with the letter of the law. The Transport Control Board may give a permit for a producer to hire a licensed carrier. He will be given a permit to load stock for transport—in some cases they have to be off-loaded at Port Pirie and put on the railway trucks and on some occasions they are given permission to bring the stock right through to the abattoirs—but in innumerable cases, and I do not know whether it does not apply to all cases, an application for a permit to cart goods back on the return journey will not be granted. The result is that the carrier returns empty—unless he has some of his own goods to

take back, and he may be driving a semi-trailer. This results in practically doubling the freight charge, which again comes back on the primary producer. Another aspect is that often primary producers have found it necessary, for their own convenience, to purchase a vehicle. Anyone with experience appreciates that a semi-trailer for the transport of stock costs thousands of pounds. Sometimes these vehicles stand idle for six months of the year. Numerous people in the country, such as hotelkeepers, have bought their own vehicles to cart supplies from the source of production, and that is the only use they have for that capital outlay—and again the consumer has to pay. There should be an inquiry into such matters.

The objective of the legislation has failed—namely, the protection of the railways. I sympathize with the railway authorities. They find, as they did when the legislation was introduced in 1930, that road transport is taking the most profitable freight offering, and they are called upon to handle the heavy and bulky freight that carriers will not touch. Therefore, they are at a disadvantage.

The number of passengers carried on the railways, both in the country and in the metropolitan area, is negligible. I have been at a metropolitan railway crossing and the number of passengers on a train with five or six coaches passing through could be counted on the fingers of both hands, and this applies throughout the day except at peak periods when passengers are going to or from the city. The only result is that the railways lose money. Recently I travelled on a diesel rail car from Port Lincoln to my old home town, and although there was sufficient accommodation for 25 to 30 passengers there were only two other passengers. One got off about 60 miles up the line and the other a little farther on, and I was the only passenger left when I reached my destination. When I made the return trip there was only one other passenger at the starting point, and after about 50 miles another got on, and that was the total number carried on that trip. This was the roughest ride I had ever had on the railways. Conditions are worse than they were 35 years ago. In those days one could get refreshments at three places on the 180 mile trip, but now one cannot even get a cup of tea in a distance of 148 miles. The old refreshment rooms have been closed because no-one will run them.

It occurred to me that the railways should cater only for mails. What occurs on this

Port Lincoln line I am pretty sure happens on other country lines, although the position there may not be so bad as I have mentioned. Despite this, there appears to be plenty of room for improvement. We cannot dispense with the railways entirely, but could it not be provided that in some way they cater for the type of freight available economically? Could not some of the non-payable aspects be cut out? I cannot give the answer. I have introduced this matter in the hope that it will lead to an inquiry. Beyond question motor transport has come to stay. We cannot put back the clock so the only thing to do is to try to meet the situation. I shall not endeavour to adduce figures on railway losses; we will have an opportunity to study them when the Appropriation Bill is before us later. As I said at the outset, our transport systems present a very sticky problem. I remember journeying to Franklin Harbour about 50 years ago as a young man in the old steamer *Ferret*. Eventually that old vessel was superseded by more modern craft and we had such vessels as *Rupara*, *Minnipa*, *Moonta*, and *Morialta* calling at all these western Spencer Gulf ports regularly. By way of contrast, when in Franklin Harbour a few weeks ago, I noticed that its sea communications had been reduced to one two-masted ketch.

I have frequently been embarrassed by situations arising from these transport difficulties. For instance, on a Monday one may hear a deputation from people urging the retention of some form of sea transport when there was a threat that it might be further restricted; then on, perhaps, the following Wednesday one might be asked to lead a deputation from some farming community requesting some relief in regard to road transport. In these circumstances I could only say to them, "What do you want? You cannot have it both ways and you must make up your minds on which you prefer." I do not want to labour this question further, but it has very wide ramifications and I am sure that if an investigation were made some very surprising information might be revealed, and the outcome I think would be advantageous to the people concerned and the State generally.

I have refrained from referring to much in the shape of itemized matter, but there are two subjects which I regard as very important and that I should like to mention briefly. One is the fishing industry and the other the tourist trade. I am happy to say that the fishing industry is expanding and as the result of assistance,

financial and otherwise, given to it through the Industries Development Committee, the results are gratifying. I happened to be a member of that committee in its earlier days when a decision was made to give financial assistance to complete the building and equipping of the tuna clipper *Tacoma*, which has been operating out of Port Lincoln for some years. Many difficulties have been overcome and the owners have reached the stage where their position is entirely satisfactory. The boat is doing an excellent job in developing a very important trade. The crayfishing industry is a big factor in earning dollars, and that, too, has been assisted financially and otherwise by Government policy. However, there is still room for more. The canning side of the business is progressing, but needs to be fostered further. However, I think that this is a case where "A little bread thrown upon the waters" will yield big returns. This is one source of production which I think will develop rapidly.

I pay a tribute to the Director of the Tourist Bureau, Mr. Pollnitz, who is performing excellent work. As a result of his investigations, many of our towns and districts have received assistance in building up tourist attractions—camping sites and so forth—and there is ample room for further expansion. In our extensive coastline, extending from Port Macdonnell in the South-East, around the shores of the two gulfs and to the far West Coast, there are admirable opportunities for the development of tourist attractions. Here again anything given by way of assistance will yield great dividends to the State. I content myself with these few remarks and support the motion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Central No. 1)—I join with others in welcoming our newly-elected members and congratulate them on their efforts in their maiden speeches. I listened with great interest on the historic occasion when Mrs. Cooper made her maiden speech and I can only say that it was excellent; she knew her subject and I congratulate her on the way she delivered her remarks. I also had the privilege of hearing the other lady who was elected as a member of Parliament last March make her maiden speech. Here again I can only describe it as excellent. These two women not only did credit to themselves on that historic occasion, but were also a great credit to the sex they represent. Possibly because of the nature of my work as a younger man going to back doors as a grocer boy and bread carter I have always

admired the work of women in their homes and have always felt that men are apt to take their better halves for granted, and therefore I am sure that both ladies will realize that my congratulations are sincere.

