

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, July 27, 1961.

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

QUESTIONS.**ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Professor D. C. Rowan has an article in the current issue of *The Australian Quarterly* dealing with universities. This gentleman was formerly Dean of the Faculty of Economics at the University of Sydney and is now attached to the Economics Department of Britain's University at Southampton. His statements in regard to universities akin to the Adelaide University show that State universities are dangerously understaffed and that if the teaching standards are not to deteriorate they will have to double their staffs by 1966. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to assist the Adelaide University in accordance with the suggestions made?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The University vote is associated with the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture. I can only say on the general question that the University is most generously assisted by the State Government. The policy is enunciated by the University itself. The honourable member's question involves not only understaffing, but could involve over-enrolments.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: And capital expenditure.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: It may be that other universities have more staff. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister concerned.

LIVING WAGE INCREASE.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Recently, in accordance with the Industrial Code, the State Industrial Court increased the South Australian living wage by 12s. a week. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends that this 12s. shall be paid to State public servants, and, if so, when?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Government honours all adjustments in State salaries in accordance with awards. The honourable member is probably insinuating that the matter is held in abeyance because a certain

appointment has not yet been made, but I assure him that on the general question whether the Government passes on these increases the answer is "Yes".

SALK VACCINE.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES. A recent press report stated that Sabin vaccine against poliomyelitis had been proved successful in other countries. In South Australia we use the very effective Salk vaccine. As the Salk vaccine that comes from Canada is not available at present, does the Minister of Health consider that Sabin vaccine would be a good alternative while Salk vaccine is in short supply, and does he consider it to be superior to Salk vaccine?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I think the honourable member's question refers to live vaccine as against Salk vaccine, which is not a live vaccine. This is a question that no doubt will be debated for a long time in research circles. At present we are married to a joint scheme between the Commonwealth and the State, whereby the Commonwealth laboratories provide the vaccine and the State provides the service and the means of inoculation. Some importation of Salk vaccine from Canada has taken place, but it was not released until it was put through the test that vaccine is subjected to before being made available for treating the general public. I think that that is a wise precaution. I would be the last to suggest that any risk should be taken in the supply of a vaccine that has proved its value, that is, if it can be made available. The honourable member will realize the risk there is in injecting a live vaccine into the system. I prefer to leave the decision as to whether one is better than the other in the hands of those who receive handsome emoluments to give us something that is proper. Nothing could be more fatal than to use something that would have undesirable results. At least, we have the devil we know. If we can get those supplies, I think it is safer to continue with it until someone has proved the effectiveness of something else.

WINE INDUSTRY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on June 21 about grape prices and the wine industry?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I think the question was whether the services of the Prices Commissioner would be available again this year in connection with grape prices. The answer is "Yes".

ANTI-SPLASH MUDGUARDS.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I think it is apparent to all that, when there is a wave of bad weather with subsequent rain and poor visibility, particularly at dusk, often many accidents are caused by the throwing up of mud, especially by heavy vehicles and semi-trailers, on such roads as the South Road, which carries many of these vehicles. Will the Chief Secretary indicate whether the Government will consider legislating to make it compulsory for such vehicles to have anti-splash mudguards and so avoid this rather dangerous practice of throwing up mud on to the windscreens of following vehicles?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: It is a question of which is the best commercial product—that which squirts water on to the wind-screen, after which the wiper is used, or a reflective disc on a piece of leather hanging behind the back wheels of a vehicle. I will refer the question to the Minister concerned.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion, which the Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph had moved to amend by inserting the following new paragraph:

1a. This Council condemns the unjustified action of the Government—

(a) In making available officers of the Crown to prepare evidence and to appear before the Federal Arbitration Commission in support of a differential Federal basic wage for Adelaide so that eventually it would be reduced to 90 per cent of the Sydney basic wage.

(b) in joining forces with the Employers Federation of South Australia and the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures in their application to reduce the living standards of the people of this State.

(Continued from July 26. Page 95.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I am not certain how the Governor's Speech has its origin, but I imagine it is rather similar to that of the chairman of a public company, who probably

has some say in its contents. I think probably the Ministry has a good deal of say in the contents of the Governor's Speech and that it is probably departmentally prepared and then subjected to "vetting," which is roughly the procedure I know. After the Speech is prepared, it has to be delivered, and that is a most important part. This year we had, I think, two notable features regarding the Speech; the first was that it was delivered by a new Governor whom we had welcomed to the shores of South Australia with his good lady and their entourage; and, secondly, I heard many people say that they had never heard a Governor's Speech better delivered. I heartily endorse that, if I may do so without appearing presumptuous. It was beautifully delivered; we could hear every word so clearly, which we all appreciated. The delivery was exceptional, as all members will agree. Of course, that augurs well for the new regime. I have always said in this Chamber that I favour the appointment of English Governors. That would always be my wish, and I am happy that that is the present policy of the Government, although certain other people perhaps think otherwise.

The Speech follows the usual pattern. It starts with certain personal references, then embodies a record of the governmental year, so to speak, and then proceeds to give the programme for the future. I should like to deal with matters in that order. Firstly, to the regret of all of us, it refers to the death of the Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh. Sir Malcolm was a kindly and capable man. I feel great gratitude to him, because when I was a new member five or six years ago he went out of his way to make me feel at home and put me at my ease. That is a continuing gratitude and is not what Sir Malcolm himself used to be fond of quoting, that "gratitude is a lively sense of favours to come". He had many of those wise adages at his grasp, and a recollection of those things, plus his personal qualities, make us all the more conscious of the loss we have sustained.

The Governor's Speech then records the death of Mr. Michael O'Halloran and unfortunately, since then, the death has occurred of the Honourable Frank Condon. I suppose it is most unusual that two leaders of one Party in the two Houses of the same Parliament should die within such a short time of each other. That brings them together, in a sense, in my mind, because it makes me realize how many qualities those two gentlemen had in common although, of course, in many ways they were

quite different. They both had humour and humanity and were both men of high principles. Success never marred the human qualities of either. We can only say with Shakespeare, "Fare thee well, great hearts".

