

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, July 24, 1963.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****ENGINEERING TRADE SCHOOL.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Education, say whether a property on Goodwood Road at Panorama once owned by a building contracting firm has been purchased by the Government for use as an engineering trade school?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think that I should get a detailed answer from my colleague before replying.

**ATOMIC POWER STATIONS.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Having in mind the statement of the Premier about the establishment of an atomic reactor station by the Electricity Trust of South Australia, will the Government set up a State Atomic Energy Commission consisting of three experts to provide technical advice for the planning and erection of such a station in order to secure the utmost efficiency and economy?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member's question probably refers to information that the Premier has given about what he saw in America. An atomic authority has already been set up by the Commonwealth. There are certain restrictions about where atomic stations or reactors can be established. I understand that some of the stations already proposed in America would be established in the midst of heavily populated areas. Some of the existing prohibitions are being modified. I think the matter is covered by the Commonwealth and the State need not be concerned. The production of electricity is a matter of economics and the possibility of establishing atomic power stations must be considered further. I think it is premature to consider whether it is necessary to establish some further authority. There is a danger that we may become overrun and bogged down as regards the State's progress and development. I should prefer to await additional information before suggesting whether it is worth while asking for further information on the matter. It can await consideration of the results of the Premier's visit abroad.

**SPEED LIMIT THROUGH ELIZABETH.**

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: On June 12 I directed a question to the Minister of Roads regarding the speed limit through Elizabeth. Yesterday he replied on that matter and I was grateful for it. In view of the fact that several matters have been raised with me since, can he say whether the appropriate authority has actually prepared regulations governing the speed limit through the area? I realize from his last remarks that there is some delay in supplying the traffic lights, which will take some time to install. Have the regulations been prepared and when are they likely to be tabled in Parliament?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Without going deeply into the matter, I consider it would not be desirable to table regulations until the lights are in operation. From a practical point of view, when the lights are in operation we shall over a short period take further surveys of the traffic speeds in the area to find the desirable speed. I assure the honourable member that I shall let him have the details as soon as I possibly can.

**TREATMENT OF ALCOHOLICS.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Can the Minister of Health say whether the Government intends to implement the recommendations contained in the report of the special committee and provide suitable accommodation for the treatment of alcoholics in this State?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Some investigations are being made regarding the recommendations and their implementation. A variety of representations are being made, all of which tend to delay giving effect to any policy whatsoever, although it is one of the urgent problems we are facing. I am busy trying to reconcile the different points of view as to where and how and why, and who is to administer the scheme. We have a heavy responsibility regarding alcoholics who occupy prisons or gaols—we can use either word—and who are recidivists and keep coming back. There is little opportunity to do much for them at present and I think it is a matter for the Government to decide whether these people, who are the responsibility of the Sheriff at present, shall continue to be under his supervision or somewhere else under a set of conditions where there will be medical administration. I leave the question at that because I

have certain views on it. The sorting out of the respective opinions is causing delay in giving effect to something I consider should be done on behalf of alcoholics.

#### STOCK TRANSPORT.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I address my question to the Minister of Roads. In order to avoid unnecessary bruising and subsequent loss of value of stock to the farming community, does the Minister intend to remove the cartage of livestock from the control of the Transport Control Board?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The honourable member has opened up a wide suggestion there. It is not within my power to see that the Transport Control Board be given certain powers by Parliament. The honourable member's question really relates to the transport of lambs to the abattoirs. I can assure him that steps are already being taken to relax the restrictions in this regard.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 23. Page 92.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. First, I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion (the Hons. Mr. Hart and Mr. DeGaris) on their excellent speeches. I have been privileged in this Chamber to witness the advent of quite a few new members. In fact, it is astonishing in the few short years I have been here, since 1956, how many new members have entered this Chamber. The standard of speeches seems to be improving as each new member comes in.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: You have really started something!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have referred previously to the improving standard of speeches of new members. Irrespective of Party, the improving calibre is a general reflection on the educational standards of our State. It would be difficult to criticize the speeches of our two new members. They were not provocative, as similar speeches have been on occasions. The members were tolerant and put their points of view fairly and clearly. Whilst we may not agree with everything they said, we congratulate them on their efforts. At times I wondered whether they were members of the Liberal Party or of my Party. For instance, when Mr. Hart was speaking on decentralization, I thought he was