I listened to the seconder, Mr. Hookings, with a great deal of sympathy because, as members realize, it was something of an anticlimax. On that occasion we had a rather large gallery who appeared to have come here for the one purpose of hearing the first speech delivered by a lady member in this Chamber, but when Mr. Hookings rose he was not only under the natural strain occasioned by the circumstance of his first speech but was compelled to speak while the gallery consistently and disturbingly left the building presumably to proceed to another place to hear Mrs. Steele's maiden speech. In the circumstances I think Mr. Hookings did a very good job, and I at least had much sympathy with him for the disturbing conditions under which it was necessary to make his debut.

Mr. Potter also gave his speech very well. It showed a great deal of preparation, and I was pleased with his deep voice because sometimes it is difficult for me to pick up the remarks of some members. I did not know then, nor do I know now, whether some of his remarks were made in a provocative manner towards the Labor Party or in a challenging manner. If they were provocative I say that we can be just as provocative, and if they were a challenge from the Liberal Party to the Labor Party then we accept the challenge. If that is the position we know where we stand. Mr. Giles also, I thought, got over his first hurdle very well. He delivered his speech magnificently, and referred to one thing at least of which I hope Liberal members will take note. He referred to Mr. William Giles, his great-great-grandfather who was a member of this Chamber in the very early days of the State and who uttered the following words upon his retirement as representative of the district of Yatala:—

I trust that no man will be permitted to represent Yatala who is favourable to State support for religion, and who will not contend for responsible government in its full integrity of meaning, with two Houses of legislature, universal suffrage, short Parliaments, election by ballot, and who will not promise solemnly never to sacrifice principle for expediency. They are magnificent words and I hope, regarding that part about the universal suffrage, that when the occasion arises, his great great grandson will hold the same views.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—What do you interpret “universal suffrage” as meaning?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—A vote for everyone. I have not had any academic education; I apply common sense. If “universal suffrage” does not mean a vote for everybody, what does it mean?

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Whether or not they are 21, for instance?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I will leave it at that. The honourable member knows perfectly well what I mean and ought to know that he cannot put me off my track. If he wants to have a go at me, let him keep going. I think that the new members of this House will improve our debating ability. I do not say that with any reflection upon the ex-members because it can only be expected—and, indeed, I think it is right—that, with the younger people coming in and the better education obtaining these days, better educated people will be entering this House. The Labor Party in the future, owing to our educational system, which has improved since my school days, and indeed since my boy's time, will produce more able and better educated members to represent it in Parliament. I make no reflection on the retired members. In fact, I have the greatest respect for them all, particularly Sir Collier Cudmore, who was a real deep-dyed blue Liberal, and who made no apology for what he stood for and always respected the point of view of the other fellow if sincerely given. Although I did not always agree with what he said, I had the greatest respect for his interpretation of things and his debating ability. The same applies in some lesser degree to the other retired members, Mr. Anthoney, Mr. Bice and Mr. Cowan.

I should like to pay a tribute to a Minister who retired last year and who was very kind and good to me on many occasions. I sincerely regret reading recently that he has again gone into hospital: I refer to Sir Malcolm McIntosh. He was a helpful and guiding friend to me not only when I had the honour to represent a district in another place but also when I came here, and on one occasion when it was necessary for me to take a matter up with him as Minister. I trust that he will make a complete recovery from his illness and live for many years to enjoy his retirement.

I want to refer particularly to the absence today of the Minister of Industry, Mr. Colin Rowe. I have had many dealings with him, and we have got on fairly well. I hope he is

soon restored to health and can return to his public duties. I am sorry that he is not here today because as an industrialist it is necessary for me to say something on industrial matters. I might have to criticize his department and, in so doing, say something personal about himself. I shall do it as kindly and mildly as I can, but one is forced to answer certain things and refer to mistakes that have been made and reported in *Hansard*. I am left with no alternative but to do that.

I should like to pay a tribute also to you, Sir, as President of this Council. I do not know, but I surmise that possibly by the time this Parliament completes its task you will have a record term of service in the history of the State Parliament. I believe at the moment it is 41 years; in two years' time it will be 43 years, but I am not going to say that you are going then. By then I think that you might have a record length of service for either House of this Parliament.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—In the whole of Australia.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Maybe so, but I say it is a record of which you, Sir, can be proud. The way you have carried out your duties since I have been here has never been questioned. I think a record of 41 years' service is something of which you can be justly proud. I should also like to pay a tribute to our Leader, the Honourable Frank Condon, who has given great service to this State. As members all know, he has been a member and secretary of the Millers and Mill Employees' Union for a number of years. He was appointed secretary of the Port Pirie branch of that union in 1906, 53 years ago, and I think I can say again that that would be an Australian record for length of service as a trade union secretary. He was appointed State secretary and became a Federal councillor of his union in 1909, a position he still holds. He has been respected throughout the trade union movement of Australia all along the line. I have been connected with a union closely associated with his and have appreciated all that he has done.

He also has a length of service in Parliament of which he might feel proud. He was elected to the House of Assembly on April 5, 1924, had a short stay there until March, 1927, and was elected to this House in 1928. With a small break in 1928, he has a service of approximately 35 years, a wonderful service for any person to give to Parliament and the people of this State. He was appointed to the Public

Works Standing Committee on April 23, 1930. I would say he is the oldest surviving member of that committee, a most important committee with important functions to carry out. Mr. Condon's word has always been accepted as being the truth. Hence, I was a little upset and hurt by one or two statements made in this House this session.