On a happier note, I congratulate Mr. Ball, the Clerk of Parliaments and Clerk of this Council, on his forthcoming trip. I think every honourable member will be delighted that he has been selected. We are conscious of his high qualities, efficiency, and tremendous knowledge of Parliamentary matters, including the complicated Standing Orders. I have recently had the privilege of being associated with him and with you, Mr. President, on the Standing Orders Committee. I imagine that Mr. Ball's great knowledge, even with your own equally great knowledge, must be of great help. I also pay a tribute to Mr. Ball's readiness to help us all. When we want to ascertain the form of a motion or anything of that nature, he will go out of his way, although busy on other urgent matters, to help us.

I congratulate the Honourable Mr. Shard on his election as Leader of the Labor Party in this House, and the Honourable Mr. Bevan on his nomination as a member of the Public Works Committee. I should like to deal with the year's record as shown in the Governor's Speech. I have heard cynics say, possibly because of the origin of the Speech, to which I have referred, that sometimes these speeches read as if the Government is patting itself on the back. I do not subscribe to that, but take the contrary view that credit is being given where it is due. I have never seen a politician hiding his light under a bushel. He would not be a good one if he did, particularly if there are as many achievements as have been accomplished by the present Liberal and Country League Government. The Speech is redolent of a balanced Budget. Not only has the Budget been balanced, but progress has been made while balancing the finances. Many people can make progress while running into debt, but the Government has made unprecedented progress while balancing the Budget and keeping taxation within reasonable limits. Those things, coupled together, are no mean achievement.

There was reference in this morning's press to something the Premier said in another place, to which I should like to refer. He apparently said something about factors which had contributed to the near-record of £1,200,000 surplus in the State's finances for the last financial year. He said the railways, with £850,000 more revenue and £200,000 less expenditure, had greatly assisted in this result. I am sure

we are pleased that the railways had an upsurge in its finances, and I am sorry that the Minister of Railways is not here this afternoon to take his bow. The Harbors Board revenue was up, the cost of the electricity for pumping from the River Murray was £650,000 lower, and we can only hope the winter season ends well so that a similar thing will happen this year. However, our reservoirs need a good inflow for that to be achieved. The Premier apparently went on to enumerate various items that had brought in revenue, and he mentioned that land tax had brought in £1,400,000. That is something I particularly want to talk about this afternoon, because it is expressly referred to in the Governor's Speech. We are all conscious that the land tax assessment has increased to a staggering extent. It affects every household head in the community, whether he is living in a rented or a self-owned house, because rent includes land tax, and if the landlord pays the taxes the rent is adjusted and passed on to the tenant. This also applies to the country landowner. I have an estimate by a competent person which shows that even allowing for the prognosticated reduction or "concession" that has been announced, the revenue will be £2,700,000 and not £1,400,000. This will result if land tax is reduced by a halfpenny except on the lowest level, as has been announced, and also if certain concessions are given to the man in the country. That is a state of affairs which has to be adjusted.

The Government has a surplus, and, although the basic wage is rising, the surplus should be able to take care of that, and yet we have the revenue from land tax being doubled in one year. I think the concessions are far too slender and do not line up with what I have mentioned about the Government's previous record of reasonable taxation. I suggest that further concessions should be allowed and I will deal with the matter in more detail when the Bill is presented. I know that we can only recommend and cannot amend because it is a money Bill. The gravamen of the situation is that on the present scale of land tax one pays three-farthings in the pound up to £5,000, and it is proposed that that rate shall remain; from £5,000 to £10,000 the rate is 1½d. and a halfpenny is to be taken off that; it slides from £10,000 to £20,000, then £20,000 to £35,000 with a penny increase each time, and so on with various slides to £100,000, where the rate is unchanged at 7½d.

Since those scales of increases were adopted we have had a three-times inflation, and where the scale jumped at £5,000, if it is to be on

the same basis as previously, this jump should not come until £15,000; where it jumped at £10,000 it should be £30,000; and where it jumped at £20,000 it should be £60,000 to put us back on the previous basis, unless advantage is to be taken by the Government of the inflation we have had. As to the justice of that, I should like to give an example, because a sliding scale applies in various aspects of taxation, and one familiar to us all is income tax. I am taking as an example the man who is on the basic wage, plus the minimum of margins, one who receives £16 a week. I shall try to show what happens if the Government continues its policy of allowing the sliding scale to remain. I have assumed the man's deductions are about £300 or £400 a year. That is, he will get an income of £700 or £800 and his taxable income will be £400 or £500. The taxation on £400 is £16 and on £500 is £37. In other words, the ordinary man with an income of £700 pays about £16 a year income tax and on an income of £800 he pays £37 a year. Assuming that we have again the inflation we have already had, namely, a three-times inflation, the man on £800 a year with a taxable income of £400 or £500 would get an income of three times, although it would only leave one-third of its value. His money income would be £2,400 and his taxable income approximately £2,000, and if the present rate is applied he would be paying £376 tax instead of £16 or £37, as I have mentioned. In those circumstances of inflation, and I am only assuming the same inflation as we have had previously, he would be paying over 10 or 20 times the tax he is paying at present on the money that is worth a third of what it was. Adjusting the value of money, he would be paying over three-and-a-half or seven times what he is paying at the moment, if the scale is not to be adjusted. To give a more exaggerated example, if there were rabid inflation, such as we have seen in France, and the basic wage became £10,000 a year, and the tax rate were not altered, the basic wage man would have to pay half his wages away in income tax. It would be at the rate of 10s. in the pound. That is why I say that the steps of the land tax scale should be altered to correspond with the loss in the value of money. Otherwise, the taxpayers will be charged too much in relation to what they used to pay. It affects all of us, whether living in the city or the country, although country members are getting some other concessions. I hope that is not to become a permanent feature, because I remember that

last year there was a special concession for country people in relation to succession duties. Now there is to be one in connection with land tax.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson: Only under certain conditions.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not begrudge their getting a concession, because I have sympathy and admiration for the men on the land who experience much trouble. We in the city also have our troubles, and if concessions are to be granted, I think we are good enough to receive them as well. The other night I spoke at a political meeting about my intention to raise this matter of land tax. A widow told me that she would be badly hit under the Government's proposals and hoped that I would go on with the matter. She had four shops in the suburbs and said that she got her whole income from them. It was pointed out that they had only a certain economic value and that there was a limit to what the tenant could pay in rent, rates and taxes. She said she did not think she would be able to pass on the additional land tax to the tenants because they could not pay it out of the limited profits of their business, and consequently she would have to suffer a severe reduction in her slender income. I mention this to show how the tax applies to all people. There is not one landowner in the community, and few tenants, who will not be hit adversely unless concessions are made. I do not regard this proposal as a concession because the tax is going upwards, not downwards. Many people in the community, I think, will be overtaxed in relation to the land tax, and I should like to underline that that tax is a capital tax; and a capital tax is the last type of tax that should be raised steeply. If anything, we should be working towards abolishing it altogether, rather than raising it.

