

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, August 8, 1963.

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

QUESTIONS.**NORTH EAST ROAD JUNCTION.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There is a very nasty corner on the North East Road, adjacent to the Hampstead Hotel, where three roads meet—Hampstead Road, Brooke Street and, a little further north, Brunswick Street. I notice that that particular corner is being widened, remade and re-formed. Is it intended to place traffic lights at that junction? If so, can the Minister of Roads tell me what the priority of the work is and when it is likely to be put in hand?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The matter of lights at this intersection has not yet been considered, because the original design of the new ring route up Hampstead Road and across to Portrush Road, with the new bridge across the river, was, as the honourable member is aware, designed to cross the North East Road 100 or 200 yards further to the north-east than the Hampstead corner. This was because the Electricity Trust said that the value of the installation and cost of removing the transformer station at the corner were prohibitive. Therefore, we made arrangements to by-pass Hampstead Road and take the new ring route across the bridge over the river some 100 yards to the north. Since then, with the grid plan coming into operation throughout the whole State, the Electricity Trust decided it would remove all the power-lines along the North East Road from Hampstead Road to Modbury, which has produced an entirely new design. The matter of lights has not yet been considered in view of the new development.

RURAL YOUTH ORGANIZATION.

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 ask the Leader of the Labor Party whether he has seen an issue of the *Border Watch*, dated August 3, containing a short article, from which I shall quote, in which the President of the South-East Branch of the Australian Primary Producers Union (Mr. E. S. Dolan) refers to the

fact that the Waterside Workers Federation is a "reputedly Communist controlled organization" and that it has approached various agricultural bodies, in this case members of the Rural Youth Organization of the South-East. His statement is:

I am surprised and disgusted to know that the Rural Youth Organization was brought into this propaganda movement.

In view of this press report, I ask the Leader (a) whether he, too, is disgusted; (b) whether, as this union is affiliated to the Federal Executive of the Labor Party, he feels it should be disaffiliated; and (c) whether the Federal Executive controls Labor Party policy or not?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The answer to the first part of the question is "No, I have not seen the article."

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I ask the Leader of the Labor Party whether, in view of the fact that he has not had a chance to see the article, would he like me to put my question on notice?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is not my prerogative to tell honourable members what to do.

GAS PURIFIERS.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: In the issue of the *News* this afternoon there appears a report as follows:

Plan to cut car fumes. New South Wales Health Department officials are examining a Victorian plan to compel motorists to fit gas purifiers to the exhausts of all new cars. The commission has sent its recommendation to the Victorian Chief Secretary, Mr. Rylah, who will consider introducing legislation to implement it. In view of the large amount of money that is being collected and placed into a fund for the laudable purpose of dealing with cancer—and I understand these fumes can be responsible for the creation of cancer—will the Government consider the report of the commission in Victoria with a view to introducing similar legislation in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Government this session will be introducing legislation dealing with air pollution that I think will cover all the matters raised by the honourable member. I have not seen the report to which he refers, but the only thing that interested me was that if this pollution could become dangerous in Melbourne it is a wonder there is anybody still living in London.

POINT GILES.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I direct a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Works. Has he a reply to my question of July 31 about Point Giles?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Yes, and I owe the honourable member an apology. I had an answer, but did not realize that it was available when he asked the question again yesterday. On July 8 my colleague the Minister of Marine sent the following information to the members for the district:

The workboat *Captain W. F. Baddams* proceeded to Giles Point on May 6 for the purpose of making a series of trial percussion bores in order to determine the level, quality and thickness of the underlying rock. It was a perfectly calm day on May 7 with only 6 in. of swell running and with the moorings hove tight a start was made on the first bore. The work however was found to be impossible due to the movement of the vessel caused by the slight swell. It was also found that a lateral movement of the boat as small as 12 in. prevented the work proceeding. After waiting a further day the work was abandoned and the *W. F. Baddams* returned to Port Adelaide without achieving any results.

It has now been concluded that drilling from the *W. F. Baddams* is impracticable and other means are being sought of carrying out the work. We are now investigating the possibility of hiring a drilling platform that was used for the diamond drilling at the Port Stanvac marine terminal. If this fails or proves unsuitable we will have to design our own drilling platform, have it constructed in the dockyard and take it to the site slung from a mud hopper. Such an appliance will be worth making, despite the cost, as it will prove useful for the exploratory work at Port Paterson. However, the design and manufacture will probably take three or four months.

Since that time the General Manager of the Harbors Board has supplied further information as follows:

Referring to the penultimate paragraph of the earlier report, the current position is that the board has been able to purchase the drilling rig from the contractors and this is being mounted on one of the board's hopper barges. This work will be completed in about one month's time and it is hoped to carry out drilling operations at Giles Point late next month.

BENARA SEWAGE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on August 1 in relation to the disposal of sewage in the Benara area?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: My colleague, the Minister of Works, advises that the land which is being sought for the temporary disposal of sewage in the Benara district is five miles from

the city of Mount Gambier. The area selected is secluded and remote from habitation, the nearest farmhouse being nearly a mile away. The proposal is to dispose of sewage by lagooning for a period of approximately two years until such time as the balance of the ocean outfall is constructed. This work is in hand, but it will take some time to complete. There is not the slightest possibility of any health hazard being created nor is any nuisance or inconvenience likely to arise from the proposed method of disposal. In any case, the number of premises connected to the sewers during the next two years in Mount Gambier will not be great nor will there be a large quantity of sewage to be disposed of. This, too, will be very diluted because of the necessity to flush the sewers with main water to keep them alive in the early stages of the scheme.

However, the temporary disposal method enables the sewers already constructed to be brought into operation much earlier than would otherwise be possible, thereby making a greatly desired service immediately available to those premises which have sewers already constructed past their doors. This applies particularly to the shopping and business part of the city which is urgently in need of sewerage facilities, and in which the department has made special efforts to comply with the requests of the city council for sewerage to be installed as early as possible. The hotels, restaurants, cafes, soft-drink shops, etc., are urgently in need of sewerage facilities for disposal of their waste effluents. To date, some 40,000 ft. of sewers have been constructed in many streets in Mount Gambier, and the completion of the main pumping station by December, along with the installation of temporary pumping plant will enable sewerage service to be given approximately two years earlier than would be the case if connections were delayed until the outfall sewer was completed to the ocean. The department has already expended some £250,000 on this sewerage scheme and is anxious to render the service to the community.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to my questions of August 6 regarding pass marks for apprentices?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The answers are:

1. The figure 47 refers to the number of boys in the particular trades mentioned who have passed the Leaving subjects required for entrance to the courses.

2. The basis on which passes in Leaving subjects are decided is known only to the examiners appointed by the Public Examinations Board.

3. The Public Examinations Board determines the pass mark.

4. The committee did not seek the opinion of the Trades and Labor Council because its aim was to consider the functions of the Education Department and the Institute of Technology in providing adequate training for technicians with special reference to any overlapping of these functions which had occurred and to any changes in the present organization of technical training which might be desirable.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Offenders Probation Act, 1913-1953. Read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 7. Page 342.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the motion. I join with other honourable members in expressing pleasure because of the honour conferred on His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, by Her Majesty the Queen in recognition of his devotion to the duties of his office. I believe this pleasure is shared throughout South Australia because of the affection the people have for His Excellency and Lady Bastyan. South Australia was again privileged this year to receive a visit from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. I compliment those associated with the various functions of this visit. The Festival of Music, held at Elder Park, was probably unique and will be long remembered by those present. The assembly of schoolchildren at Victoria Park has been mentioned in this Chamber. I believe we should give credit to all those devoted people who tried so hard to make this function a success and whose efforts contributed to the obvious pleasure the children received.