I want to refer to recent discussions on the basic wage case. On June 11 the Honourable Mr. Condon asked a question in connection with the cost of opposing the application for an increase in the basic wage. It was as follows:—

Can the Minister of Industry say how many of his officers were employed at the recent basic wage case hearing to oppose an increase in the wage for employees, and what was the cost of that representation?

The Minister replied:—

None of the officers who were present at the hearing in the recent basic wage case were employed to oppose the increases. The purpose of the attendance of the officers was to place certain facts and figures before the Commission. If the honourable member looks at the record of the proceedings in that matter he will see that the Government did not set out to oppose the application. Since we did not set out to oppose the application, there was no cost to the Government of doing so.

The same afternoon Mr. Condon, speaking on the Appropriation Bill, said:—

I now come to an item the Minister of Industry and Employment shelved this afternoon. Every time a case is before the Federal Arbitration Court to improve workers' conditions and wages it is opposed by the South Australian Government.

Then the Minister said, "That is not a true statement." That afternoon, Mr. Condon referred to me as his authority for supporting his statement. I said:—

The Government has never sent an officer over to support an increase.

Having been mentioned as an authority on this, I thought I should do something about it. If members want to look in *Hansard* to check my words on this matter, they will find a question on page 63 of this year's *Hansard*, and the paragraph I spoke of is at page 69. I took the necessary action to see what actually happened in the proceedings in this case. I contacted the secretary of the Australian Council of Trades Unions and told him what was said and what I was after, and that I would be pleased if he could give me some matter which would resolve the question one way or the other. I did not want hearsay or just his words, but some cuttings of the transcript of the case. Under the date of July 17 I received from

Mr. Souter the following letter addressed to myself:—

Dear Bert,

Enclosed please find relevant extracts from the 1959 basic wage transcript relating to the submissions made by Mr. Chamberlain, counsel for the State Government of South Australia, and the two instrumentalities cited as respondents in this hearing. We have omitted material extracts relating to argument developed by Bob Hawke and included the principal points which should cover the points raised as to the Government's attitude in relation to the union's claim for increased basic wage and restoration of quarterly adjustments. It will be noted on page 2 that in the second paragraph there had obviously been prior consultations between this counsel and Aird for the employers generally as Chamberlain indicates in the transcript that the State Government associates itself with the submissions of Mr. Aird (counsel for the employers) who, on behalf of the employers, strongly opposed the introduction of quarterly adjustments and any increase in the basic wage, to the point of saying that they would oppose "even 1s. increase in the basic wage." Trusting this information will be of assistance to you. With best wishes, Yours fraternally, H. J. Souter, Secretary.

The relevant extracts from the 1959 basic wage transcript are as follows. On page 1070 Mr. Chamberlain said:—

May I please Your Honours, the interests that I represent—the State Government, the Electricity Trust and the Tramways Trust—are State instrumentalities and the number of employees of those bodies which are affected by these proceedings is 42,350, so that we have this direct interest in the proceedings that every one shilling alteration of the basic wage involves an alteration of £100,000 a year in the total salary bill. The claims would involve £2,200,000. I desire to address a brief argument on the application for the re-institution of the quarterly adjustments.

On page 1074 of the transcript he said:—

The next matter in Mr. Hawke's argument with which I wish to deal is one which affects the State of South Australia particularly, because as the Commission knows South Australia is the one State which adheres to the Commission's principle in this matter. We are the only State which has not got any automatic adjustment system under State law. We adhere to the Commission's principle and we follow it in our own industrial set-up.

On page 1078 he said:—

Now, if the Commission pleases, those are the reasons why I submit that this claim for the re-introduction of quarterly adjustments should be rejected. There is no way in which it could be re-introduced, anyway, and that is one practical answer to it. In my opinion there is no logic upon which it could be even if there were a way of doing it.

On page 1080 he said:—

The other part of the claim for the basic wage increase is based partly on the 1952-53

basis and on the submission that the economy is basically sound and has the resources to pay higher wages. As far as that is concerned, we content ourselves with submitting that there is certainly no demonstrated increase in the capacity of the economy since the matter was last before the Commission. We associate ourselves entirely with what my learned friend, Mr. Moore, submitted on behalf of the Commonwealth. Although the Commonwealth as an independent and unbiased intervener did not draw any deduction from the submissions, we would submit that the deduction clearly to be drawn from the material submitted by the Commonwealth is that the present time is not an appropriate one for any increase in the basic wage. We also associate ourselves with what we understand to be the submissions to be advanced by Mr. Aird. We do not like the process of appearing at the beginning of the case and saying we support whatever one side or the other is going to do, but submit ourselves to be a little better informed than that, if the Commission please, because we know the general lines of the analysis which will be submitted and at least we agree in the conclusion which we understand will be submitted that there is no demonstrated increase in the capacity and certainly it is not appropriate at the present time, as far as the economy is concerned to increase the basic wage.

Page 1081 reports:—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN—For these reasons we submit that each of the claims should be rejected. Mr. HAWKE—If the Commission will excuse me, there is one question that I should like to ask through the Commission of Mr. Chamberlain. In the course of his submissions he said he desired to associate himself with submissions that were to be put by Mr. Aird. It is of some interest to the applicants to know whether he associates himself with the whole of Mr. Aird's submissions which will, as Your Honors recall, be in part for no increase and in part for a reduction in respect of some awards.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN—I can answer that, if Your Honors please. The State has no interest in the part in which Mr. Aird is submitting there should be a reduction. One of the industries we have not gone in for is the pastoral industry and we have not got any sheep stations. We are not interested in that part of my friend's claim. What we associate ourselves with is his suggestion that there should be no general increase in the basic wage.