I pass on now to the legislative programme for this session, as set out in the Governor's Speech. As one would expect in a pre-election session, it is not revolutionary. Unfortunately, it provides for the continuance of price control. The Honourable Mr. Edmonds had something to say about this matter when moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. He said that he rather felt that it was time price control became a permanent feature rather than have it continued from year to year. Of course, that filled me with horror, because I think there is only one thing worse than price control at present, and that is the crowning tragedy that it might become a permanent feature, rather than something we have from year to year. Although we have it

from year to year, even the gloomiest of us, and I am one of them, hope that we might get rid of it altogether sometime. Once it becomes a permanent feature, we shall have it always. I would hate to see it as a permanent feature on our political horizon. A uniform Companies Bill is to come before us at some time. I believe that our Attorney-General is even at this moment having something to say about it elsewhere. The prospect of having that Bill does not fill me with enthusiasm. To me, it smacks of something of uniformity for uniformity's sake; and if there is anything worse than the application of uniformity, whether it fits or not, I do not know of it.

I find much more exhilarating the reference in the Governor's Speech to the possibility of an enormous dam being built on the River Murray. The Honourable Mr. Story referred to it yesterday. Further, money is to be provided in connection with bulk handling, which has been a great success. It must have already saved farmers a tremendous amount of money on freight and cornsacks. Then we are to have country electricity extensions. I have more enthusiasm about these things than the type of stagnant legislation dealing with a uniform Companies Act. I have previously mentioned that I do not think the Government is spending enough on cultural matters. It has a huge Budget, in excess of £100,000,000, but only a tiny fraction of that amount is going to cultural matters. I congratulate the Government on the extensions made to the Art Gallery, which is a move in the right direction. If we could have an amount included in the Budget each year as is provided for these extensions, it would go a long way towards helping culture.

I am conscious that there are many basic things of life that must come first, such as schools, hospitals, and so on, but they have been very well treated over the years. Our Budget is so big that an amount of say £500,000 each year would hardly be noticed in relation to the more customary things. It would be a tremendous help if the money were available. I do not know whether Ministers feel that money spent on cultural activities has not a wide enough application amongst the people. If that is so, then I should disabuse them of that view. No-one will tell me that music is for a few wealthy people. There is just as great a love for music among the poorer sections as among the wealthy sections. If people think music is only for the comparatively few, then as those in the richer section, as it is called, contribute

a far greater percentage of their income in taxation, I say that surely they should have something for their way of life. I hold the view that culture is something for everybody. If there is anyone who is not interested in culture of some sort, then heaven help him.

I suggest with the utmost respect to the Government that the time has arrived when it should make a small contribution annually to the National Trust of South Australia. I feel that I can say this because I retired as president of the trust after its first five years and that was about six months ago, and although I retain a great interest in the affairs of the trust I am not so personally involved now. Some six years ago Parliament was good enough to pass special legislation incorporating the trust, which is something for the benefit of all the people. It has been struggling along on a few hundred pounds a year. Practically all the work done has been voluntary, because nothing else could be afforded. It is not right that a few should finance these things to the benefit of the many. It is not right that people should be doing work for practically nothing. I suggest with all respect that the Government might consider a small donation of about £5,000 a year to the trust, or even less, because a few hundred pounds would be a great assistance. The trust is going ahead and I think it will come of age when the Government gives it Austral Place. The trust will become of age when that place becomes a museum. The Government has not been officially approached, so I cannot say that it should have done this before, but the time will come when it might properly consider giving the trust support, because it will have a great impact on the lives of the whole populace.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose: Can you really make progress without enormous funds?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes. Miss Ashby, of Blackwood, gave us a gift of land as a public park. It contains 80 acres which, I think, is worth at least £50,000. I should imagine that land under the ownership of the National Trust may be worth up to £100,000. We could make progress in a capital sense.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose: You cannot acquire land on your own?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: No, but it is being given to us generously. All we need is a small amount of money for annual running expenses. The 1960 Festival of Arts was a great success and it placed Adelaide

on the map. A tremendous amount of interest was taken in it in England, Scotland and other places in the world. There, again, I feel that you cannot expect a few to be running it and paying for it all the time; indeed, the experience overseas has always been that the public just cannot wholly support these things forever. The Government has been helpful to the Festival and has encouraged it, and I hope it will be able to see its way clear to give it more financial support, as I feel that without that no Festival can survive. I believe it is a good thing for Adelaide and South Australia that the Festival should be held biennially, which has been the aim. I mentioned the provision of a Festival Hall in a previous speech in this Chamber, but the credit squeeze has made me pull my head in on that, as the saying goes.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Has the Adelaide City Council decided on the site?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not think so, but there are plenty of sites. The last has not been heard of it. I have studiously avoided mentioning sites, because I have always seen that the argument can become diversified, not on whether we are to get the hall or not but on where it is to go, and the whole thing collapses. I should rather see the hall a financial possibility first, but, if my architectural and honourable friend, Mr. Bardolph, wants to talk about a site, I refer him to such as the imaginative site the Town Clerk suggested for the weir restaurant. That has one of the most glorious views in Adelaide, and I understand it has been practically full every night since it was opened. That shows how much it has been appreciated. The restaurant caters for everyone, as downstairs a meal can be obtained at a reasonable price and if one wishes to have a little more luxury one can go upstairs. The whole thing is air-conditioned and I am sure it will be a great boon to the public when the summer comes.

