

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 12, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

BASIC WAGE.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question is asked for information and clarification of the position regarding the recently announced increase of \$2 in the basic wage. I noticed it was stated in the press that the increase should not apply to an employee already receiving the prescribed minimum over-award payment. I have also seen a statement of what this increase will cost the Government. No doubt the Minister has looked at this matter. Can he say whether these increases will take up some of the over-award payments introduced by the Government last year or whether those payments are outside this award?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Last Friday the Commonwealth Arbitration Court handed down a decision giving an increase of \$2 in the basic wage. It then referred to a minimum wage, which was going part of the way towards the application by the employers for a total wage structure. This, in association with the basic wage for South Australia, would give a minimum wage in this State of \$36.05. I, in consultation with the President of the Commission in South Australia, then decided that it was in our interests that the same living wage be paid in South Australia as the Commonwealth basic wage—that the living wage in South Australia should be increased by \$2 also. Yesterday Cabinet considered this matter and it has been proclaimed that the living wage in South Australia as from July 11 be increased by \$2, bringing it into line with the Commonwealth basic wage. The question of margins is a matter for the Commissioner to decide on application from the unions, and of course the Government's employees are covered in this matter. Those that are not covered by a Commonwealth award are covered by a determination of the State court. The problem in regard to over-award payments has to be looked at. I think the Leader of the Opposition was referring to service payments, because he referred to an over-award payment that was made last year,

and whether the service payments granted to daily-paid employees would be taken to be over-award payments in terms of the Commonwealth decision. Cabinet looked at this situation this morning and was of the opinion that the service payments should stand aside from that decision.

TRAFFIC SIGNS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: A large number of fatalities, including a double fatality in June of this year, has occurred at the intersection of the Lincoln Highway, Norrie Avenue and Blast Furnace Road, Whyalla. I understand that since 1964 a large number of requests for improvement of road discipline has been made to the police, the Road Safety Council, the Minister of Local Government and the Road Traffic Board by responsible organizations at Whyalla, including the Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Combined Unions Council, by placing "stop" signs at this intersection. As many hundreds of people cross this intersection daily on their way to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's works, often with the early morning sun in their eyes, will the Minister explain why no "stop" signs have been erected at this intersection?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The intersection that the honourable member is referring to is the one where a recent accident took place and, unfortunately, a young woman lost her life. Requests have been made to the Highways Department for "stop" signs. There are "give way" signs at this intersection and these are more stringent than "stop" signs because, under the Act, all motorists are obliged to stop at "stop" signs and then may proceed. A "give way" sign means that a motorist must give way to all traffic, whereas at a "stop" sign a motorist gives way only to traffic on his right.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: He may have to stop there all day at a "give way" sign.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: He can. The implication of the question is that there is no sign at this intersection, but there is a "give way" sign, which means that a motorist must give way to all traffic on his right and on his left. Unfortunately, as far as this particular accident was concerned, the reports that I called for and obtained and the police reports indicated it was human error that was the cause. No-one is more concerned about road safety than I am, but I consider that changing the "give way" sign to a "stop" sign would

make this intersection more dangerous than it is at the moment. Consideration has already been given to this matter, and it is considered that the most effective sign at this intersection is a "give way" sign and not a "stop" sign.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Minister in his reply mentioned "give way" signs. The difficulty is that when a motorist is at such a sign waiting to cross a busy road, whether it be a main road or an arterial road, he has no opportunity at all of entering. I find that, even when entering a highway or a main road at a T-junction, no consideration is extended to the person entering, because it is only traffic on the right that is to be considered and other traffic must allow the person to enter. That is according to the regulation but, because of the "give way" sign, no consideration is given to the person desiring to enter, even at a T-junction. Will the Minister and his officers examine the effect that a "give way" sign has on traffic generally in destroying respect for traffic on the right? A person may have to wait indefinitely at a "give way" sign, with traffic coming in both directions, and then, when the intersection is clear and he starts to enter, other motorists who may be a quarter of a mile away travelling at 60 miles an hour toot their horns and proceed on, giving the person no opportunity to enter. This makes the "give way" sign dangerous.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Frankly, I have considered the matter of "give way" signs, which have been installed at intersections where it is considered exceedingly dangerous for a motorist to enter, such as at the point of entry to a main road or highway. The procedure there has been to use a "give way" sign rather than a "stop" sign. As Sir Lyell has mentioned, the "give way" sign places an obligation on the motorist entering to give way to traffic, both on the right and on the left. According to the report I have received, accidents have occurred because motorists entering a main road have stopped at a "stop" sign, given way to traffic on the right and ignored traffic that had already entered the intersection on the left. These accidents have given rise to the board's placing of "give way" signs at certain intersections. The Port Road centre plantation is a typical example of where such signs are necessary.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Yes, but traffic proceeding in only one direction is involved there.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I appreciate that and intimate to Sir Lyell that he will have an