Extracts were taken out of the judgments given in the 1959 Basic Wage Case. The first is one from the Reasons for Judgment given on June 5, 1959, by Kirby, C. J. On page 2 he said:—

Mr. Chamberlain, Q.C., and Mr. Wells, appeared for South Australia and two of its instrumentalities in opposition to the claims of the unions.

I do not think it could be claimed that Mr. Justice Kirby is a friend of ours. Mr. Justice Gallagher, another who would not be called a friend of ours, on page 3 of his judgment said:—

The State of South Australia took part in the proceedings, supported the employers generally and adopted their arguments.

I say there is only one conclusion that can be drawn and from the replies that we have had either Mr. Chamberlain did not carry out his instructions (and if that were correct—though I do not think so—he should be dismissed) or this House was misled by the Minister of Industry. I think it is sufficient to say that the Government owes Mr. Condon a very deep and sincere apology. I had to do what I have done this afternoon because many of our people read *Hansard* and already I have been asked who is telling the truth? That is why I went to all the trouble that I have gone to. I want to make this point, that I and my colleagues have no objection to the South Australian Government opposing any application, but we do take exception to the fact that the Government tries to mislead people by saying that it did not do something it did. There is no need for that sort of thing. I do not make any apologies for saying what I have said. I realized what the situation was and it caused me a great deal of worry. However, it is all recorded, and that is all I require.

I now come back to the question of the basic wage increase being of no benefit to the people. I have given this matter some careful thought and I reiterate what I have previously said that basic wage increases do assist the average family, and although I am not foolish enough to think that people get the benefit of the whole of each basic wage increase I do think they retain some small proportion of each. If that were not so they would not be any better off today than they were in the depression. Nobody can tell me that the average family on the average wage is not enjoying a better standard of living and comfort today than when the basic wage was £3 3s. a week. If anybody does say that I am prepared to issue a challenge to debate the question publicly, because I am convinced on that point and it is something to be proud of. Unless we improve the standard of living we are not succeeding in our job. I refuse to believe that I have spent my whole life assisting people to obtain a better standard of living and that I have failed. Even assuming the whole of the basic wage increase

was taken up in added costs we would still be better off because of basic wage increases.

I now refer to margins, and for the benefit of honourable members opposite I state that a margin is the difference between the basic wage and an award rate. In the depression the basic wage was £3 3s. a week, and our margin at that time was 11s., which represented 17.46 per cent of the basic wage. The basic wage in 1947 was £5 9s., and a fitter at that time received a margin of £2 12s. Today the fitter gets a margin of £3 15s. when the basic wage is £13 11s. Look at it in this way. In 1947 the fitter's margin represented 48 per cent of the basic wage compared with 17 per cent in 1933. Today his margin represents less than 29 per cent of the basic wage, but he is still 12 per cent better off because of the increases in the basic wage. We can consider the margin of the fitter and turner, which is the margin that the people I represent get. The process worker in 1947 had a margin of £1 2s., which was 20 per cent of the basic wage. It was better than the margin percentage in 1933, but today his margin represents only 8 per cent of the basic wage. I hope that before the end of the year there will be an increase in his margin because the evidence supports it, and if 20 per cent were justified in 1947 the figure should be considerably higher than that today. I hope that clears the position that because the basic wage has been increased we are worse off. Nothing is further from the truth.

I had a case in the last fortnight which brought to my notice the discrepancy in the Industrial Code as between ordinary wages and overtime. Section 207 of the Code provides that no employer shall pay an employee less than the award rate or that fixed by any determination, and if he does proceedings for recovery shall commence within 12 months. Section 208 provides for the number of hours that are overtime as fixed by an award or determination. Action for recovery of wages in these circumstances must commence within two months. The difference there is too great and is out of proportion. In the case under consideration, the employees had received payments to cover their ordinary time. It is a vital question in our industry. The competitor who cheats and gets overtime for nothing before and after ordinary working hours is the worst competitor one can have.

One case relating to not being able to go back further than two months was referred to the Chamber of Manufactures for settlement. It said its policy was to advise employers

that they need pay only what was prescribed in the Code. I have no quarrel with that, but if they are to stick to that the Code should be realistic. I would not accept the period of two months. Then, under the Master and Servants Act, we could go back the whole of the time. The trouble then is that you have a bad friend in industry who does not like the union secretary because he does his job, and this creates friction. The case I referred to has been finalized, and possibly went back four or five months, and now we are a happy family. That is the way it should be. I ask the Government to look at the position I have mentioned and provide for a longer span. Claims for back wages made by the industry with which I am concerned are few and far between. I do not think the Government or the Code should protect those who want to take unfair advantage of a competitor. I have no sympathy with the employer who does that. In his speech the Governor said:—

As from July 1, 1959, the administration of all labour legislation will be undertaken by one department, to be known as the Department of Labour and Industry, which will administer the functions now carried out by the Factories and Steam Boilers Department.

The trade union movement is prepared to give this new idea a trial. I had an interview with Mr. Bowes, who has been appointed secretary of the department, regarding a case that occurred last week. Today I could have caustically criticized the Factories and Steam Boilers Department. We have never been satisfied with the way it has functioned. Mr. Bowes said that the new department had a job to do and was going to do it. We are prepared to give it the opportunity. I hope that the next time I address the Chamber on the motion now before it to be able to say that the department has kept its word. We do not want to be vindictive to any set of people who are paid to do a certain job.