I should like to mention some of the other improvements the Adelaide City Council has made to the park lands, as I think they are a great thing for Adelaide and also for South Australia. Many of these things were suggested by the Town Clerk, and I remind members that it was the Adelaide City Council that sent him overseas for the very purpose of investigating traffic problems and the development of the park lands. It was a timely visit. He has shown great ingenuity, and I give him the fullest credit for applying what he learned

so successfully to the city of Adelaide, but I also give the council credit for supporting him both financially and otherwise.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Where did the council get the money?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: In the same way as the Land Tax Department—mainly from an increase in assessments. Unlike land tax, however, the rates are not on a sliding scale, so we have never had double the rates in one year. The shallow lake in the East Park lands near Dequetteville Terrace has proved a wonderful boon to the people, children, and New Australians, who are used to that sort of life. On any Sunday or holiday the place is crowded and full of gay colour; it is really an exciting sight and the public is being catered for in a worth-while way. Work on the new park on South Terrace, which my friend, Mr. Bardolph, knows all about as it is opposite his house, is progressing slowly. That is inevitable as work is difficult during wet weather. It is an imaginative scheme and when it is finished I believe members will be surprised at the result. There is a most exciting scheme to the west of the weir that will be almost a country holiday ground within the city. Many acres on both banks of the Torrens are being developed; shallow lakes where canoeing, boating, paddling and even fishing can be indulged in are being constructed, and there will also be barbecues. It is a huge scheme that few people have seen, as it is in rather a secluded spot, but I believe it will be a wonderful holiday ground within the city of Adelaide.

Members will remember that the new Road Traffic Board was established by an Act passed last session. I think some of us had some qualms about it (as a member of this Council and of the Adelaide City Council, I did in particular). I supported its establishment, as I realized there was a need for some overall supervision of traffic signs and that sort of thing. The difficulty I found in supporting it was that the Adelaide City Council had its own traffic engineers who had had far greater experience than the Highways Department engineers on city work.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: They made a good job of it, too.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think so. I felt that there should not be another body sitting over those experienced people. However, this board has worked well. I congratulate the Government on its choice of members, who are most sensible people, and I

feel that as long as they adopt the policy of interfering with the wishes of councils and others as little as they feel they have to do it will work. In other words, if a council wants something, I feel that the board should not interfere with it unless it has a real and substantial reason for doing so. If it follows that charter, I think it will continue to work. Otherwise I can see conflicts, as there are fashions and fads in traffic engineering just as in all other things. For instance, the amber light was good a few years ago, then it was bad, and now it is good again.

Speaking about local government generally, I think it is not getting the deal it deserves from the Parliament of South Australia. I use the word "Parliament" deliberately, and not "Government", because much of this, in my opinion, comes from the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and some of it from the Government. All in all, for the reasons I will enumerate, I do not think local government is getting the run it deserves.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think local government is taking its full responsibility and not using Parliament as a shelter in some cases?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not know what the honourable member means by that. I am sure that local government is taking its full responsibility. Members of councils in this State are unpaid. Also, they are elected by ratepayers in the same way as this Parliament is elected by taxpayers, so councils are therefore elected bodies. The Subordinate Legislation Committee was set up after the practice of disallowance of by-laws came into being. In other words, the mode of disallowance has always been that either House could disallow a by-law. I think that in itself, with a new type of committee like the Subordinate Legislation Committee, overloads the thing against local government, because both Houses do not have to disallow; only one House need do so.

The Hon. L. H. Densley: Doesn't that apply to every Act?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: As my friend Mr. Bardolph says, "I will come to that". For every by-law that the Subordinate Legislation Committee wants to disallow there is a motion in both Houses for the disallowance. In other words, the committee has a two-barrelled shot gun and has only to hit the bird with one barrel for it to be a dead bird.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It only does what the Act of Parliament allows it to do.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes, before the formation of the committee.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The committee can work only under the framework provided by Parliament.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is so, and I think it is working under too rigid a framework. I do not blame the committee for this, but if it finds one clause in any by-law obnoxious it must reject the whole by-law. Thus, because of the procedure that must be gone through, a council can be left for 12 months without a by-law that might be sorely needed.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That is because there is too much legal advice on the committee.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I recommend that if the committee successfully moves against a by-law in relation to a certain clause or clauses the authority promoting the by-law should have the option of having the by-law without those clauses, rather than lose the whole of it for an unlimited period.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Would you give the committee power to withdraw the objectionable clauses and tell the council what it meant?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is a matter that would have to be investigated fully. I would not pin myself to any detail, except that it is time for this to be reviewed. I have the utmost respect for the members of the committee, all of whom are knowledgeable men, and some of whom have had local government experience, although sometimes one might think they had forgotten; but they seem to have a bee in their bonnets about not allowing councils a discretion.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Would the honourable member move for the abolition of the committee?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: No. I think it is a worth-while committee, but I have made suggestions as to how it could be improved. As I was saying, the members seem to have some bee in their bonnets about not allowing councils any discretion. There is some sort of ritual here in giving the ground for moving for a disallowance. I cannot remember the exact words, but it is a rigmarole that means that the committee will not trust councils with any discretionary powers. The members of councils are elected people and, if they exercise powers in a silly way, we can trust the ratepayers to deal with them for, unlike us, they come up for election every year.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The argument is not with the council, but when it delegates powers to the town clerk and expects to get that through.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is not the only thing the committee objects to.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Yes, it is.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: There may be something in that. I am not in favour of that myself, but it is by no means the only thing on which the committee moves for disallowance. I do not want honourable members to think that I am criticizing this committee, which does valuable work, but I am criticizing this rigid approach of not giving councils any discretion. I can give the honourable member plenty of examples of that, but that is the position. Councillors are only human and are people who do the work for nothing and expect to have some work to do, work which is not within a rigid framework that any administrator could do because they have no discretion. They should have some reasonably discretionary powers, and the members of this committee should consider its attitude on this matter with a view to trusting the councillors. If not, they should trust their electors, the ratepayers, who are the people paying for it and who are affected by its decision.

The Hon. L. H. Densley: Isn't the decision one for Parliament rather than for the committee?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Ultimately it is, but . . .

The Hon. C. R. Story: The committee only recommends certain things to Parliament.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Parliament at one stage, when I was first a member, had the habit of accepting the recommendation of the committee as gospel. In fact, when Sir Frank Perry and I quibbled about one of the recommendations concerning Murray Bridge, our then leader turned to us and asked us, in forcible language, what we were talking about. These by-laws were not disallowed. I think the committee is working for Parliament and therefore should work in such a way that it will achieve the wishes of Parliament. If the committee's attitude becomes too tough on councils, that is likely to weaken the local government system, and that would be a tragedy. I believe it is a wonderful system and saves the Government much money.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Do you think it is clothed with too much power and that it should be more of an advisory committee?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The honourable member mentions the machinery of the committee. As there is such a committee, I believe that both Houses should disallow a by-law, because if we refuse to disallow a by-law the other House can disallow it without hearing our views. That is not a healthy situation, but I do not wish to labour the point further.