doing an excellent job from our point of view. I hope he holds to what he said.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What is your point of view?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Knowing what can happen to members of the Party opposite, I am afraid that Mr. Hart may not be able to go as far on decentralization as he implied. Again, when I listened to Mr. DeGaris speaking on local government boundaries I wondered whether it was one of my colleagues speaking; but at least what he said was sound and good and it was nice to hear somebody, be he a new member of the Liberal Party or not, agreeing in the main with our views on local government. History will prove that, whether it be in this Parliament or in the Commonwealth Parliament, most of the real progressive steps taken by Liberals have been Labor Party policy. That is history. It is pleasing to hear a new member agreeing with part of our policy. I am sure my colleagues agree with me that both honourable members delivered excellent speeches. We sincerely congratulate them and welcome them to this Chamber. If they continue to put forward their points of view with the moderation they showed yesterday, this Chamber will remain peaceful and happy.

Before dealing with the Governor's Speech, I want to refer to the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh earlier this year. The more we have of these visits the better it is for our State. It brings home to us the form of democracy under which we live. From what I have seen, read and heard of other countries, I firmly believe our form of living is equal, if not superior, to that practised anywhere else in the world. It is good to see people in such high positions, to whom we look for leadership and guidance, prepared to travel so far from their normal places of residence to make contact with the ordinary people.

I congratulate all those people (and particularly the public servants) who organized the visit. Generally speaking, it was well done and on this occasion more people outside the upper strata had an opportunity, if not of actually meeting the Queen, at least of seeing her. I should like to mention particularly the Festival of Music in Elder Park. It was truly a magnificent evening. The organizers of that function deserve the highest commendation. I also mention our Police Force which, on all occasions, does such an excellent job in controlling huge assemblies of people so efficiently and so pleasingly. We all owe its members our thanks.

I was touched by one incident connected with Her Majesty's visit. I was talking to a friend who had taken his young children, the eldest of whom was a girl aged about six or seven, to the Port Road to get a better look at Her Majesty on one of her visits to the city. When the Queen had gone past the little girl said to her father, "Daddy, the Queen is only just a lady. She is only dressed just like any lady." The father replied, "Well, how did you expect to see the Queen?" The girl answered, "I thought she would have her robes and crown on." The thought struck me that it might be possible (I put this forward in all sincerity) on some future occasion when we are blessed by another Royal visit for the Queen to wear her robes, her crown and all the regalia necessary at some function where the children could see her thus attired. I suggest that not so much for the sake of adults as for the children of this State. Such a sight would be an inspiration they would never forget. I do not know whether it is possible or whether it has been done previously. If the Lord Mayor of London can transport all his robes to Australia for a special occasion, it should be possible for Her Majesty to do likewise. If this could be done, not only the children but many adults would be thrilled to see Her Majesty in her regalia. I hope that the proposed visit next year by the Queen Mother materializes and I am sure she will receive as enthusiastic a welcome as that given on her previous visit and to her daughter this year.

I fully concur with the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply in expressing my appreciation of the dignified manner in which the Governor carries out his duties on such occasions as the opening of Parliament. It is a credit to himself and to our State. Paragraph 8 of his Speech states:

During 1962, the number of people in civilian employment in this State increased much faster than the average for the whole of the Commonwealth whilst the percentage of persons registered for employment was almost the lowest in the Commonwealth. I commend both employers and trades unions upon their responsible attitude in the sphere of industrial relations which contributes to industrial stability. The Government is still concerned with the frequency of industrial accidents. It is pleasing to note that efforts to reduce these are receiving active co-operation from all sections of industry.