Another paragraph of His Excellency's Speech reads as follows:—

Harmonious relations continue to exist in this State between employers and employees. Throughout Australia in 1958 there were fewer days lost through strikes than in any year since 1942 and South Australia had the lowest number of strikes per person employed in the Commonwealth. This is a tribute to the good character and moderation of our citizens and a most important factor in attracting new industries.

At the time it was made that comment was possibly 100 per cent correct, but since then trouble has arisen between the Electricity Trust and its employees. Today I should like to have placed on record a full account of the dispute at the

Port Augusta power house, but my friends at the Trades Hall asked me not to do so as the matter was *sub judice*. I entirely disagree with that attitude, but because of my friendship with them I will honour my promise. I know enough about things not to attack the merits of the case, but wish to refer only to the aspect of employer and employee relationship. That will not bear investigation. I think that honourable members will agree that after an employer, whether it be the Government, a semi-Governmental body or a private employer, has given employees some added benefit over that provided for in an award for a period of 10 years and then takes away that advantage without consulting anyone, by the stroke of a pen, he cannot expect harmonious relationships to continue. Earlier this session I told the Chamber what the inevitable result would be, and that has eventuated. I am not an agitator for strikes, but if that kind of action is to continue we must expect trouble. If employees or organizations strike against the pay rates fixed by an award or determination they can be charged under section 111 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which provides for penalties. Section 109 gives the court power to enforce an order. Section 111 provides as follows:—

(a) Where the contempt was committed by an organization (not consisting of a single employer)—the maximum penalty which the court is empowered to impose is £500.

(b) Where the contempt was committed by an employer, or the holder of an office in an organization, being an office specified in paragraph (a), (aa) or (b) of the definition of "Office" in section 4 of this Act—£200 or imprisonment for 12 months; or

(c) In any other case—£50.

Section 138 provides:—

(1) An officer, servant or agent, or a member of a committee, of an organization or branch of an organization shall not, during the currency of an award—

(a) advise, encourage or incite a member of an organization which is bound by the award to refrain from, or prevent or hinder such a member from—

(i) entering into a written agreement;

(ii) accepting employment; or

(iii) offering for work, or working, in accordance with the award or with an employer who is bound by the award . . .

This section is rarely used. I do not know of a case I could quote, except the one that happened last month. I sound a warning that if an employer, whether it be the Government, a semi-Governmental institution or a private

employer, insists on using the penal clauses against employees when the men decide to strike, one of these days they will revolt. We do not want to see that. With all earnestness, I appeal to those in authority not to use a big sledgehammer in relation to these things, because sooner or later the younger generation will have to be told that the conditions they now enjoy have not been won easily. Our forefathers had to suffer and even go hungry in trying to get these conditions. Once the younger generation realize that and see things taken away from them, and have these sections of the Arbitration Act enforced on them they may not take it as calmly as their forefathers did. I was very interested in paragraph 24 of His Excellency's Speech, as follows:—

A matter of some importance which is under consideration is a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to road traffic. The existing Road Traffic Act dates back to 1934, since which date it has been amended nearly every year, on some occasions twice in the same year. The result of piecemeal amendments cannot be satisfactory and my Ministers have under consideration a consolidating measure in connection with which opportunity will be taken to introduce any amendments that are considered desirable in order to bring the law up to date.

With that I am in entire agreement. A few years ago our Leader, Mr. Condon, asked me to take the second reading speech on the Road Traffic Bill. With my limited education I tried to read and understand it, but got hopelessly bogged. I have tried since to understand it, and the further I go the worse befogged I become. I therefore sincerely hope that the Government will bring down a consolidating measure in language that is easily understood by the average citizen, because I feel that of all our Statutes the Road Traffic Act, in view of the ever-growing volume of traffic, is one that the average citizen should be able to understand readily. I frankly admit that I cannot follow the present Act and apparently the Minister is not too clear on it either because, despite five attempts by way of question on my part in the last day or so, I finished up with an answer as clear as mud.

I now want to say a few words on the subject of pedestrian crossings at traffic lights and I agree with Mr. Edmonds that it does one good sometimes to look back on what one said a couple of years ago. In 1957, when speaking on the Address in Reply, in congratulating the Government or whoever was responsible for the lights at Emerson I said:—

Traffic lights have done more to bring about a decrease in the accident rate than anything

else and they could be used in many other places. I am not concerned about their cost because money will have to be found for them to reduce the number of accidents. In my district are two corners where they should be erected. The first is at the intersection of Main North Road and Irish Harp Road. I do not know any corner that has a greater volume of traffic. The other is the intersection of the Main North Road and Grand Junction Road where traffic lights are essential.

I have sometimes thought that views expressed by members during the Address-in-Reply debate are wasted, but in this matter I want to say that I appreciate, as do many people in my district, the fact that lights have been installed at these two corners. The lights at the Irish Harp Road and Main North Road intersection are a great boon and I am sorry that the Minister of Roads is not in the Chamber at the moment because, although I have a crack at him when I do not get the answer I want, I do wish to take this opportunity of complimenting him and his department on the grand job that has been done at the Gepps Cross corner. I went through there on Monday last for the first time since the lights have been functioning. I proceeded up the Main North Road and came back on the Port Wakefield Road, where I pulled to the side of the road to watch the lights at work. I do not see how they can be faulted and on behalf of the community I give credit to whoever was responsible for their installation.