A number of efficiency experts are available today, men who are experts in business efficiency, materials handling, time and motion study and that sort of thing. They are called in by private business, and it often happens that when this is done to see if anything can be done to improve the system, the management of the business think it is a slight that their own efficiency should be queried. That is not the object at all, because no man can be a repository of all knowledge on business methods. These people are experts in their own particular line. I hope I shall not be misunderstood when I suggest that the Government may well consider trying what private business does by employing efficiency experts to check and see if there is any way costs could be decreased. That is not criticism, but a suggestion of a way to make the efficient more efficient, if possible, rather than to say there is no efficiency. I hope the Government may give that suggestion a trial, possibly in some small appropriate department. It would be a wholesome step forward if a successful trial were made. I hope my suggestions may be felt worthy of some consideration. I have proffered many suggestions and heard many presented by others since I have been a member, but I have not heard of any acknowledgment that any is to be adopted, or has been adopted, and have often wondered whether the members' suggestions are given the consideration they deserve. Sometimes they are adopted, so I suppose something happens, but I have never yet heard any member praised for a suggestion. I cannot believe that someone has not made a worthwhile suggestion during these debates.

Dealing with the Hon. Mr. Bardolph's amendment, which criticizes the Government for appearing in the Arbitration Court, it will not receive one iota of my support. I take the contrary view and congratulate the Government on having the guts to put its case to the court. Its attitude in the court should not be the subject of any objection. It is not an administrative or executive act, but an appearance before a tribunal that is going to decide the best thing to do. The Government's

attitude does not influence one iota a tribunal of that nature; all that would tend to influence a tribunal is the evidence and facts it puts before it, and I have no doubt the tribunal would be grateful for a proper exposition of the facts. It is proper that the Government should appear in all court proceedings affecting it, as applies to any person. If anyone has the misfortune to be sued in a court of law, or have court proceedings taken against him, he should immediately plan to appear in court and put his case. He would be foolish if he did not do so. The Government is criticized for doing precisely the same thing. I congratulate the mover of the motion, the Hon. E. H. Edmonds, and the seconder, the Hon. C. R. Story, on their excellent speeches. They were most interesting and merited congratulations. I support the motion, but will oppose the amendment.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): I support the motion, and indicate that I will vote against the amendment. I join with previous speakers in expressing my complete agreement with their remarks concerning His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edrie Bastyan, and Lady Bastyan. I am certain, as other members have indicated, that they will be of great importance to the State. The Governor's Speech at the Parliamentary dinner impressed those present, and Lady Bastyan is a charming woman who will appeal to all sections of the community.

I express regret at the death of the Hon. F. J. Condon. As one of several new members who entered this House two years ago, I cannot think of anyone who helped me more, or was so willing to advise where necessary. His kindness of approach to all was something that I will never forget. It was my lot on at least one occasion to cross swords with him in debate, but, in spite of several heavy words and weighty interjections, I found him pleasant to me outside the House. I hope the attitude for which he was largely responsible will continue in this Chamber. I agree with the remarks of honourable members with reference to you, Mr. President, the Hon. Mr. Shard, and the Hon. Mr. Bevan.

I will now refer to the Highways Department, and in the absence of the Minister of Roads express my complete admiration of the work he and his department are doing. Many members who had the opportunity to travel to the South-East recently for the opening of a power station and a hospital were amazed at the rapid expansion in an area that is so important to the State's future. There

has been an almost magical change in the road system in that area. Not many years ago it was difficult indeed to motor anywhere off the main roads through the South-East. As my colleague, Mr. Densley, will remember, it was then really an effort to get anywhere near the lower South-East. Recently, I was fortunate to see a plan of future roads that are being considered for this area, and it shows that it is being well served by the Highways Department. Those who live in the Adelaide hills have sometimes looked with jealousy at certain areas of the South-East because of the large amount being spent on new highways, but I am sure they appreciate that in those areas a road must be put down and sealed properly so that people using it can get in and out of farms in low-lying areas subject to inundation.

The Minister and his department will not forget that certain areas of the State, some in the north and others to the south of Adelaide, have developed rapidly since the war, such as Padthaway, where many thousands of acres has been turned into improved pasture. This area represents a small, but significant, agricultural asset to the State. There are areas in the high rainfall country and poor scrub-like country from Victor Harbour to Mount Compass where the development has been so rapid that perhaps the Highways and Local Government Department has not been able to keep up with that improvement.

Paragraph 13 of His Excellency's Speech states:—

My Government continues to expand and improve water and sewerage supplies and facilities in both metropolitan and country areas.

I congratulate the Minister of Works on the programme he has envisaged for many towns south of Adelaide. It has been apparent in Naracoorte for some time that that work has been carried out in connection with sewerage. I hope that the local council will be able rapidly to overcome the consequent poor state of the roads. It was in essence a most necessary work. The gang carried out the work and moved or is about to move on to Nangwarry to start sewerage in that area. This takes us back to the debate on the Underground Waters Preservation Act. In both towns the water level is high and pollution from septic tanks has been a great danger. I am delighted to see that the Government is acting in this matter and I look forward to its helping Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge which need attention. It is significant that the lower South-East has been

heavily hit by hepatitis, which has greatly increased in the area. I am pleased that the Government has acted to ensure that its incidence will not continue because of poor sewerage facilities.

Paragraph 13 of the Governor's Speech continues:

I refer in particular to the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, the new dam at Myponga and the increase in the capacity of the Mount Bold dam by 5,000,000,000gall., the Clarendon, Belair and Blackwood scheme, and water supplies at Elizabeth, South Para and the Onkaparinga Valley.