That is an important paragraph and I shall take it section by section. It relates first of all to the number of people in civilian employment, which must grow each year to keep pace with the increasing population. It would be tragic if the number of people in employment did not grow. Since the Address in Reply debate of last year the State has reached a population of 1,000,000. Unless the number of people in civilian employment keeps increasing there will be far more people registered for employment, which nobody wants to see. When we come to the number of unemployed we can see that the South Australian Government can no longer say it has the lowest ratio in the Commonwealth. I believe Victoria is .2 per cent below us now. This is an aspect of our economy that has always worried me and I shall never be happy about it, notwithstanding how low a figure we get, while there are still able-bodied people who want to work but are unable to get work. I have given this matter some thought in the last two or three months and have tried to ascertain why some people cannot find work and what kind of people are registered as unemployed. What worries me is the break-up of those registered as unemployed and those who are on social service benefits. The following table shows the number of persons registered for employment in South Australia and in Australia during the last three years:

	South Australia			Total	Australia		
	Males	Females	Total		Males	Females	Total
June 30, 1961 . . . .	5,710	3,325	9,035	79,939	31,745	111,684	
June 29, 1962 . . . .	3,764	3,122	6,886	60,612	32,516	93,128	
June 28, 1963 . . . .	3,139	3,340	6,479	48,895	32,512	81,407	

The first total of 111,684 for Australia is possibly the highest for a number of years. Those figures are bad enough but, if we look at the break-up of males and females and see where they are and what the percentage is, we can see how serious the position is. I am quoting the break-up for the people who are registered for employment in South Australia. The male

adults total 2,550. We can presume that the bulk of them are breadwinners for the home. The greatest tragedy is in the case of juniors (under 21): in South Australia 589 males. There are 1,930 female adults unemployed. I do not know whether they are breadwinners or whether they are married. We cannot ascertain that. I have made inquiries, but unless one inspects each individual card one cannot

ascertain their occupations or circumstances in life. Again, the tragedy is in the number of females under 21 who are registered for employment—1,410. Here we are with half the year gone and it is reasonable to suppose that the juniors—male or female—are, in the main,

school-leavers of last year who have found no employment to June 30 this year.

The following table shows the number of people receiving unemployment benefits in South Australia and Australia during the last three years:

	South Australia			Total	Australia		
	Males	Females	Total		Males	Females	Total
June, 1961 . . . . .	2,940	1,102	4,042	42,479	11,775	54,254	
June, 1962 . . . . .	1,747	1,310	3,057	32,401	13,923	46,324	
June, 1963 . . . . .	1,179	1,265	2,444	24,200	13,988	38,188	

Nobody can be happy about this position. In South Australia 1,914 people are receiving unemployment benefits in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Are they classified?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No classification is available. In Elizabeth 182 people are registered and in Port Pirie 135. These figures are

disturbing. I always believed that the bulk of these people were labourers or members of the lower strata but it is surprising to see in the records the categories from which they come. I have obtained figures for June from a news release of the Department of Labour and National Service showing the various categories of those registered for employment as at June 30 last and they are as follows:

	Persons Males.	Registered. Females.	Vacancies. Males.	Registered. Females.
Rural . . . . .	140	39	71	1
Professional, semi-professional, commercial, clerical and admin- istrative . . . . .	362	1,374	170	123
Skilled building and construction	175	—	104	—
Skilled metal and electrical . .	146	—	683	3
Other skilled and semi-skilled manual . . . . .	1,024	1,047	458	66
Unskilled manual . . . . .	943	4	136	2
All other occupations . . . . .	349	876	42	148
	3,139	3,340	1,664	343

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I have seen these figures and those relating to skilled metal and electrical workers are rather astounding.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is so. I do not understand why we have 683 vacancies whereas 146 people are registered as unemployed. I submitted certain questions to departmental officers and they were partly answered. I appreciate the way I was received by these officers and I commend them for their work. The figures I was given showed the position on that day.

The department is doing a good job in many directions; it is improving the lot of many employees who have a job in which they are not happy and feel that they would be better suited somewhere else. There are many of these applications, but the applicants are not always registered. Employers contact the department when they need an employee. I was surprised to learn that the department finds employment for about 1,000 persons a

week. It is a man-sized job. I did believe that a number of those who are continually registered may be considered no-hopers, but I am pleased to say I was told that this was not so. It is good to know that the department does not believe that any person registered for unemployment is a no-hoper.