I also join with other honourable members in expressing my sympathy to the families of the late Hons. Lionel Hill, Sir Cecil Hincks, Alec Melrose and Allan Hookings, and Messrs. R. F. Ralston and Edgar Russell. All these members gave distinguished service to the State and will be remembered by all those who had been associated with them. I particularly wish to

refer to Sir Cecil Hincks and Allan Hookings, with whom I was associated during the last session of this Parliament. Sir Cecil Hincks had been known to me for many years and I pay a very special tribute to him because he was a great help to me for a number of years. His encouragement and advice contributed to my being in this Council. The Hon. Allan Hookings I did not know well until I became a member last year. In the short time that I knew him I felt that I had made a close friend. His death was a great loss to all members, not only because of his ability as a member, but because of the personal regard each of us had for him. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Hart and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the mover and seconder of the motion, on their excellent speeches. I am confident that their knowledge and ability will contribute much to the working of the Council, and to the benefit of the State.

I want to refer to one or two matters mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. Paragraph 6 refers to the Government's intention to continue its active policy of the provision of scientific services in all fields of primary production. A service is rendered to primary production and through it to the State generally, which we all appreciate and which we are glad to see continued. I hope all the money that can possibly be found for the service will be made available. Not only is scientific research covered, but the Agriculture Department is responsible for disseminating knowledge throughout the rural community. Excellent field officers are stationed in various country centres and I would like to see a mileage allowance as generous as possible made available to them so that they can give the maximum service.

The matter of water supplies is mentioned in paragraph 9 of the Speech. I commend not only the Government for its foresight and initiative in supplying water throughout the State, but also departmental officers who have done so much in planning schemes. Several centres are mentioned for consideration. The Orreroo scheme is well on the way, and extensions to Burra, Booborowie and Wirrabara were promised. They were to receive water from the originally proposed route of the duplicated pipeline to Whyalla, but when the route was changed to run parallel with the existing pipeline they were promised water simultaneously on completion of the scheme. The Wirrabara project has been started and pipes have been stockpiled. I understand the other centres will receive water in due course. I am pleased that the Government is honouring the promise

in this respect. The Hon. Mr. Robinson mentioned the Kimba water supply. I do not wish to dwell at length on that scheme, but it is good news that a water supply for the town is assured for the next 18 months, because that will give the department time to investigate the scheme thoroughly and an opportunity to prove the Polda basin. If the basin proves to be satisfactory in its capacity, it will open up a new era for the country between the Polda and Kimba. This could prove of financial help to the scheme. I understand that 96 per cent of the population in South Australia receives water from a reticulated system.

Now that the water problem is being overcome to such an extent I hope consideration will be given to the areas which up to now have been fringe areas, and possibly not satisfactory economically because of poor water supplies. I hope that, even although it may be costly to supply them with a water supply every endeavour will be made to do so. I have in mind places such as Terowie and Whyte-Yarcowie, where it would be costly to supply water, but it must not be forgotten that the people in these areas are providing a great service in the economy of the State. Any additional costs incurred in providing amenities for them will do much to keep the areas populated. In commending the department for the work, and the research and planning that goes into the provision of water supplies, I want to briefly use an example. Eyre Peninsula is generally low rainfall country and not good holding country for dams. In many cases there is not suitable underground water. A trip through the area well illustrates what wise planning can do. Most of the water has to be piped long distances. The run-off into reservoirs is uncertain in dry seasons. Much has been done to explore the possibility of making Eyre Peninsula self-sufficient for water from underground basins. The Hon. Mr. Robinson referred to the Polda being opened in November last year. The Polda basin of 1,000 square miles is in comparatively low rainfall country. I believe that the average over the catchment area is 13in. Fortunately the water basin has a granite bottom, which permits the water to accumulate and be held. I was impressed with the work that has taken place in proving the area. Bores have been put down and the water is measured during the seasons to judge its rise and fall. Samples of the strata are taken and the water holding capacity is worked out. The flow against the known head is also worked out. The amount

of annual rainfall which replenishes the basin is estimated by analysing the water in the various rainwater tanks in the catchment area for the salt content. This salt is from the sea and is carried in the atmosphere. It is a fascinating story, but I shall not dwell on it much longer. One instance of progressive planning can be seen not far out of Port Lincoln, where there are the Lincoln and Uley basins. There was a leak in one of the basins, but it was traced by the department and plugged. A pump was installed and water, which used to go to waste into swamps, and which in some ways created a nuisance, was used for water supply purposes.

Paragraph 10 of the Governor's Speech refers to roads. The matter has been dealt with efficiently by previous speakers. The Hon. Mr. Potter dwelt at some length on the problem that will occur in the metropolitan area in the near future, and I should like to compliment him on the manner in which he presented his case. The Hon. Mr. Bevan, too, made constructive remarks about some of the problems associated with district and domestic roads in the metropolitan area. I was interested this year to attend a local government conference of country district councils and to hear a resolution passed unanimously which requested more money to be made available for roads in country towns. With the increasing volume of traffic, cities and country towns are carrying much more outside traffic on what used to be their own domestic roads, and this is becoming a problem.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: The honourable member wouldn't put the brake on the wheel of progress, would he?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: In what way?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: In seeing how the domestic roads in country areas are used by other traffic.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I do not get the point.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: I do not think he gets it himself.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I support this principle because the amount of traffic is rapidly increasing. I support both honourable members in their plea for more money from the Commonwealth tax for roads because it appears to be the only practical solution to keeping up with the rapid increase in the amount of traffic that we shall experience in the next few years. The Hon. Mr. Bevan also said that 40 per cent of this money was to be spent in the country. In this respect, I point out that the city depends on

many country roads, particularly the main arteries leading to the city, because that is the means of channelling commerce into the metropolitan area. Also, much of this petrol tax is collected from the country areas where, because of the long distances, more petrol is used for each vehicle. As an illustration of the problems associated with country roads, we should again turn to Eyre Peninsula, where there is a vast area with many miles of roads to maintain and reasonably low rating because of the undeveloped nature of much of the country.

Earlier this year I was fortunate enough to be present, with the Minister of Roads, at the opening of the Eyre Highway. I compliment the department on its efforts to overcome the problems of people in isolated areas. The completed portions of the Eyre and Lincoln Highways are two excellent roads which are very well constructed.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They are stabilized now, are they?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: They are of normal construction. The problem exists with other roads that will not be sealed for many years to come because of the vast mileage involved. I suggest we shall have to pay more attention to keeping these roads in a better condition whilst we await the completion of the present sealing programme, because they are used not only for domestic traffic but also as a railway line in those areas where much of the produce is carried by road transport.

One big problem on Eyre Peninsula is the lack of suitable road making material. In most instances we have a choice of only two materials—limestone or a sandy loam, both of which are inclined to shatter under dry conditions and cut up under the very wet conditions now being experienced. I hope it will be possible to discover some cheap scientific method that will help to stabilize these materials. I can imagine what it must be like to drive on this type of road month in and month out without ever having the opportunity to drive on a piece of sealed road. That applies to many hundreds of miles in that area. The department is doing a magnificent job on the highway, and the district councils are doing their best with their resources, but more finance is required.