This, of course, refers to the improvement by the Government of water supplies and sewage treatment in both metropolitan and country areas. About nine months ago I mentioned in this House certain ideas on the desalination of brackish and salt waters. I will not deal with that matter at length today, because it has been well covered in another place. I am pleased that the idea of desalination has received regular attention by the press over the last six months. Members will have read in the press recently that Mr. Dridan gave evidence to the Public Works Committee on this matter. He quoted the cost as being roughly one American dollar for each 1,000gall. In Australian currency that is about 9s. 6d. As a comparison, in Mr. Story's area irrigation water would probably cost the consumer about 3d. a thousand gallons, whereas in the city the water price is 2s. a thousand gallons. At present about 9s. 6d. is the price of water desalinated by various means. The duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline is estimated to cost £18,000,000. In America the cost of a desalination plant capable of producing 2,000,000 gallons a day is about £1,000,000. The cost of supplying water is high, but in a recent report Senator Spooner of the Commonwealth Government suggested that either in highly brackish water or in salt water there was salt that could be used as a by-product, and the proceeds would go some way towards paying the extra expenses incurred in providing such desalinated water. If the capital cost is £18,000,000 to get water from the River Murray to Whyalla, it will not be long before costs become comparable. Some months ago I brought before members various forms of desalination. I think now that there is more chance of its coming about than I thought at the time.

Apart from the mover and the seconder of the motion, we have had three speeches from representatives of city electorates, and at least two of them referred to the

common market problem, and the difficulty of marketing primary products. I agree with Mr. Potter that the common market is a marketing bloc, possibly inspired on political grounds. In other words, there is a banding together of countries with a common interest in future marketing. I do not think it is any different from America, where there is a united body of states. That is what the common market envisages. Already in the six countries involved, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Holland and Belgium, there is freedom of movement of labourers, travellers, currency and the marketing of goods. This sort of thing will not be achieved overnight. The problem is whether or not Great Britain should join this common market. The Right Honourable Christopher Soames, Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food in Great Britain said recently:

But it is not only agriculture; our special relationship with the Commonwealth, the traditional free entry of Commonwealth goods and Commonwealth foodstuffs into this country, the preference we give to the Commonwealth and which the Commonwealth countries give to us, all of which are not in tune with the principles of the Treaty of Rome as it now stands . . . The point we have reached is still no further than seeking whether there can be a basis for negotiation. This brings the insinuation that the common market is entirely out of step. I think this is as far as I am prepared to take my argument on this matter. I am surprised that there should be such help from Mr. Bardolph in putting the case for the primary producers. Over the last two years I have tried to win some sympathy from him on behalf of the dairy industry. Now I find him springing to the help of the decaying agricultural industry and pointing out that there are many dairy farmers in South Australia who do not get the basic wage in returns from their products, bearing in mind the assets involved and the risks taken.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Does he know about them?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Perhaps he does not. It is nice in these days to find that we have a new friend in the Council springing to our help and giving us advice.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: What did he advise?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: There were several things that perhaps I might refer to later. I support Sir Arthur Rymill in his mention of the National Trust. I want to place on record the fact that at Willunga the council is considering building a new council chamber. The present chamber is one of the

oldest and most attractive buildings in the State, and it stands back from the road. I support Sir Arthur Rymill in asking for financial help for the National Trust, which has laboured over the years on gifts in order to finance what I consider to be a worth-while job. There seems to be no doubt that sometimes in Parliament and in local government we get too realistic in our thoughts. I think Sir Arthur Rymill's suggestion contains much merit and I look forward to the day when he sees some fruits coming from his endeavours in this regard.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Is the National Trust taking over the Willunga building?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I am not suggesting that, but it is a compact and old building. I am theorizing on the generosity of people regarding certain buildings, as was Sir Arthur Rymill in relation to the National Trust. I heartily congratulate the Hons. Harry Edmonds and Ross Story. It seems a bad thing to me that people like Mr. Edmonds, who has physically hacked his way through scrub and carried on farming from that stage, must of necessity disappear from the ranks of members of Parliament. I do not know that I have ever wished to hack my way into a farm and set up on that basis, but there are many things I wish I had been able to do. One was to ride up to a country hotel, hang my reins over the rail and then go inside and have a drink. I am afraid those days have gone. Undoubtedly, much colour and sincere opinion based on solid thought over the past will be lost to Parliament when people like Mr. Edmonds retire from this Chamber. I join with others in wishing him the best of luck. I have derived much pleasure from listening to his speeches, given without frills and theatricals, and I, together with all members of the Chamber, will miss him very much.

The part of the Hon. Ross Story's speech I found most interesting was that in which he produced figures to substantiate the growth of country towns based on one man engaged on an irrigated block. From memory, I think the figures were nine or 10 to one in terms of the people who would affect decentralization in a solid way, based on agriculture.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: On irrigation schemes.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Yes. This is an important point, particularly when I think back to the time I was first interested in dairy cattle, and travelled to Kyabram and

Shepparton twice a year. The growth in those places is astounding, and is based on irrigation. The essence of the contract is, of course, the density of the farming population. Places like Shepparton have grown to an enormous extent and minor industries have come in to supply the population. They are now growing to such an extent that heavy industries are being established with the prospect of marketing all over the world. They have been established with the idea of being close to the source of supply. Mr. Story's speech was close to the mark and to the pattern that future Governments must follow.

Whether we like it or not, we in Australia are caught between the various economic blocs and social ideas. I like to think of them in terms of Great Britain. In marketing and commerce, we may have to think in terms of the common market bloc, with Europe influencing us in many ways. Basically, of course, we owe our origin to that source. On the other side of the Pacific Ocean is America. There is not a shadow of doubt that during the war and since America has largely influenced our way of life. Although there is much to admire in the American way of life, certain aspects I do not admire. It is interesting to study the way in which Australia and, in particular, Australian society, will develop. The third influencing factor that must affect us even more in future is, of course, the Far-East, as no doubt once the Far-Eastern countries can build up their balance of payment accounts to the stage where they can afford to buy primary products, much of the surplus of Australia must go to that source. It is up to all Australians who think seriously about the future of their country to study all aspects of the character and make-up of the people of the Far-East. We often rather gloss over them or get away with a couple of lewd opinions in terms of their character and make-up. That is not good enough, and I am quite certain that there will be these three blocs, with the possible intrusion of a Communist bloc, which may, in terms of marketing and commerce, be quite significant, although I hope it will not.

We in Australia have a social structure that, to my mind, is something of which we can be proud. The Party I represent, in particular, encourages a society based on all that is best in family life. We encourage private ownership of houses, free enterprise and free expression—things that are hackneyed around in a democratic world, but which, in this

country, I believe, have come to mean something. There is no doubt that between the various blocs to which I have referred lies our destiny. I hope that not too much notice will be taken in Australia of certain aspects, particularly American ideas, and that the whole of our social structure will never be founded on indoctrination of small children in terms of stars and stripes, of believing they have the freest country in the world, and that no other country is equal to theirs. It is wrong. I like the open-mindedness of Australians. Where it does not interfere with the productivity of the country, I like to know that our lives are not run by the dollar. I have many friends who went through the war and, when they accumulate enough money they intend to go fishing when they can. This is not a bad feature of the Australian character, and I rather approve of the fact that we do not let our lives become ruled completely by personal ambition and money.