One officer told me that on occasions, before an applicant is placed in employment, it is necessary to bring him to the department to tell him why he was dismissed from his previous job. In the main the persons who register for employment are not considered to be no-hopers. He said that anyone suggesting that was at liberty to come to the department to investigate the position. When I was in the office at least 50 persons were seeking employment. I was challenged to decide by appearance whether any was a no-hoper. To my mind they were all decent citizens of good standing. There were both adult and junior males and females. With my knowledge of people, provided they

could do the work, I could not see, and the officer agreed with me, any reason why any of them should not be sent to a job. It is possible to take out a card at will and ascertain why a person left his last job, why he was still unemployed, and to which jobs he had been sent. I remember one card where the person concerned had been sent to three places before being accepted for employment. Sometimes it takes three weeks to a month to place a person of reasonable ability.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is in the job he wants?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, any job. Up to that stage I could not fault anything done by the department. Possibly every unemployed person is not registered, but I was surprised to learn that some people say the unemployment figures are inflated. The officer said that anyone believing that could come and check the position. I understand that a press reporter intended to write a sensational story about this inflation, but when told he could come and check the cards nothing more was heard from him. I was surprised to notice the standard of the persons seeking work. I was one who had been guilty of accepting the statement that many were no-hopers. It was proved to me that I was wrong, and I am glad to say that. I was told that the persons we regard as no-hopers do not in the main register for work, and that there are not as many as may be imagined. I asked the officer whether anything was done by the department to make work for unemployed persons. He said, "No. This is a Commonwealth department and our job is to regulate people into industry." The Commonwealth Government makes money available to the State Government and asks it to establish projects, if it can, for unemployed persons.

Then I wondered who could do something for them if the Commonwealth Government could not. I understand that the Loan Council has made available to the State a sum of money, which is not repayable, and which could be used to provide work for unemployed persons. I do not know what the Department of Industry is doing in the matter, but it may be doing all it can. Has the department, or any other department, inquired how some of these persons can be occupied during June, July and August, which I think are the worst months of the year for unemployment? We are told that Government and local government departments run short of money about that time. Of course, the position in the building industry is due to the extraordinary wet weather this

year. If the Department of Industry can do nothing, would the Government consider the possibility of money being made available to local government to enable councils to provide work of value at that time of the year, particularly for unemployed persons. I do not mean making money available to them to keep ordinary staff at work, but to make a special effort to reduce the number of unemployed persons in those months. It seems that the figure in South Australia is about 6,000, and it is possible that it will not be much lower, unless something is done to alleviate the position as it arises each year. Paragraph 8 of the Governor's Speech states:

I commend both employers and trades unions upon their responsible attitude in the sphere of industrial relations, which contributes to industrial stability.

That Speech was delivered on June 12, but since that day the relationship between employer and employee has deteriorated. Although the Governor mentioned how prosperous and progressive the State was, representatives of the Chamber of Manufactures and the South Australian Employers Federation have since been in court and have stressed how poor the State was and that it could not afford to pay an increase of 10 per cent in margins. Ever since the Commonwealth Arbitration Court has given its decision on the matters of annual leave and the 10 per cent increase in margins, both private employers and some Government sectors have done everything possible to prevent employees from getting their due reward as determined by the court. The employers first of all challenged the three weeks' annual leave to certain employees and took a test case, but the Industrial Court agreed with the awarding of three weeks. Then the 10 per cent increase in margins was challenged. The Full Bench of the Arbitration Court agreed that the 10 per cent should be paid to the employees. The latest information now is that the employers want to split the three weeks' annual leave.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: In a decision today the court has done it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I did not know that. I do not know where we are getting to. The employers opposed the three weeks' annual leave; they wanted a clause written into the award that, if the employers and the employees could not agree how the annual leave was to be taken, the employers should have the right to tell the employees how it should be taken. If these things in the private section of our industry continue, how can we expect the good