I was interested, in another part of the State, to see a stretch of sealed road put down recently where the ordinary crusher material was not used to form the base, but ordinary rubble crushed on the site by a Hyster

grid roller was used. It has settled down and looks like being a first-class road. Some of these experiments may lead to cheaper road making and that, in itself, will overcome many problems. While agreeing with much that the Hon. Mr. Bevan had to say about roads, I should like to disagree with him on one small point—when, referring to my colleague, Mr. Dawkins, he inferred that he was propounding Labor policy and that the Liberal Party was adopting Labor policy.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: So it is!

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Any policy that will benefit the people of this State will get a fair hearing from this Government and from the members of the Liberal Party in this Chamber, and it is natural to suppose that the more progressive parts of the Labor policy would be very similar to the Liberal policy.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They can't be wrong all the time!

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN; Paragraph 11 of the Governor's Speech refers to the railways of this State, and in particular the standardization of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line and the line at Thevenard. I should like to say briefly that the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line is causing much interest in the districts it will serve. It is a long-awaited project that we are pleased to see is now to be put into effect. It is not only that we are going to see a vast improvement for Port Pirie and Peterborough which depend on the smelting of ore and railway traffic, but other towns will get a lift from the building of new railway stations and facilities. I am pleased at the speed with which this project is being put into operation.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The whole State will benefit.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, because that is only a forerunner of other schemes. Paragraph 12 refers to the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the subsidy made available by legislation last year. Although this subsidy has benefited all those consumers supplied by the trust, I should like to see, if possible, the amount of subsidy paid to independent suppliers increased, because in the main these smaller plants are located in remote areas where people lack some of the amenities found closer to the metropolitan area.

The work of the Housing Trust has been covered fairly comprehensively by previous speakers, but I should like to support the Hon. Mr. Dawkins in the reference he made to the purchase of land for the erection of trust homes. I think more attention could be paid in

some instances to the locality as regards drainage and accessibility to made roads because in many country towns the land that is cheap is usually cheap for some particular reason, and if these houses are built on land that needs new access roads or drainage schemes installed it creates an added expense for local government as well as a problem for the people living in the houses. However, the Housing Trust is generally doing fine work in providing houses and in stabilizing our cost structure in South Australia, which is one of the benefits we enjoy, and which has helped make this State prosperous.

Paragraph 22 refers to a Bill to amend the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act and to provide additional funds for the trust. I am pleased to see that this matter is being brought forward this session because the Renmark Irrigation Trust has problems peculiar to that area. It is a project that was initiated by private enterprise. It is one of the oldest irrigation settlements in South Australia. Over the years many of their installations, through the passage of time, have become in need of repair and of course the big flood we had some years ago aggravated the problem of drainage. In addition to this, the Renmark-Chaffey area has a very fine sand below the surface, and this has created additional expense and problems in the installation of drainage schemes. The sand is so fine that if any installations become faulty, that is, if any of the pipes should crack, the force of the water draining into the pipes will undermine them and eventually cause them to collapse. The same problem has occurred in the Chaffey irrigation area which is, of course, under the control of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and attempts to overcome this problem have failed. I am pleased to see that finance will be made available for this purpose on terms that should suit and please the trust.

I should like to support my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Wilson, on his remarks regarding the flora and fauna reserves on Eyre Peninsula. I, in common with Mr. Wilson, believe that we should preserve these reserves because much of our country is rapidly being developed and now is the time when we should give these matters full consideration. We should look further than the immediate future if these reserves are to be preserved for posterity. I believe that most careful planning should be done. These flora and fauna reserves to which I refer specifically are located on Eyre Peninsula in the vicinity of

Lock and Darke Peak. There are five altogether on Eyre Peninsula covering a large area, but two in particular, one in the hundred of Hambidge (with an area of 94,000 acres) and the other about 17 miles away in the hundred of Hincks (with an area of 163,000) making a total of 250,000 acres. These have a detrimental effect on the development of a large part of Eyre Peninsula because of their close proximity.

It not only affects schools, roads and towns because of the resulting lack of population, but it affects development in other ways because it means that roads have to be deviated. This adds to the cost of transport of goods, and it could also affect the reticulation of water. If the water for Kimba is taken from the Poldia basin it must go somewhere in the vicinity of this reserve in the hundred of Hambidge. This reserve contains first-class agricultural land. The other is situated 17 miles to the south and is made up of various types of land, the good land being in small pockets only and it is unlikely that there would be any great demand to have this particular reserve used for rural production.

Looking at the long-term view of preserving flora and fauna reserves, I consider that with an area such as this one in the hundred of Hambidge we shall be subject to constant pressure which will increase as the needs for land and food grow, and eventually we could lose this land as a flora and fauna reserve. There is alternative land offering in this area that is not suitable for farming because of the nature of the soil. It contains varied flora and fauna and also water, which is not available on the other reserves, and I believe that we should be well advised to consider sending qualified botanists to survey the areas involved, to list all the flora and to make sure that we are acting in the best interests of preserving flora and fauna for the future and in the best interests of the district.

In opposing the cutting up of the Hambidge reserve it is possible that those responsible could be not only denying the district of the expansion that it desires but could miss out on this other available land which may prove equally suitable for a reserve and which could justifiably be preserved for the future.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson: Do you think it will ever attract tourists?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: These reserves are very remote from the populated centres and I understand, from the tourist point of view, the alternative land that is being offered

presents much more in the way of an attraction. As I understand it, the main reason the hundred of Hambidge is being held is that it has soil that grows a rare type of mallee. It seems unlikely to me that nature would have reserved that particular type of soil and mallee tree for one area when so much of the Peninsula has not yet been fully investigated. Finally, I am pleased that so many of the projects forecast last year for the area I represent are completed or have been initiated. I am confident that the excellent seasonal prospects and the progressive policy outlined in the Governor's Speech will contribute to another year of development and prosperity in this State.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I support the motion. It was not my intention to intervene in this debate, but one or two matters have been raised by other honourable members that I think might need a little enlargement and that is my reason for speaking now. At this stage of the debate I believe it is completely unnecessary for me to add any comments to the personal expressions that have been made by other honourable members other than to say that I totally subscribe to the feelings they have expressed. I will deal with two matters if I have time. If necessary one can wait until a future debate.

First, there is the question raised by the Honourable Mr. Bevan yesterday about parking meters. I consider that it requires urgent discussion because I understand pressure is being put on the Minister of Roads at the moment, and secondly there is the question raised by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins about a proposal for a festival hall in Adelaide. I shall first deal with what I regard as the more urgent matter and give a few facts about parking meters which seem to have been either overlooked or to be unknown to the general public and, I believe, to members because they may not have had the same opportunity as I to see these facts. I believe I cannot do better than refer to a few passages in Mr. Bevan's speech to introduce these matters because I think he marks some of the misconceptions. He says, referring to certain parking meters that have been installed in Adelaide recently, that parking spaces where all-day parking was available are now not being used to any extent because of the installation of meters. It is a curious thing that whenever meters are installed in a new position the public apparently expects them to be fully utilized the next day. Indeed, the press sends

its photographers the very next morning after meters have been placed in position to take photographs to show that the spaces are unoccupied which, of course, they are for a very clear and obvious reason. Meters are put in not to harass the motorist, as some people seem to think, but to give a fair distribution of the available parking space to those who really need it. As cities grow, all-day parkers of necessity have to go further and further out to make available the spaces they previously occupied to people who really need them for short-term and urgent business, and it is the duty, in these circumstances, of the authorities who control these spaces to see that everyone gets a fair share of them.