My ubiquitous friend, Mr. Bardolph, in his speech, travelled all over the country. I admire the sheer statesman-like qualities of his approach to the overall problems regarding the welfare of South Australia. In so doing, he gave us much information. As a representative of a primary producing area, I was delighted to think he was so much on our side. His reference to dairying, and the fact that so many dairymen are earning less than the basic wage, is a magical thing, and I am now certain that not all my words during the last two years on behalf of primary producers have been wasted on the desert air. However, there were slight inconsistencies in his approach, not the least of which was that his amendment deals with the fact that the State Government should not have interfered in the basic wage hearing. On the one hand he saw fit to say that His Excellency's Speech this year was window dressing, and on the other hand he gave us his own variety. He referred to the poor return of dairy farmers and said they were not earning as much as the basic wage. If that is not window dressing, I should like to see some. This subject went on and on until it reached the stage where he said that a Government that takes its responsibility carefully and clearly should not give evidence for the sake of the community in general.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I did not say that.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: The honourable member cannot have his cake and eat it too. He was sticking up for the farmers, and maybe it was not window dressing, but on

the other hand he insinuated that people should not go before the court and put forward an honest and courageous view. That is too stupid for words and reeks to me of insincerity of approach, because there is no doubt that country people, with markets and prices based on overseas prices, have no hope of getting out of this vicious spiral. I should be interested to hear the policy speech by way of window dressing before the next election and how the Labor Party proposes to get over this small technical difficulty, which is not of much importance in the honourable member's mind.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: They are facts, not technicalities.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: We have an apple and divide it into sections. No matter how many sections, the apple is still there and the elasticity the honourable member speaks about is hard to achieve.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: The Government made its evidence available to the employers; keep to that point.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: If the honourable member would keep to his point without giving agricultural advice, it would be apt. I support the motion.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I support the motion and congratulate both mover and seconder on their fine and lucid speeches. I join with the Hons. Mr. Edmonds and Mr. Story in their welcoming words to His Excellency, Sir Edric Bastyan, and Lady Bastyan. Sir Edric comes to this high office as a distinguished soldier and leader of men. In less than four months he has become known to many hundreds of South Australians and his readiness, indeed eagerness, to share fully in the life of this State has already brought confidence and happiness to many citizens in all walks of life. Lady Bastyan has in quiet dignity endeared herself to all citizens, but especially to the women of South Australia. At the end of May, 1,200 women came from every part of the State, under the aegis of the National Council of Women, to give loyal welcome to Lady Bastyan. On that moving occasion, Lady Bastyan, by her calm, unhurried personal words to each president of the various affiliated societies, proved herself to be very genuinely interested in the comprehensive and varied voluntary work of the women of this State. I share with all honourable members in this Chamber the earnest wish that His Excellency and Lady Bastyan will be spared to spend many happy years among us.

Every honourable member who has preceded me in this debate has spoken sadly of the deaths of so many of our distinguished men. While mourning their deaths, I still hold dear many happy memories of them. South Australians will always remember with pride that theirs was the first State chosen for a visit by their Excellencies, Lord and Lady Dunrossil, and many South Australians cherish the memory of that visit. I was privileged to be a guest at the opening of the Commonwealth Parliament in 1960, the only time that Lord Dunrossil was destined to perform that solemn duty, and I shall always remember the dignity of that occasion.

I remember another Scot and his jovial personality—the late Sir Malcolm McIntosh. I remember the forthright and honest Michael O'Halloran, whose speeches on State occasions were always so appropriate; I revere the memory of one in this House, the Hon. Mr. Condon, who brought a keen wit and a Puckish sense of humour into debates, who upheld the traditions of Parliament on every occasion, and who gave the hand of friendship, as I well know, to every new member.

During the period when Parliament has been in recess I have spent many weeks in travelling through electorates other than my own. This has enabled me to appreciate greatly many aspects of the Government's work as instanced in His Excellency's Speech. Honourable members do not need me to tell them that in Australia we are living through a period of great changes, and these changes are obviously not taking place in Australia alone. The winds of change have blown with various effects, some not very pleasant, in many parts of the world, but here in Australia our changes largely stem from the vast increase in our population. South Australia is sharing in this increase to a remarkable extent every year, both naturally and by immigration. In the city, this is very evident; one sees and feels the increase. The South Australian Government has in recent years been working hard and steadfastly towards the objective of doubling our population. It has spent vast sums of money all over the State, but particularly in country areas, in order to develop facilities for that increased population. For this development, the basic requirements are roads, water, electric services, food, houses, schools and hospitals—all given prominent mention in His Excellency's Speech.

The mover of the motion has spoken fully and excellently on the subject of roads, and particularly of the beautiful Port Lincoln Highway on which I have travelled several times in

recent months. The Government is to be congratulated on the way in which it has perfected a splendid system of main highways throughout the State. In fact, it is the first thing noted by our interstate visitors, and it is certainly a source of pride and relief to the South Australian motorist once he crosses the border on his way home. It is interesting to know that we have more miles of high-grade main roads in proportion to our population than any other State.

South Australia is a land of contrasts, and in the matter of water there is no greater contrast: too little here, too much there, and so on. It is a wonderful achievement for any Government to be able to say that 96 per cent of the population has reticulated water, and that is a fact in South Australia today. Already in the comparatively short time that the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline has been in operation we have become so accustomed to our use of Murray water that we have forgotten the hardships and difficulties of former years when water restrictions were an ordinary summer hazard. The same story can now be told of the great benefit of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, and I note with satisfaction in paragraph 13 of the Speech that further expansion of water services is planned. I have here the figures of the quantities of water pumped to metropolitan storages from the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline for the seven-year period 1954-1960. They are of great interest, and I pray the indulgence of the House to read them. They are:

1954-55	5,627,000,000 gallons
1955-56	1,006,000,000 gallons
1956-57	3,919,000,000 gallons

And here are the most interesting figures:

1957-58	14,020,000,000 gallons
1958-59	5,240,000,000 gallons
1959-60	14,975,000,000 gallons

The figures for each of the periods 1957-58 and 1959-60 equal the total storage of the Adelaide reservoirs. Several paragraphs of His Excellency's Speech are devoted to the superabundance of water in the State, and I refer to paragraphs 10 and 14. I have recently made two trips to the South-East of this State, and by the kindness of the honourable members for the Southern District, have been able to see much of the Government's work in developing that area. The South-East is the only large piece of land in South Australia rich enough in rainfall and good soil to have the potential of producing very much more than it is producing and of carrying many more people than it is carrying at present. If South Australia

is to double its population in the next 20 years or so, the food for that increased population will mainly have to be produced in the South-East, and as a natural corollary the South-East will have to more than double its population and more than double its production. Therefore, the present rate of development in the South-East by the Government must not only be maintained but increased.