As regards pedestrian crossings, I do not want to be misunderstood; I am not opposed to them, but I am against having them unless there is a legal obligation on people to honour them. After asking the Minister no fewer than five questions this week on the subject I still cannot understand his replies. Section 130e (5) of the Road Traffic Act states:—

Where a vehicle or animal approaching a pedestrian crossing would, if it continued without changing speed, collide or run the risk of colliding with any pedestrian on such crossing the driver or rider of the vehicle or animal shall decrease the speed of his vehicle or animal to such an extent or stop his vehicle for such time as is necessary to allow the pedestrian to pass in front thereof.

As a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee I am told that the matter is controlled by way of regulation or some council by-law. I have always held the view that a council by-law cannot over-ride an Act, but I do not know whether I am right on that. I am trying to find out, but it appears that no-one can tell me. Perhaps this is one of those paradises for solicitors.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You cannot expect that information for nothing.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—If the Attorney-General were here I would expect him to give it, for after all I represent perhaps half of the metropolitan population and I think I am entitled to it. I want to find out what the law is with a view to striving for a little uniformity. Now I wish to give the Adelaide City Council a “rap up” and a smack at the same time. It has done a really good job in the installation of additional traffic lights throughout the city and the more it installs the louder will I be in its praise. However, when it comes to the question of pedestrian crossings I cannot offer the same praise. After considerable observation of its operation I am convinced that, although the council’s intention was a good one in installing the pedestrian crossing in Grote Street, it has put it in the wrong position. In my view there is only one place for this crossing, namely, further to the west about opposite the Trades Hall, near Morialta Street. All pedestrian crossings, where possible, should be put at intersections. It is a calamity, for example, that the crossing near the Nailsworth School should have been put about 50 or 60 yards from the intersection, thereby creating two dangerous positions in place of one. I compliment the women who volunteer for duty at crossings near schools, as at Blair Athol and on the South Road. I passed along the Main North Road last Monday when it was drizzling with rain and saw women there with their National Safety flags. I started to ease up about 150yds. away because I knew I was approaching the crossing, but other motorists went merrily on their way at about 35 to 45 miles an hour. This is all wrong and I put it to the Government that where it is necessary to have pedestrian crossings there should be traffic lights.

I am convinced that the safest and best form of crossings at intersections is that which is adopted in some other countries. When the traffic is flowing in a north-south direction a red light comes on and the traffic comes to a standstill, and likewise the east-west traffic is brought to a standstill with a red light, so that in effect the whole of the traffic is held stationary for a period to enable pedestrians to cross. At the same time, with the four red lights all against vehicular traffic, a pedestrian light which shows “Do not Walk,” changes to green saying “Walk.” I am convinced that this is the best way to educate people

at traffic crossings and it overcomes the difficulty of motorists turning left through pedestrian traffic. Some say that this will slow up the traffic, but what of that? I do not mind if it does so for a minute or two if it results in the saving of one life or the prevention of one accident in 12 months. Surely we are not in such a big hurry to get from point A to point B that we cannot give the pedestrians some sympathy and make their crossing safer. I hope that on this occasion the Government will, as it apparently did in 1957, give some consideration to what I have suggested. Now a few words on the attitude of Ministers in answering members' questions, and I am sorry that no Minister is in the Chamber at the moment. I think that Ministers have a bounden duty to give straight-forward answers to legitimate questions asked by members.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—If you do not get your answer here you can read it in the press next morning.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—It is remarkable how often one gets evasive, side-tracking answers that are not in keeping with the position of trust that Ministers hold.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What has the honourable member to say to that?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—It is true. If I ask a question in the interests of the people at large, I expect an honest and straight-forward answer.

I touch now on Sir Arthur Rymill's point about the car barn at Victoria Square. If new members care to read my speech of last year on the Road Traffic Bill, they will know how I feel about Victoria Square. It is an eyesore and could well be lifted up to something worthwhile. With the City Council's request that the car barn be transferred I agree entirely. I was under the impression that it would be shifted. Some time ago, when we were at the tramways offices—if I remember rightly, it was in connection with the dispute about the "Bouncing Billy," not so many years ago—Mr. Barker and Mr. Keynes, the Chairman and Manager respectively, informed us that their plan was to have a series of depots around the suburbs, including one at Richmond and one at Gepps Cross. I thought that was a sound idea. Economically, it must be good because it would save two trips. The last trip, on which I have not been for years, goes out to the terminus and then comes back almost empty to the central depot. That is repeated in the morning; it leaves the central depot, goes out to the terminus point and returns. Economically, those trips cannot pay.

Other large cities of Australia have depots around the outskirts of the city and the authority rosters the men who live near those depots to work from them. I suggest that this proposal might help the City Council get rid of this car barn and beautify that point. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I am sorry it is so late in the day that I have to take this opportunity to speak, but I could not possibly let the opportunity pass of saying what I want to say. I propose to confine myself to one subject. I shall not traverse any part of His Excellency's Speech because it has been well covered by everybody from all directions. Members have spoken on their own specialities. However, I should like to congratulate our new members upon the impression they have all made upon us. They belong to that wise group that speaks about things on which they are well informed. Therefore, I look forward to valuable contributions from them in future.

What has brought me to my feet is the fact that only passing reference has been made to the retirement of Sir Collier Cudmore. As one who has been associated with him for longer than most members, I should like to add a tribute to his work for the State. I am sorry I am not a more polished orator and able to deal adequately with this subject, but what I say will be said in all earnestness.

Putting last things first, as it were, I believe that, if it were not for the work of Sir Collier for so long a time, ever since he was a young man in the political life of South Australia, we should not have been blessed with the continuous sound administration of the Playford Government because Mr. Cudmore (as he then was) was largely responsible in the background for the sane and generally sound and solid administration that continued to return our Premier and his Government to office. When I speak of the Playford Government I refer not only to Sir Thomas Playford but to all the men who have assisted him in the government of this State.