early opportunity of debating this matter, because amendments to the Road Traffic Act will be introduced and they refer to this matter. I have seriously considered the position and agree that difficulties can be created whereby, as Sir Lyell has said, a motorist may wait a long time before being able to enter a main road. I know the board is considering this matter with a view to increasing further the use of "give way" signs.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Agriculture an answer to the question I asked on June 29 in relation to the new Agriculture Department building?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, informs me that the Government has agreed to the construction of new offices at Northfield to house the whole of the Agriculture Department with the exception of a small service unit that will be located in the city to serve public convenience. Plans for a suitable building are now being drawn up and the site will be adjacent to the new research laboratories recently occupied on the department's research centre at Northfield. Apart from the small service unit mentioned above, all officers of the department from the Director down will be located at Northfield.

WEEDS.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of July 6 about the spraying of weeds on the sides of roads?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Agriculture Department is well aware of the problems of councils and landowners in connection with the control of noxious and other weeds on road reserves, and measures are taken during road construction to ensure that noxious weeds are not spread. Generally, in all present-day construction, every endeavour is made to leave road shoulders and reserves as tidy and free from obstructing stones, borrow pits, heaps of spoil, etc., as possible. Occasionally this work is done as maintenance after the completion of road construction, and it may be that in certain parts of the West Coast these operations have not yet been completed. It is pointed out, however, that the department can justifiably expend funds only in restoring the original *status quo* of the roadside, and cannot provide graded tracks at the side of the road to allow free access for weed-spraying plant.

BEDFORD PARK BLASTING.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry obtained a reply from the Minister of Works to my question of June 29 about blasting at Bedford Park and the possible resultant damage to houses?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Works, has informed me that no complaints have been received by the Public Buildings Department from property owners that their houses are cracking as a result of blasting operations for site works at the new Bedford Park Teachers College. The contractor is responsible for ensuring that the work is carried out in such a way that no damage occurs to nearby houses. If damage does occur, and it can be shown to have resulted from blasting operations, the contractor is liable, and he is required to be insured against claims made as a result of any negligence on his part. Before work started, the Public Buildings Department satisfied itself that the amount of insurance cover taken out was adequate and that the policies specifically referred to the use of explosives.

SABIN VACCINE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Last month I asked the Minister of Health a question about the new Sabin oral poliomyelitis vaccine, which is now being made available in some of the other States, and in his reply the Minister informed me that it was hoped it would be made available in this State next autumn. Since then a medical practitioner has pointed out to me that poliomyelitis is largely a summer disease, and this means that, if the vaccine is not introduced until next autumn, it will not be of any effective use for perhaps 15 months—until the summer of the following year. In view of this, will the Minister of Local Government, in the absence of the Minister of Health, obtain information on whether it will be possible to hasten the introduction of this vaccine, as from discussions I have had with some members of the medical profession I know they consider it will be advantageous to have it as soon as possible?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the question to the department under the jurisdiction of the Chief Secretary and bring back a report in due course.

OVERSEA TOUR.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the Adelaide *News* of Saturday, July 9, there was an item under the heading "Engineering and Water Supply Rate Study Overseas". The article stated:

Two Engineering and Water Supply officers left Adelaide yesterday for a five-week oversea tour studying water rate charging methods.