I believe that the processes in relation to the installation of new meters will be clear to honourable members when I mention my points. We have reached the stage when meters are mainly being placed in areas previously used by all-day parkers, sometimes lawfully and sometimes unlawfully. Of course, if meters are not in position it is hard to have sufficient inspectors to police these spaces and see that people are utilizing them only for a lawful period. Let us consider the current instance of meters being placed where there have been all-day parkers. What happens is that as soon as meters are placed in position the all-day parker must go elsewhere and find another space, because if he puts his money into the meter he knows that in one, two or four hours, according to circumstances, the meter will have expired and he will have committed an offence. He has to go to some completely different place. What man, not being in the habit of using such spaces because he knows they have been fully occupied, can be expected to go along there the next day when new meters have been installed, particularly as most people are not aware when they are going to be placed there or even where they are going to be placed? It stands to reason that as the needs of an entirely different section of the community are being catered for, there must be a time lag while people get to know that the spaces are available for their reasonable use. It would be quite impossible for these people to suddenly appear on the scene the next day after the all-day parker has been sent further out.

Mr. Bevan said that, in the first five years that parking meters operated, about £500,000 was collected by the Adelaide City Council. His figure is approximately correct. It was quoted previously in response to a question asked in the City Council, but, of course, that is the gross revenue from the meters; as far as

I know nothing has ever been published about the expenses of installation of meters, the cost of servicing them, or all the ancillary costs, the car parking problem and the traffic problem generally. I propose to give those details because I have obtained authentic figures to show exactly what has happened and what is happening to meter revenue. The actual revenue for the six years 1958-1963, inclusive, was £495,527. That is near enough to the Hon. Mr. Bevan's figure. The cost of the installation of the meters over the period was £78,000, and during the current year another £44,000 has been spent. That is a total of £122,500 for the cost of meters, which reduces the net revenue to £373,000. I point out that all my figures are approximate.

The cost of operating parking meters over the period was £128,000, further reducing the net amount to £245,000. The burden of the song is that the money should be used for the provision of off-street parking, and the Minister is being pressurized about it at present. It is fair to deduct from the net figure already arrived at the amount that has been spent by the council on buying sites for off-street parking. I shall mention two major sites, but will not refer to others, although they represent a substantial figure. The cost of the Light Square site was about £100,000. The property occupied by Waymouth Motors in Topham Street cost altogether £150,000, but portion of the money was used for widening the street, so I have deducted a generous amount to bring it back to £100,000. In the last two years the City Council has thus spent £200,000 plus in the provision of sites for off-street parking. This reduces the net amount to about £44,000, as against the £500,000 so gaily quoted in some places. The deficit on the Topham Street site was £17,000, thus reducing the net profit to £27,000. Expenditure on traffic installations, etc., in the city that is deductible, pursuant to a motion of the council, has been £61,000, so that creates a deficit of about £34,000, instead of a profit of £300,000. The resolution carried by the council was:

It is resolved that all fees received by the council for the use of unit parking spaces be recorded in a separate account, and shall, after deducting therefrom all expenses of providing, maintaining and operating parking meters, marking out and maintaining metered parking spaces, and metered parking zones, and administering the provisions of this by-law, be appropriated by the council towards the provision and maintenance of off-street parking areas, building or other off-street parking facilities, the installation and maintenance of traffic lights, the provision and maintenance of signs,

the marking of streets, and any other expenditure by the council with respect to the requirements of traffic within the city of Adelaide.

Surely it is fair enough to deduct this money, which was done by the council and not by an outside authority. If that is accepted as fair as a contra to parking meter revenue, there is then the cost of the traffic lights, traffic line marking, etc. Over the period the City Council has improved and converted many roads for centre and side road parking at a cost of another £75,000. If we put that against the other figure, the deficit is increased to £109,000. Over the period the total cost for the provision and maintenance of traffic lights, the maintenance of signs and the marking of streets etc. was another £230,000. That makes the deficit now £339,000 instead of a profit of £500,000. Then if we add the cost of road widening, which is part of the traffic problem in Adelaide, and which provides a benefit for people who feed the meters with their sixpences and shillings, we have another £1,437,000. We have already reached the deficit of £339,000, so instead of a profit of £500,000 there is a total deficit of about £1,800,000.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: The revenue is building up each year.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Last year the revenue was £112,000 gross, the year previously £107,000, and the year before that £97,000. Additional meters have been installed this year. I am quoting these figures so that members can take them as they wish. The figures show that there is another important side to the case. It depends on the individual concept of the matter, and what members think should be done, or what the people who use the meters think should be done about working out the formula. The group to which I have referred concentrates on saying that the meter revenue should be spent on off-street parking facilities, but I do not know to what meter revenue they refer. As far as I know, they have not specified any. Apparently they forget the cost of operating the meters. I have said that, depending on how you apply the formula, the revenue can be turned into a deficit. These people want the money applied for off-street parking. I feel that concept is only toying with the idea. As far as anyone can see at present, the cost of off-street parking to keep Adelaide alive within the next decade or so will be far more than possibly the gross revenue from the meters, let alone the net revenue.

People might then say, "Why do you object to a suggestion that there should

be a law to segregate the revenue from meter rents?" I object to it on the grounds that it infringes two fundamental principles of local government. There is no such thing in local government, or in the principles of local government, to provide for the segregation of specific revenue for specific purposes. If that principle were to be developed I might well ask that the council rates I pay at North Adelaide be totally applied to servicing the footpaths and the road outside my property. The other principle of local government is that it has never been considered right that we should accumulate present day revenue for some time in the future. The principle of local government has always been that if we want to provide funds for a purpose that people of the future will enjoy, we should borrow money and spread the repayment of it over a period so that the people enjoying it would have to pay for it. We may say in response that meter revenue is in a different category, but the principle remains the same because the people who are enjoying parking meters at the moment are enjoying the fruits of the past payments on the roads and so on by the ratepayers of the City of Adelaide and will be for many years to come.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Does the honourable member use the word "enjoy"?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes, I use the word "enjoy" deliberately because people enjoy their use even if they do not enjoy paying for them.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Are there many complaints about them?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think people, in the main, enjoy the meters. There is, of course, initial resistance to them, as there is in all cities of the world, but, when people know that they can get a parking place for an almost nominal amount instead of no parking place at all, for legitimate purposes, they grow to respect these meters. I enjoy them myself; I do not know whether the Minister has the same needs as I have in that regard.

I think I have said all I wanted to say about meters. More generally, the Hon. Mr. Bevan said "It doesn't seem that the Adelaide City Council is making bold decisions on the parking problem." He will have seen in this morning's paper, contemporaneously with that report, that a traffic engineer has arrived in Adelaide from the United States for the specific purpose of investigating this problem. Again, I should like to correct a misconception.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is after I mentioned it!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The sum of £30,000 has been mentioned in connection with this traffic survey, and some people thought that amount excessive. I should like to point out that the Americans are receiving a fixed fee of £12,850. The rest of the £30,000 is the cost of the existing staff of the Adelaide City Council that will be helping the experts (and they may employ other people of their own) plus the cost of some extra help that it may be necessary to obtain.