Briefly, it may be fitting to recapitulate the origin of the Liberal and Country League. You yourself, Sir, were closely connected with it in its infancy and know, as few of us do, exactly at first hand what steps were taken to bring about the final result. As long ago as September, 1925, subcommittees were formed from the then Liberal Federation and the Country Party Association, respectively, to further their common interests. They were not very great. They were trying to get a team of candidates into the Senate. It was not until

June, 1932, that the Liberal and Country League, as we know it today, was formed.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What was its name before that—the National League?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—No, the Liberal Federation.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—And before that?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—My honourable friend desires to be funny, but I must remind him that the Liberal and Country League, whatever its name was, has always been a South Australian Party. Its members are South Australians and it is governed here in South Australia; whereas, in spite of the honourable member's proud boast that he belongs to the Australian Labor Party, it is not a South Australian Labor Party. It is governed from some point such as East Sydney or Woolloomooloo. I said that you, Mr. President, were associated with the formation of the L.C.L., and I know you played a prominent part in the negotiations which eventually persuaded those cautious countrymen, who then belonged to the Country Party Association, to throw in their lot with us, who were then the Liberal Federation. You, Sir, were president of the Liberal and Country League in 1932. Mr. Cudmore (as he then was) was president from 1934 to 1936, and I had the great honour to follow him. I know, because of my close association with him and from working with another great man, Mr. Dunk (who was general secretary of the league) how sound the work was that resulted in the smoothly running league of today. A great deal of tact was necessary to overcome the shyness and caution of these ex-members of the Country Party, to make them believe that we were people worth marrying with.

If I may read from some notes here, after the formation of the Liberal and Country League, amongst other things its objects are set out. I am sorry that all members of the Labor Party are not here now to appreciate that nobody can possibly take exception to these objects, which are:—

(a) To stimulate interest in public affairs throughout South Australia.

I remind honourable members that these are the stated objects of this newly formed Party which had resulted from the amalgamation of the Liberal Federation and the Country Party. They knew they would have to draw up a new constitution. The objects continue:—

(b) To foster the spirit of political and industrial co-operation amongst those engaged in production and in industry throughout the State.

(c) To advocate sound, progressive and humanitarian legislation and to unite into one movement all electors who believe in a fair deal for every section of the community.

(d) To guard the interests of those engaged in productive enterprise, including a reduction of the tariff, and a solution of the transport problem.

(e) To educate electors to understand that the prosperity of the State depends upon the success of primary production and the encouragement of private enterprise.

(f) To elect to Parliament representatives who will uphold the traditions of a free British deliberative assembly.

The soundness of those objects is really the reason why the Liberal and Country League has been so successful, because those are the basic sentiments of the citizens of this State. But the successful establishment of an organization is not the end of the problem. I dare say it applies less now than then, but in the early stages a great deal of tact and forbearance were needed to see that this marriage stayed stuck. Much wise guidance and management through the years has been necessary to maintain its success.

As I have said before, without the maintenance of this sound organization, it is doubtful whether the Playford Government could have elevated the general standards of living and the general prosperity of this State so phenomenally. In the days when this organization was formed, we were a poor, mendicant State. He was a bold man then who would express any hope for our industrial future. We had no water, no forests, and no mines. Today, we are the richest community, per head, in Australia. Our financial standing per head is shown by the Savings Bank deposits, and our low rate of unemployment, and many other things now rank us as the head, and not the bottom, of the Commonwealth.

Up to the very end of his active life in the political spheres of this State Sir Collier Cudmore took an active part in the administration of the Liberal and Country League. He always helped to see that the officers of the organization and the members of the executive kept their feet on the ground and their heads out of the airy clouds. He made a life-time study of politics and was actively interested in politics even while still at school, and when he came back to South Australia from Oxford he threw himself wholeheartedly into the political movement: it was his very life's blood.

With very great respect to his predecessors and to his successors, I doubt whether we

will see such another man because there is no man now coming on who could possibly have had his background in the history of the Liberal organizations of this State. Even those who were associated with him are becoming fewer and fewer. I think today there are about four of us remaining and they include yourself, Mr. President, the Honourable Mr. Condon, the Honourable the Premier and myself, who have been here in Parliament since 1933. The members who were really associated with the organization in its earlier days and had so much to thank Sir Collier Cudmore for are becoming fewer and farther between. I think it could be truly said of Sir Collier Cudmore, because he played not only a part in what I am speaking of now, but a very important part in some of the big business interests in South Australia, that we in Parliament are not the only ones who should thank him for his services. All who have worked with him for so long think he is a great man in his own right. We mourn his passing from this Chamber and we mourn it more particularly because he wore himself out in the service of the State. All we here can do is express a very real wish that he finds enjoyment and ease during his well-earned leisure. I support the motion.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to say a few words in support of the motion. Firstly, I express my very great regret at the absence of the Honourable Mr. Rowe who is an indefatigable worker during the whole time he is in this Chamber. We all regret his illness and his inability to be present here today. I support the sentiments that have been expressed regarding his Excellency Sir Robert George and Lady George. I feel that they have filled their position admirably and with great distinction and that their record of service has greatly benefited the State. I congratulate the new members who have spoken. Even if I do not take half an hour to express that sentiment it is nonetheless sincere. I congratulate them on the very excellent speeches they have made and I am pleased to have the assistance of two such able new members to work with me in the Southern District. I add my expressions of regret to those uttered by the Hon. Mr. Melrose regarding Sir Collier Cudmore and I endorse the remarks of that member.