relationship between employer and employee to remain on the high standard as it has in the past?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It has gone further than that. There is no agreement. It is absolutely in the employers' hands after giving 14 days' notice to the employees.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am afraid that will not be the last of that. I said so on another occasion. Having spent the best years of my life in the trade union movement, I can foresee trouble there affecting the relationship between employer and employee. The Commonwealth Court has given a certain decision and employers have gone out of their way to get the last ounce they can out of the State Industrial Court.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Do you blame anybody for getting the best he can out of a court? Doesn't everybody do that?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: What will happen in this State is that people under Commonwealth Arbitration Court decisions will enjoy three weeks' annual leave straight, whereas those working in the same industry under the same roof will have two weeks, if the employer so decides, and then one week at some other time.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: You can roster holidays.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We have nothing against rostering, but do not break the three weeks into two parts.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: That is only a minor point.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is not very minor from the employees' point of view. If the employer and employee can agree, there is no objection to it. The employers' request was that, if the employer and employee could not agree, the employer should have the right to direct the employee how to take his annual leave; and that is what the court has decided. If it is thought that that will bring peace and happiness into industry, then I have a poor idea of what peace and happiness in industry means.

I now want to clear up one or two points on railway rents. It was on June 13 that I spoke on this matter, when a question was raised on the number of staff employed by the railways. I wanted to find out who was right and who was wrong. I said then that approximately 25 per cent of the employees were affected by rent increases. The Minister, admittedly, agreed that the 25 per cent was correct.

The Hon. C. R. Story: A point well taken. I agree now.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Looking at the annual report of the Railways Commissioner, we find that for the year ended June 30, 1962, the total staff engaged was 9,189, so 2,300 was approximately 25 per cent. Therefore, that is settled. When I was speaking on this I was battling a little when the honourable Sir Arthur Rymill interjected and I remember not understanding what he was saying as well as I might have. I was talking about rent increases and Sir Arthur interjected: "What is the real value of these things?" Being a truthful man, I said, "I do not know." Then Sir Arthur said, "You do not care." I do care, but I want to carry that a little further, too, and put my interpretation on what was meant by the interjection. If I am wrong, I will not pursue the matter. I believe in freedom of speech. If I have something to say I say it and, if somebody wants to reply, he can, and it will not hurt me if he does it as pleasantly as Sir Arthur always does. My interpretation of the interjection was that the employees or those people occupying the houses should pay the full value of the rental according to the costs of the houses. If that was a fair interpretation, I want to pursue the matter. I tried to find out the actual costs, values and rentals of some of those houses. I think I took the worst ones available; I asked for information and got it. I have in my hand a letter from the Australian Railways Union, which should know about these things. I telephoned and asked if they could tell me the value of some of these houses and what rents were paid and was told, "We have a real good one for you." I want to give the details. They said:

Tenders were called for the sale of cottages numbers 575 and 576 at Wilmington, the cottages to be removed from railway premises. Tenders closed in December 1962, a tender for £160 the pair being successful.

These cottages had to be transferred from Railways Department property to another block in the town where they were required.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Where—in the town?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Anywhere they wanted to take them. Cottage No. 574 at Wilmington is occupied by a packer in the Railways Department and until June 30, 1963, his rent was 17s. 9d. a week. This cottage was identical with the two sold with the exception that two rooms were lined with masonite whilst two were unlined. The packer received advice that his rent would be increased from 17s. 9d. to 29s. 6d. as from July 1, 1963.

This means that under the new scale of rental the packer will pay £76 14s. a year, or £3 6s. less than the accepted value of each of the two cottages sold. If anyone can say that that is anywhere near a fair rental then I do not know what I am talking about.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Do you mean on the value?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: On the value the Railways Department accepted. The cottage was sold for £80 and in 12 months the people occupying the other one are paying £76 14s. a year.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What do you think you would get for your house as salvage?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Would the honourable member like to pay 29s. 6d. for a house worth £80 which can be shifted?