It is easy to criticize people for what they do and what they do not do, particularly in relation to traffic matters, on which everybody is an expert. These figures are interesting. In the last three years (the 1960, 1961 and 1962 financial years) the Highways and Local Government Department has spent in the metropolitan area approximately each year £1,300,000 to £1,400,000, out of which the sole grants to the Adelaide City Council have amounted to the completely nominal sum of £19,000, which is entirely disproportionate. I raise that point only in response to criticism of how the City Council spends the funds it raises from the ratepayers—because they are the only people who finance it.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins raised the matter of the proposed festival hall for Adelaide. He said:

Let us be quite clear in our minds that what is needed is a festival hall . . . We need a festival hall, not a national theatre.

I entirely agree with him and, because there are new members in this Chamber who were not here when I last spoke in any detail on this matter, I ask the older members who did hear my speech then to bear with me. I shall not weary them for long, but make a short précis of what I said on October 20, 1960—almost exactly three years ago. I quoted from a letter that the Board of Governors of the Adelaide Festival of Arts had sent to the Premier, preceding a deputation, and these are the points we made in that letter. The first was "that the project should be financed from public money." The point was made that that was how these things were financed elsewhere in the world. It is how the beautiful cultural buildings on North Terrace were financed, and it was pointed out that in these days of high taxation it seems unfair that the same old people should be called on all the time to pay out of their own pockets for these sorts of things when already they are probably the most liberal contributors to taxation.

One or two things have been done since 1960 so I want to make my own corrections to bring the letter up to date. I cannot speak for the Board of Governors because I am no longer one of them but I can make my own corrections to this letter, (which, incidentally, I myself wrote and which was approved by the Board of Governors). They gave me the job of writing it, because I made the suggestion and this is, of course, the customary practice. The second point was that it was many years since any very large sum of money was spent from the public purse for the cultural benefit of the public. Since then, that magnificent addition has been made to the Art Gallery. I give the Government full credit for that and hope it will be able to see its way clear to go on and allocate a small portion of the annual funds for these cultural purposes, because it would not really dent the Government's Budget significantly. It could allocate the comparatively small sum of, say, £250,000 a year from a Budget of well over £100,000,000 to these sorts of purposes. After all, it is taxpayers' money and I think that, as the broad spread of the people pay the taxes, the broad spread of the people ought to be the recipients of the expenditure of these taxes.

The letter then went on to refer to the need for a multi-purpose hall—that is, for concerts and theatres. It mentioned that the Theatre Royal was likely to go out of existence. Again, this may need a little amendment because, since then, we have had a beautiful new theatre (because it is, virtually, a new theatre) constructed—Her Majesty's—replacing the Theatre Royal. So, in my opinion, the need for a theatre in this hall has gone—at least for the present. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins that what we need is a decent size concert hall, because we have not got one, to seat 2,500 to 3,000 people. So, if this letter were being written today, those amendments would have to be made. I have given, as I promised, a short precis of what was said in 1960. If any member cares to read that part of my speech in full, he will find it at page 1468 of the 1960 volume of *Hansard*. I wish to finish on a financial note. The letter suggested that the Government should find £250,000 a year for five years. What I think the board had in mind was that it would take two years to plan and get everything ready for the hall, and it would probably take about two years to build it. That would mean that at the beginning of the fifth year the last sum of £250,000

would fall in and thus, by doing it at the rate of £250,000 a year for five years, no time would be wasted: the planning would start at once. Although it seems a completely detached matter, this is what I had in mind when I asked the question last Tuesday as to what the costs of pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main had been over the last four years. I find they average about £420,000 a year, although in 1960-61, because of a bounteous summer, they were as low as £150,000. It seems to me that every year we are going to have to set aside in our Budget a sum of money for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main and it will depend on the season whether the money is used or not.

If we can afford to set aside that money—which we can and which we have to anyhow, because it is absolutely essential—then surely in a bounteous season, as the present one must be, we can let the bounty of Nature provide something towards a cultural project, and I consider that if money is needed it can easily be obtained from the operation of this particular fund when there is more than is necessary each year. I mention that because whenever we raise any of these matters the costs always become paramount.

The other thing that becomes paramount in a project of this nature is the site. Please do not let me embark on that, because there are plenty of sites and my opinion is, and always has been, that if you get into an argument about where it should be you get bogged down and that is the end of it. Let us get the money promised first and then we can soon find a site.

The Government has indicated its willingness already to find £250,000 for a theatre project. I congratulate it on its attitude in that matter. I only hope it will build on that and go ahead and provide for South Australia—I say South Australia and not Adelaide because a hall of this nature would benefit the people of the whole of the State—such a hall as has been suggested.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Many people in Australia would benefit.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thank the honourable member for that interjection. I conclude by saying that a concert hall and what it will give to the public is not related to any particular section or class of the community whatsoever. In every section of the community there are people who like music—good, bad and indifferent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Would you like the Festival Hall from London brought here?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I should like it very much, but not piece by piece. We know that many important artists have to by-pass Adelaide because there is not a hall big enough to finance the project. That applies not merely to classical music but to every realm of music, jazz included which is a form of music that many people like. I like all sorts of music myself. I am trying to make the point that a hall like this would benefit a proportion of the people of the State in every walk of life and thus I believe it is a completely legitimate project that should be financed out of taxpayers' money.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder on their most excellent speeches in this Chamber. I should also like to compliment both of them on the subject matter they raised, which was well presented and something quite new, I believe, in the case of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. He gave us his own thoughts, and it is obvious that he has done much research into the matter of local government, a subject on which he is well qualified to speak.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He has been reading our policy.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have not started on that. The honourable member is getting in a little early to provoke me. I certainly join with other members of this Chamber in wishing the Hon. Mr. Hart and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris a long and close association with this Chamber.

I support the views of other speakers concerning paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 4a and 5 of the Governor's Speech. I have spoken upon all of these subjects on other occasions and I do not wish to go over them any further except to say that I heartily agree with the sentiments expressed by other members. I do not intend, either, to deal with the Governor's Speech paragraph by paragraph as there will be plenty of opportunity later for honourable members to speak on the subjects foreshadowed as legislation later in the session. I wish to deal, however, with one or two items that are not specifically mentioned in these paragraphs but which have a great contributory influence upon the well-being of the people of this State.

Before proceeding I should say just a few words of appreciation where they are due. Firstly, I compliment the members of the Government who, in season and out, are the targets for every sharp-shooter who has a bead

to draw. I think all Ministers perform their allotted tasks very capably, even if at times we do not see eye to eye with their decisions. It would be a very poor day for democracy if we did, as members of Parliament or otherwise. The men we have in Cabinet in this State are dedicated, capable and strictly honest, and any Parliament anywhere would be satisfied to place administrative trust in them. This Government has been fortunate, too, in having such a capable and conscientious Public Service during the very long time it has been in office.