In South Australia we have come to the end of the soldier settlement scheme but there are still returned soldiers who have not been

settled. I hope that the Government will be able under its new scheme of development to give preference to those soldiers for blocks which will in some way compensate them for the loss they have already sustained. Dr. Callaghan and the Land Settlement Committee expressed very high estimates of the possible production of land in the South-East. Although full credence was not given to those statements at the time, they have been fully substantiated and some people are carrying more stock per acre than the capacity then expressed by Dr. Callaghan.

The area which is available at present for further development lies mostly in the Southern District and although it is rather expensive to develop, like all land today with the prevailing high costs, a big area could still be developed and brought into further production. I believe in one area there are almost a half a million acres capable of reasonable production. However, it is necessary that the people in those areas should be assured of a good water supply. Many people on the land have had to provide their own supply of household and stock water—a condition that does not apply in the metropolitan area. It is essential, if we are going to settle this country, that water facilities be provided in the area. It will not be practicable to get this land fully developed unless suitable water supplies are made available. The productivity of land is limited by the amount of water available for stock and human purposes and I ask the Government to give full attention to any scheme for supplying water to that area as soon as possible.

I was on Kangaroo Island recently and the problem associated with the Island since the inception of the settlement still remains the water supply. Kangaroo Island, with its high rainfall, does lend itself to a scheme which would be very expensive but anyone who stays at Kingscote and tastes the water used there for household purposes soon realizes what these people have to put up with because of water shortages. I ask the Government to inaugurate a scheme which would be financially possible for Kangaroo Island to meet seasons such as the dry one experienced this year. Such a scheme would greatly encourage the people there to push their settlement further and develop the country.

There has been a continual demand in country areas that agriculture should be a subject on the curriculum of the various high and area schools. People desire that agricultural science in its entirety should be taught

but that is not practicable today. The children at school in country areas, however, could be taken along some of the journey of agriculture so that they could get a grounding in the fundamentals of the job to which they have been bred and born for this would be of considerable advantage to them in later years.

The Hon. Mr. Edmonds mentioned the Transport Control Board. I believe that the board has reached the end of its useful life with regard to the development and the prosperity of South Australia. I feel that we have reached the stage where we must do everything we possibly can to cheapen the cost of transport. That may mean that greater losses will be incurred by the railways and it may cause more competition for the railways, which may be considered undesirable; but as one who sees many of the things that are done by the Transport Control Board, I think we should seriously consider abolishing it. I mention an example to show what I mean.

Some people cart hay from Keith for delivery at Murray Bridge. They have to send their trucks from Murray Bridge to Keith where they are loaded and the hay is taken to the railway. It is then taken to Murray Bridge where it has to be collected from the railways and carted out to the farms. Cheese from Glencoe must be put into a refrigerator van and taken to Mount Gambier where it is put into another refrigerator van and brought to Adelaide. These things are high undesirable and unhygienic and should be eliminated. It is time we abolished the Transport Control Board. I believe that the losses which would be incurred by the railways would be no more onerous than the disadvantages people have to put up with now.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What will the honourable member say when the railway between Monarto South and Sedan is closed?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—As long as road transport is available it will not matter so much. I deal now with prices charged for meat. Meat of quality is expensive to grow. People who grow beef today and supply the luscious steaks that many people enjoy will not be able to provide that steak at the price charged for old beef. I leave it to members to decide whether we are going to encourage the production of better quality meat or otherwise, and the same thing applies to lamb. If we are going to provide the public with good lamb throughout the year we cannot

do it as cheaply as we can make available average quality lamb which is not required at all times in large quantities. Price-fixing, if it governs these particular items of meat, will be a disaster for the industry in this State.

Reference has been made to the University and it was suggested that the State was not giving as much support to the University as it should be giving. Although I am not going into this matter to any great extent because I feel it is undesirable to do so at this stage, I have in my hand a paper issued by the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee. It is a submission dated July 4, 1957, to the Committee on Australian Universities. The recommendation made by the committee was that the University of Adelaide should not receive a grant comparable with grants to Universities in other States because the Adelaide University was in a position much superior to that of other Universities in Australia. If there is any doubt in any honourable member's mind that the Government has not done its full share in supporting the University, an examination of this document I have before me will convince him. Over the 10-year period the amounts spent by the various Universities on buildings were as follows:—Sydney £226,000; Melbourne £366,000; and Adelaide £279,000.

Fees paid by students to the Adelaide University have for many years been lower than those in any other Australian University. The reason for this was the liberality of the Government, which desires that the fees should be kept low. Only in the last two or three years has there been an increase. We can definitely say that the Government has supported the University very well. In the 10-year period the South Australian Government's support compares very favourably with that given by other States to their Universities. In 1956 the South Australian Government contributed £624,000, the Commonwealth £235,000, and students' fees amounted to £69,000. The respective figures for Melbourne and Sydney are:—Melbourne £915,000, £540,000 and £545,000; Sydney £842,000, £463,000 and £606,000. I leave it to honourable members to form their own conclusions regarding the South Australian Government's assistance to the Adelaide University.

I feel that I would not be doing justice to all those who have made endowments and bequests to the Adelaide University if I did

not pay a great tribute to them. The day of endowments has not disappeared. Practically every few months some generous person hands a cheque to the University, and it may be for £10,000 or even £20,000. I pay a tribute to those who are so generous in their support of this institution. I also pay a tribute to Mr. Kenneth Wills, the chairman of the University finance committee, for the magnificent work he has done. If any South Australian deserves the highest honour for the work he does that person is Mr. Wills. I support the motion.

Motion for adoption of Address in Reply carried.

The PRESIDENT—I have to inform members that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive them for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 4.45 p.m. today.

At 4.43 p.m. the President and honourable members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 5.20 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 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 first session of the thirty-sixth 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 5.22 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 18, at 2.15 p.m.