One of the greatest factors in this development must be what is being done about the wonderful supply of underground water and what is being done by drainage. When one realizes that one of the richest districts in the State—Millicent—is the result of the success of the first drainage reclamation in 1885, one recognizes the value of the constant policy of the Government in the matter of South-Eastern water drainage. By the Government's continual expenditure of large sums on this project, the South-East is becoming every year nearer to fulfilling its destiny as the garden of this State. Paragraph 14 refers to another drainage scheme recently put into operation in part of the electorate which I represent. I refer to the South-Western suburbs drainage scheme. The Government should be congratulated on the speedy way in which it commenced this work after the enabling legislation had been passed. It is a source of great satisfaction to the residents of these districts.

Before leaving the Department of Hydrology, may I say, Sir, how pleased and interested I was in hearing the Hon. Mr. Story's remarks about the necessity for easements on the River Murray. The rest of the people of this State are also greatly interested in the Murray. In South Australia we have few good harbours suitable for boating; we have no snow fields for winter sports, and we have virtually no trout streams to fish. Particularly because of these facts, and partly because of its unique nature in this country, the River Murray almost fills the part of a national playground. Years ago when most of our country, especially that adjacent to the river, was undeveloped and poorly fenced, there was no let or hindrance to those who wished to take advantage of the river for fishing, picnicking, camping and other forms of relaxation. Today, with the use of all of our land becoming intensified and more efficiently and more highly developed generally, many miles of river frontage have been completely blocked off and alienated from the general public. In fact, today, from the lakes in the south to the fruit-growing areas in the

north, it is difficult for the tourist to obtain legitimate access to the banks of the river, except in the vicinity of the ferries and the odd few miles where government roads happen to run alongside the stream. In other parts of the world it has been common practice to preserve for the people natural pleasure grounds and means of access near lakes and streams. I request the Government to examine this matter most carefully before the development along the River Murray is everywhere so far advanced that rights and reservations for the common people can no longer be provided.

Referring to paragraph 17, well-deserved praise must be given to the Electricity Trust for its continuing success in furthering the Government's objective—that is, of extending a vast scheme of electric power services throughout the State—a scheme aimed at developing the country areas, at decentralizing the people's activities, at carrying a bigger population, at producing more food, and inevitably, as a result, aimed at increasing the wealth of the people who own and work the land of this State. The recent Parliamentary trip to the South-East gave honourable members a chance to see how intensive is the work of the Electricity Trust.

Last year we saw the Port Augusta B power station opened; this month at Nangwarry we saw a new power station which, as I have been informed by those technically presumed to know, is a most efficiently designed construction of its type, developed and built by our Electricity Trust and now handed over to the Woods and Forests Department. I noticed that the piping system was patriotically designed, red pipes for steam, white for compressed air, and blue for water. Another interesting development of the Electricity Trust's work is envisaged in paragraph 37 where mention is made of the £1,000,000 grant by the Government for the provision by the Electricity Trust of a new transmission line to connect the South-East with the main grid system, a new backbone to the whole system, as it were.

In education, the Government is showing vision and confidence in the future by a most ambitious and progressive policy, which is designed to cope with the continually increasing numbers of children requiring education, and the continually increasing demands by the people for higher education. The Education Department has followed wisely the determination of the Government that the education of our young must be maintained at the highest possible level. The provision of a textbook

allowance to all students of secondary schools is certainly costing the Government £500,000 each year, but is most appreciated by parents. Many new buildings are being planned by the department, which is aware that no matter how splendid a school building is or how lavishly equipped, it is what is taught and how it is taught within the building which really matters. Therefore the expenditure on the new Teachers' College will pay tremendous dividends by encouraging more and more of our good secondary students who have the ability and temperament to take up this noble profession. So far the response in recent years has been most heartening. The recent Education Week also proved a source of great hope and inspiration for the work in education in South Australia.

In higher or tertiary education, there have been remarkable strides in this State and in other parts of Australia. Early this month when I re-visited the University of Sydney, I was astounded by the vast physical expansion of the place. This was even more spectacular when one takes into account that the University of Armidale and the University of New South Wales have also developed vastly in that State. People in New South Wales have the same worries as we have about the increasing demands for tertiary education, and it was during my stay in Sydney that the University of Sydney Senate decided that in future, for the first time, entrance to faculties would be restricted. Entrance to the Faculty of Medicine is to be limited from 1962 and into all other faculties from 1963. The basis of selection will be the aggregate co-ordinated mark of the best five papers in matriculation subjects in either the leaving certificate or matriculation examinations. When one con-

siders that the 1961 enrolment in arts at the University of Sydney is 1,428, in medicine 575, and in science 843, it is obvious that the senate was justified in making this decision. The *Sydney Morning Herald* of July 5, 1961, stated, "By its latest act the University of Sydney has given itself a fighting chance of maintaining its academic standards."

I mention this in view of the question asked earlier today, and hope that it will help members to think on this matter. Another question regarding tertiary education may be of interest to you. In May of this year the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney, Emeritus Professor Stephen Roberts said, and I quote from the *Sydney Morning Herald*:

It is my personal opinion and contrary to everything I have ever believed before, that the community can no longer be held responsible for providing University education for everyone who wants it.

There will, of course, be no doubt in the minds of honourable members, that it is essential for this country to find more and more money for the capital requirements of building and establishing our universities, but it is an interesting point of view to consider whether those receiving the benefits should not be required to contribute more towards the upkeep and running expenses of the universities. To me, His Excellency's Speech is one of confidence and hope for the increasing prosperity of our fine State. I support the motion.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.20 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 1, at 2.15 p.m.