I wish to congratulate the two senior members of the Government today, in particular the Premier who has served this State in his official capacity for over 25 years and it is with great satisfaction in closing this debate from the floor members' point of view that I have the opportunity of congratulating the Leader of the Government in this Chamber, the Chief Secretary (Sir Lyell McEwin), on entering his 25th year of office.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That is his silver anniversary; hear, hear!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am sure I am speaking for 15 members of this Chamber when I say that I hope Sir Lyell will be leading the Government in this place for many years to come. I speak on behalf of 19 members of this Chamber when I wish him and Lady McEwin, who has helped him no end, good health for the future. Sir Thomas Playford and Sir Lyell McEwin have a record length of service for any Commonwealth country and we owe a great debt of gratitude to them for the way they have carried on their good work through these very good years of great development in this State.

Highly interesting topics have been discussed during this debate and I think we are all particularly indebted to the honourable members for raising the points they have. I am particularly indebted to the Hon. Mrs. Cooper and the Hon. Mr. Wilson for drawing our attention to and commenting on the campaign of the Returned Servicemen's League against the infiltration of Communists into high public office and into the services. I, too, believe that the R.S.L. is entitled to more active support in alerting the public to the dangers of this pernicious scourge. People often fall into the trap of believing that, because a person is well known in the community and known to be a Communist and appears to be a good fellow, Communism cannot be too bad. They believe he is not a bad fellow if he performs all kinds of good work. That is one of the dangers into which we can

allow ourselves to be lulled. We can fall into a state of complacency which leads one to think, "How can a few hundred people who are members of the Communist Party in Australia influence the thinking of our nation?"

A study of the history of Communism from its commencement shows that its whole strength is in small cells of fanatical, trusted and indoctrinated men and women. I believe most of them are backed up by do-gooders, fellow travellers and opportunists. I agree entirely with the Hon. Mrs. Cooper and others who point out that one of the nicest traits in our nature and one of the weakest is that we give everybody a fair go and this could very easily be our downfall. It is too late to do something about these matters when Big Brother is breathing down your neck, and he certainly will be unless Australians are vigilant and support the policy of the R.S.L., which will certainly have my practical help in every possible way.

I commend the Hon. Mr. Giles for bringing forward the matter of off-course betting and giving the Chamber a most judicious speech on the pros and cons of the subject. In common with most honourable members I have received much correspondence on this subject, which I read and pondered upon. The conclusion I have reached is that those who have written to us represent two interested parties and therefore I believe that what they have said is biased. The present argument goes a long way beyond the question of whether gambling is a social sin. That matter was resolved, in the eyes of the law anyway, many years ago in this State when legislation was passed acknowledging gambling and laying down rules for its conduct. What I believe we are being asked to decide is whether people who desire to place a bet should be legally entitled to do so without attending a race meeting where totalizator facilities and licensed bookmakers are provided.

We have a responsibility to the large majority of South Australians whose voices have not yet been raised either way, and I reserve my right, as one who has no affiliation with either interested party, to deal with the matter entirely on its merits if and when it comes before Parliament. I firmly believe that if any legislation is brought before Parliament on this subject consideration should be given to a provision to enable the people most involved to have the opportunity to express their opinion, similar to that provided under the Licensing Act and other legislation, whereby interested parties are given the right to have local option polls if they desire.

The Hon. Mr. Hart raised the question of the Town Planning Committee's report, especially that section dealing with open spaces. At the moment I do not know how far the Government intends to implement this section, but I was quite surprised that no reference was made to it in the Governor's Speech. I realize that to implement the suggestions fully will take many years and involve vast sums. I believe that Parliament would benefit from a general debate on the subject and I hope that a Bill will be introduced before long to provide that opportunity as well as implementing the principles contained in the report.

Australians are said to be very fortunate people. They have ample wide open spaces in which to enjoy sport, which they love so much. This may have been true in the past, but we are rapidly reaching the stage when this country will be developed not only in the city but in the country areas. I believe we have to look 10 to 20 years ahead when we think of open spaces, not only for sport, but for reserves where the public can enjoy being in the open. I do not agree with those who say "Let posterity look after itself". There is a classic story about an aged Irishman who said, "To the devil with posterity; what has it ever done for me?" I believe that many people often adopt the same attitude. Several voluntary bodies, such as the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Fitness Council and youth organizations are showing great interest in preserving our open spaces, and I believe that they should be encouraged to create a balance with those who have no thought other than land speculation. I look to the Government to see that the scales of justice are held with equal poise in this matter.

I am obliged to the Hon. Mr. Bardolph and the Hon. Mr. Potter for their interesting observations about the role of the Legislative Council, but as my honourable friend, Mr. Bardolph, has often said, I will come to that later. Mr. Bardolph made some interesting observations about the state of the economy and the role of primary producers and manufacturers. Our primary producers are constantly faced with marketing problems. It does not seem to matter much which line of business they choose in attempting to make a living from the soil, the same problem continues to occur. We have learned to grow commodities with reasonable skill backed up by instrumentalities provided by State and Commonwealth Governments, such as the Departments of Agriculture, the Commonwealth Scientific and

Industrial Research Organization, the Australian universities and similar bodies, but it is one thing to grow a crop or raise an animal and another to market that product profitably. This is not a unique situation here; it is happening all over the world.

Perhaps the subtle difference between Australian primary producers and those in other countries is that we have had a dose of prosperity. We have found it to our liking and are reluctant to accept a lower standard of living in order to dispose of our products, whereas primary producers in countries such as India, Africa, France, Italy, Greece and Turkey are peasant-like people on a peasant-like standard of living. They are extremely grateful if they get a good crop because then they can retain some of their produce for their own use. If they have a bad season they tighten their belts and do not eat so much.

One of the reasons, we are told by experts, for low prices for our export goods on the world market is over-production. This is one of the most misleading phrases in any language. What the experts probably mean is that there are not enough people in the export markets of the world who can afford to pay the prices asked. If all the wheat-producing countries of the world had a record year there would still be no over-production. Every grain of the wheat could easily be consumed, and much more with it, if the hungry people of the world were given an opportunity to use it. We are not up against over-production as much as under-consumption, which is brought about by too few customers who share our general high standard of living. I have often smarted under such platitudinous expressions as "The farmer must reduce his cost of production"; "the farmer must look to his efficiency;" and "the farmer has had it pretty good for a long time". Another person will say "I do not believe in tariff protection. Let any industry that can't stand on its own feet go to the wall, so that the people engaged in it can be more gainfully employed in industry". Another may say "If the farmer could buy a tractor and other pieces of machinery direct from overseas he could save thousands of pounds a year", or it may be "Subsidies make for inefficiency". It is great fun taking in the other fellow's washing, but it does not get us anywhere. Frequently, when a person is asked to make a wise pronouncement on primary industries, and to some extent secondary industries, he will come up with one of these expressions and talk about it as if it were new. I believe that

the future of our children is closely allied to our thinking on these matters, and the future of the western type democracy may well be tied up with it also.