The Hon. C. R. Story: How would you like it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I would not go out there if the house were rent free.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What is the salvage value of the house?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The department sold the house for £80. That is not an isolated case. There was another batch of houses in Taillem Bend built over 30 years ago at a cost of £400 each, and I believe these were made of some form of concrete mould. The rents of these houses have been increased to approximately £2 a week. I am told that the capital value and interest on those houses have been paid for at least twice. The Trades and Labor Council took this up with the Premier, and although I do not like averages being quoted I want to submit this list as proof of how misleading averages can be. According to a statement in the press the Premier said that the rents of public servants would be increased by an average of 15s. a week. I have a table of increases showing how averages can be misleading. There are 23 listed Railways Department cottages on this list and various increases from 10s. 6d. upwards. The average is 18s. 11d. I ask permission to have this table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Area.	Cottage No.	Old rent.		New rent.		Increase.		Percentage increase.
		s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	
Bowmans .. . . .	170	25	0	35	6	10	6	42
Long Plains .. . . .	77	26	0	47	6	21	6	83
Long Plains .. . . .	225	25	0	45	6	20	6	82
Long Plains .. . . .	223	25	6	47	6	22	0	86
Long Plains .. . . .	224	25	0	45	6	20	6	82
Long Plains .. . . .	227	25	6	47	6	22	0	86
Mallala .. . . .	163	27	9	47	0	19	3	69
Mallala .. . . .	162	26	9	45	6	18	9	70
Mallala .. . . .	164	27	9	47	0	19	3	69
Mallala .. . . .	161	25	9	43	0	17	3	67
Two Wells .. . . .	333	27	9	45	6	17	9	64
Two Wells .. . . .	65	26	9	46	0	19	3	72
Virginia .. . . .	220	31	0	46	6	15	6	50
Virginia .. . . .	221	30	6	48	6	17	6	57
Virginia .. . . .	157	28	0	47	0	19	0	68
Virginia .. . . .	160	27	0	45	0	18	0	67
Mallala .. . . .	270	28	3	47	6	19	3	68
Virginia .. . . .	159	27	6	47	6	20	0	73
Bowmans .. . . .	301	25	6	41	0	15	6	61
Angaston .. . . .	—	29	9	52	0	22	3	75
Angaston .. . . .	—	29	3	50	6	21	3	73
Angaston .. . . .	—	28	6	48	6	20	0	70
Angaston .. . . .	—	34	9	53	6	18	9	54
Total increase, £21 15s. 6d.: Average increase, 18s. 11d.								

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: When we speak of an average of 15s. a week it does not help those people who have to pay more than that. Although the Government has agreed to increase these rents by a third each year commencing July, 1963, I do not think the last has been heard of this matter. The lowest increase on this list is 10s. 6d., which means that everybody, even if he is a tradesman who receives

the full 10s. increase in wages, will have a reduction from his pay packet of whatever he was getting prior to the increases being paid. That is hardly a move towards a good employer-employee relationship.

I now come to the Railways Commissioner's annual report. If it is good enough that the employee who rents a Railways Department

house should pay the full value and the Railways Commissioner should get the full value for the capital invested in the railways, what would be the reply to some statements of the Railways Commissioner? I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am not advocating an increase in fares or freight rates but, if we carry the Honourable Sir Arthur Rymill's interjection that I mentioned earlier and my interpretation of it to their logical conclusion, the honourable member would have to support an increase in fares and freights to recoup the losses of the railways. The Railways Commissioner, on page 4 of his annual report for 1961-62, says:

The contribution of the State Treasurer towards greater costs not covered by higher freight and passenger fares was decreased from £3,500,000 to £3,300,000. After taking this into consideration the financial results for the year showed a deterioration, compared with the previous year, of £407,232.

The State Government made a grant of £3,300,000 to the Railways Department to cover running costs. How are we justified in insisting upon employees paying the full rental value

of these houses? I am not suggesting that freights or fares should be increased, but it is not right to expect one section of the Railways Department's employees to pay the full value, considering the isolation of many of these houses. We have never questioned the railways being a service to the State but we have said that the department's losses should be borne by the whole of the State, but we are not prepared to stand idly by and say nothing while employees who are working and, by the nature of their occupations, have to live in these remote areas in houses supplied by the department are charged the full rental value on the purchase price or valuation of their houses while increases in costs of the other sections of the Railways Department are met by a grant from the Government. I support the motion.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 30, at 2.15 p.m.