Australia has a very high standard of living. Anyone doubting that should make a trip overseas and visit any country he chooses so as to compare our average standard of living with the standard in that country, and I throw in the United States of America for good measure. A country's economy must be viewed as a whole and not sectionally, as is the tendency in some quarters today. This is one of the most dangerous phases we have to face. People say that the workers are getting too much money, and that the manufacturers are grabbing too much. Others say that the primary producers are not getting enough. We must look at the matter as a whole. We must have a prosperous home community that can buy our goods at payable prices. The workers are dependent on the manufacturers for full employment, so it does not help to talk of by-passing Australian-made goods in order to get cheaper imported articles. We would have these cheaper imported articles if there were no tariff barriers. Perhaps the solution is lower taxation by Commonwealth and State authorities. If we are to prune Government spending, how are we to do it? Would it be in education? We are told that education should be receiving double its present allocation to enable our children to keep abreast of scientific advancements. Who would dare to reduce the highways grant, or any of the grants for essential services? If we talked about pruning hospital expenditure there would soon be a hue and cry everywhere. Therefore, we must reduce either national development or defence expenditure. Perhaps it should be both. These two appeal to many thousands of Australians, mainly because they are happy with their lot. They say, why spoil it by developing northern parts of Queensland, Western Australia, Northern Territory and New Guinea? They say "Why worry about defence? We are not at war, and in any case what could Australia do with the few servicemen, aeroplanes and ships she has for her defence?"

We ought to remind these people that unless we make an honest and speedy endeavour to develop our northern areas and island dependencies we can expect a demand by pressure of world opinion, or by force, to move over and give someone else a go. It should be known and never forgotten that we are signatories to the Anzus pact and members

of Seato, and that under the terms of the agreements we are bound to pay an annual premium in the form of defence expenditure on an insurance policy that has a face value of the assurance that should any of the members be the victim of an aggressor the other shareholders, including the United States of America, will join in a common defence. If we fall down on our annual contribution we stand a good chance of forfeiting our bonuses and having to surrender our policy. To people who are notorious for their complacency in public matters this may not matter much, but for those who treasure the hope that what we are working for today will be the cornerstone of the success and prosperity of our country, and the security of our children and grandchildren, there is cause for anxiety. To delude ourselves by digging our heads further into the sand, and by saying that it cannot happen here, is even more dangerous.

Let me illustrate my point about world public opinion a little further. The Governments of the world powers today fall into three clear-cut groups. First there are the friends of the United States of America, known as the western bloc. Then there are the friends of international socialism, or the Communist bloc. Thirdly, there are the non-aligned or neutralist countries, such as India, the independent States of Africa, Indonesia, Ceylon, etc. This last group worries me, because it has great bargaining powers. Although it shows a preference for one side or the other in its dealings, it still has to be caught and leg roped. What real justification did Indonesia have for claiming West New Guinea? It had none whatsoever. The fact that Holland was in possession was not justification in itself. The people of West New Guinea are not Indonesian. They belong to the same race as our New Guinea people.

Why then did Indonesia receive no real opposition to her demands from the other world powers? First, she claimed that the people of West New Guinea should be liberated; secondly, that Indonesia had the population to develop the country; and, thirdly, she pleaded over-population of her existing territories. The Communists have used the United Nations organization as a forum to whip up hatred against such countries as Britain, Holland, France and Belgium. In fact, ever since we have had a United Nations Organization they have been against all colonial powers. They have received the sympathy and support of many countries, such as India and the smaller nations of the Middle East, although

they themselves are not Communists. In other words, under pressure of world opinion, Holland bowed out and Indonesia took over.

What happened to the United States of America and the Western bloc? I believe they dare not risk losing the friendship of the other unaligned countries by defending colonialism, and further they still hope to woo Indonesia away from the Communist bloc. This is a subject that we particularly, as primary producers in Australia, have to watch carefully, for hungry people have roving eyes and, unless we can reach the stage where we can feed them, I think we are in for a dreadful awakening. The Australian community will have to make some sacrifices. Some people have made them in two world wars but the whole community may have to make sacrifices in order that we can export our commodities overseas, and export them competitively. We may have to do it by equalization schemes or direct subsidies, but we have to do it if we are to hold the way of life we have treasured so much over the last few years.

I turn now to the question of the Legislative Council in this State. The Hons. Mr. Potter and Mr. Bardolph both spoke on this so I do not wish to take up too much time. Mr. Bardolph, in his carefully prepared, provocative and, I understand, controversial speech sheeted home to us several interesting points worthy of comment. First, he told us that the policy of the Australian Labor Party was to abolish the Legislative Council.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That's right.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He also told us how they would do it.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That's right.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I, for one, have been for years warning the Legislative Council electors of this State of the very things that Mr. Bardolph has explained so well as being Labor Party policy: the means of getting rid of this House of Review. In the past many people to whom I have talked have thought I was slightly alarmist and that I was over-emphasizing the danger.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I have not stolen any of your thunder?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, you have not: you have helped me. I shall be able to go out in a very much stronger position and say that I have no less an authority to quote than the Deputy Leader of the Labor Party in this Chamber.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It is our policy. We have nothing to hide; we do not do it in such a surreptitious way.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have not had it so nicely laid out before. His speech also indicated to me that the Labor Party is not a free Party. He said that in his speech.

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

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; it is in the speech.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: No, it is not.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Party is one that is bound by certain majority decisions, as the honourable member so kindly pointed out to us. I do not want to waste honourable members' time; I will refer the honourable member to his own speech.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: In fairness to your own assertion, I think you ought to qualify it and be truthful about it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This, of course, many of us have known; we have always suspected that this is the position, that they are not a free Party but, coming right from the horse's mouth, so to speak, it is now final; it must be authentic. The honourable member leaves the impression of being sad that his Party is controlled by the faceless ones, and that they have misguidedly instructed him and his colleagues to destroy an institution of democracy, of which he is justly proud.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Is the honourable member qualifying for the comic role in the new television show?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No; I am merely putting it in a more colourful way.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: John Brown is dead, unfortunately.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: And then the honourable member sees a ray of hope, for he mentions that, if the Labor Party could gain control of this Chamber, perhaps his masters would have another look at the position and reform the institution to their liking.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I said "abolish" the Legislative Council.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No—reform. I have put some time into studying your speech.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I hope it has been educational.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It has been and it has taught me one or two useful lessons. It would not take a college education to work out how they would reform the Council: they would simply make it a rubber stamp for another place, devoid of its real purpose and a burden on the taxpayers of this State.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: No; I said I would abolish it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My Party believes in the retention of the Legislative Council as a bastion against violent innovation. We believe it has proved itself beyond doubt as a necessary part of constitutional government, providing it is allowed to function as a House of Review where members are free to express themselves and vote according to their wishes. Fortunately, the Liberal and Country League members in this place can do this, and I believe that the Legislative Council voters of this State will see to it that their interests are guarded by continuing to support members who will guarantee—

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are like the boy in the cemetery whistling to keep his spirits up!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —strenuously to resist any move to abolish or reform the South Australian Legislative Council along the lines proposed by the Australian Labor Party; they will be the ones who will retain power in this place. Over a period of years, this Council has done a remarkable job in the way it has legislated, in the way it has amended and in the way it has assisted the other place. Mr. Potter made one very good point, among several, when he said that in Parliament we had to rely at the moment upon the vote of one person in another place and we had an institution like this Council where we could have another look at a measure. Surely that is a safeguard.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: If that is the case, why continue such political perfidy? Why don't you go to the people in another place and get an expression of opinion, as regards government? You are carrying on unconstitutionally with one vote in another place.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. That was worked out a long while ago. As we shortly have to go to Government House with the Address in Reply, I shall conclude by expressing my appreciation of the speeches of honourable members who have spoken in this debate, and particularly the two new members from Midland and Southern. May I conclude by quoting the following, which seems to be most appropriate (it is a message from Nitish Laharry, World President of Rotary):

Isn't it strange that Princes and Kings
And clowns that caper in sawdust rings,
And ordinary folk like you and me,
Are builders all of Eternity.
To each is given a bag of tools,
An hour-glass and a book of rules,
And each must build ere his time has flown,
A stumbling block or a stepping stone.

I support the motion.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): Before we conclude the debate, I should like to add my tribute to those expressed by so many speakers. I appreciate the speeches of all members. I have heard many of these debates and on this occasion we have had a very high standard of debate. I should particularly like to congratulate our new members who have made their first contribution to a debate on the Address in Reply. They, like everybody else who has spoken, have been original and have brought experience and practical thoughts into this debate. I can assure them that it is not just beating the air to speak on the Address in Reply, as is sometimes suggested. The views put forward by honourable members are always considered by the Government.

I do not wish to delay this Council any further except to congratulate the mover (Hon. L. R. Hart) and seconder (Hon. R. C. DeGaris) and all those who have supported this debate on the standard they have maintained in this Chamber. As has been said, this House has very definite work to do and, with the material that we find in the Chamber at present, it will lose none of its former lustre so far as legislation in this State is concerned.

Motion for adoption of Address in Reply carried.

The PRESIDENT: I have to report that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive honourable members at 4.30 p.m. this day for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply and I ask the mover and seconder and all honourable members to accompany me to Government House to present the Address.

At 4.17 p.m. the President and honourable members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 4.42 p.m.

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

I thank you for your Address in Reply to my speech at the opening of the second session of the thirty-seventh Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main objects are: firstly, to enable an incorporated association to transfer all its property to the municipal or district council or other local government authority for the area within which the property is situated; and secondly to bring the provisions of the principal Act relating to the use of names by incorporated associations into line with the corresponding provisions of the Companies Act, 1962, and the Business Names Bill. Section 22 of the principal Act empowers an incorporated association to transfer all its property to any other body, whether corporate or unincorporate, formed for promoting objects similar to its own or charitable objects or to any other incorporated association. The bodies to which an incorporated association may transfer its property therefore do not include local governing bodies.

Under section 380 of the Local Government Act a council has power to accept a gift, conveyance or assignment of any real or personal property for any charitable or public purpose not connected with religious worship, but although this power to acquire property is given to a local governing body, there is no power on the part of an incorporated association to transfer its property to a local government body. Clause 5 accordingly confers this power on an incorporated association. Paragraphs I to IV of subsection (1) of section 7 of the principal Act contain the grounds upon which objection may be made to the incorporation of an association. One of the grounds of objection is that the name of the association is similar to that of any other incorporated body or a name registered under the Registrar of Business Names Act, 1928-1955, or is so similar thereto as to be likely to be mistaken for it. The effect of clause 3 is to extend the ground of objection where the name of the association is similar to a name registered under the Business Names Act, 1963.

Section 10 of the principal Act regulates and controls the use of names under which an association may be incorporated. Clause 4 re-enacts section 10 so as to bring it into line with the corresponding provisions of the Companies Act, 1962 and the Business Names Bill and in effect precludes the incorporation of an association under a name by which a company or foreign company could not be registered under the Companies Act or by which a business name could not be registered under the Business Names Bill.

Section 24 of the principal Act provides that an incorporated association which is

unable to pay its debts may be wound up under Part XI of the Companies Act, 1934-1952. As this Act has now been replaced by the Companies Act, 1962, clause 6 re-enacts section 24 so as to bring its provisions into line with the corresponding provisions of the Companies Act, 1962.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHURCHES OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST, INCORPORATION BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is introduced by the Government at the request of the First Church of Christ, Scientists in the State, which seeks incorporation by statute for the purpose of more effectively regulating and managing its affairs and for the general conduct of affairs relating to the Church. At the moment there is only one Church of Christ Scientist in this State. It is incorporated under the provisions of the Associations Incorporation Act. It is, however, possible that other Churches of Christ, Scientist may be formed and they could of course likewise be incorporated under the Act which I have mentioned.

However, the Christian Scientists feel that with a view to the protection of the true doctrine of their denomination and giving them some greater status as a denomination they should have special statutory authority for their incorporation rather than continue to become incorporated along with a number of other bodies of various kinds under the general provisions of the Associations Incorporation Act. As I understand it, the basic rules of Christian Science were laid down by the founder of the organization, Mary Baker Eddy, in what is known as the Church Manual of the Mother Church in Boston, Massachusetts. According to these rules it is basic that each church be separately incorporated, each retaining an independent control of its own affairs. With this end in view, the organization has already secured the passage of such statutes in Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia. I believe that a similar Bill is contemplated, if indeed not already introduced or passed, in Queensland. At any rate the organization is moving towards separate statutory recognition throughout the Commonwealth.

The Bill is based upon, but is not identical with, the Acts which have been passed in other States. It has, however, been prepared very

largely as a result of discussions between the Parliamentary Draftsman and the solicitors for the organization and is in the form and makes the provisions which the organization has requested. As the Bill is of a nature calling for investigation by a Select Committee, I shall not go into detail regarding its provisions. The recitals set out the background leading to the specific provisions. Clause 2 incorporates the existing church under and by virtue of the provisions of the Bill, enabling the church to make by-laws and rules and in particular referring to eligibility for membership. Clause 3 empowers the church to hold and deal with property, while clause 4 provides for continuity of the organization. Clause 5 vests the land now owned by the present church in the body as incorporated under the Bill.

Clauses 6, 7 and 8 provide for the incorporation of any future Churches of Christ. Clause 9 relates to contracts by any of the churches incorporated and clause 10 deals with the procedure at meetings. What is perhaps the basic provision of the Bill is the First Schedule, which sets out the tenets of the Mother Church. As I have said, this Bill is introduced at the request of the organization, and I believe will not meet with any objection in principle by honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

BALHANNAH AND MOUNT PLEASANT RAILWAY (DISCONTINUANCE) BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Railways): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable the Railways Commissioner to remove the railway line between Balhannah and Mount Pleasant. This line of 5ft. 3in. gauge is a spur line of single track which leaves the Adelaide-Melbourne main line at Balhannah and extends over a distance of a little over 20 miles to the terminal at Mount Pleasant. It was authorized by Statute in 1914, opened for traffic in September, 1918, and carried passengers and freight until June 1963 when passenger carriage was discontinued for lack of patronage. In November, 1962, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works received notice from the Transport Control Board of its intention to issue an order for the closing of the line. The committee, having inquired into the matter, reported on December 6, 1962, that it had concluded that it was desirable to close

the railway, and so recommended. The Transport Control Board, in its report recommending the closure of the line, stated that such action would benefit public revenue by approximately £14,000 to £17,000 per annum, while an estimated special maintenance expenditure of £54,000 over the next five years would be avoided.

This Bill accordingly, by clause 3, empowers the Commissioner to take up and remove or otherwise dispose of the railway (which by the definition in clause 2 includes the buildings

and other works and conveniences connected or used in connection with it), use any materials so taken up as he deems expedient, or sell or otherwise dispose of them as he deems proper. I commend the Bill for the consideration of members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADOURNMENT.

At 4.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 13, at 2.15 p.m.