It went on to state that the gentlemen will visit the United States to investigate aspects of rating and water supply administration. Their studies will be the first move in planning for the introduction of quarterly rating for water in Adelaide. First, will the Minister reveal the estimated expenditure on this oversea tour and, secondly, does he consider such expenditure worthwhile and prudent in view of the present financial position of the State?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will pass on the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

FAUNA AND FLORA RESERVES.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Has the Minister of Roads, representing the Minister of Lands, a reply to a question I asked last week about the areas of wild life reserves in South Australia?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The under-mentioned reserves have been dedicated and placed under the control of the Commissioners of the National Park and Wild Life Reserves:

Adelaide and Hills.

	Acres.
Belair National Park	2,065
Para Wirra National Park and Wild Life Reserve	2,616
Cleland Wild Life Reserve	1,749
Horsnell Gully Wild Life Reserve	346
The Knoll (Waverly Ridge) Wild Life Reserve	4
Torrens Island Wild Life Reserve	180
Hale Wild Life Reserve	471
Kyeema Wild Life Reserve	689
Sandy Creek Wild Life Reserve	127

Lower Murray.

Ferries Wild Life Reserve	483
McDonald Wild Life Reserve	1,602

Murray Mallee.

Peebinga Wild Life Reserve	7,775
Billiatt Wild Life Reserve	90,874

<i>South Coast.</i>	
Nixon-Skinner Wild Life Reserve	19
Waitpinga Wild Life Reserve	6
Eric Bonython Wild Life Reserve	15
Spring Mount Wild Life Reserve	85
<i>Northern.</i>	
Penwortham Red Stringy Bark Reserve	716
Mundoorra Wild Life Reserve	1,352
Alligator Gorge Wild Life Reserve	9,466
Mount Remarkable Wild Life Reserve	673
<i>West Coast.</i>	
Hincks Wild Life Reserve	163,315
Hambidge Wild Life Reserve	93,865
Coffin Bay Wild Life Reserve	4,425
Lincoln Wild Life Reserve	35,521
<i>Upper South-East.</i>	
Archibald-Makin Wild Life Reserve	70,149
Messent Wild Life Reserve	28,000
<i>Lower South-East.</i>	
Fairview Wild Life Reserve	2,690
Canunda Wild Life Reserve	22,135
Penguin Island Wild Life Reserve	5
Big Heath Wild Life Reserve	5,809
	547,227

I have a copy of this reply plus a map showing where these reserves are situated, and I will hand them to Sir Lyell for his own information.

IMPOUNDING ACT.

The Hon. L. R. HART (on notice):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to amend the Impounding Act in relation to straying stock?

2. If so, has it instructed that no more prosecutions be proceeded with until Parliament considers amendments to this Act?

3. If not, will it consider doing so?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The replies are:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Yes.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

- Flagstaff Hill Water and Sewer Services,
- Morphett Vale Primary School,
- Smithfield Plains Primary and Infants School,
- Whyalla (Scott Street) Primary and Infants School.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 6. Page 306.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I rise to support the adoption of the Address in Reply. I should like to associate

myself, first of all, with the various personal tributes that have been paid by the number of honourable members who have spoken before me in this debate. They have said the sorts of things that I should have liked to say earlier in the debate, and I think that at this stage it is not necessary for me to repeat what has already been acknowledged. There is one person about whom sufficient has not yet been said—that is, the honourable gentleman who is retiring tomorrow from his extremely important offices, now the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition and formerly Premier.

I have often referred in this Chamber to Sir Thomas Playford as a man in ten million. When one thinks of the population of Australia, I think one will recognize what I mean. He has done a magnificent job for the State and I am sure that will be acknowledged by members of the Labor Party as well as those of my own Party, because I know they will give him full credit for the wonderful job he has done for South Australia. I hope that, although he is retiring as Leader, we shall have the benefit of his advice and guidance in other ways for many years to come.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Hear, Hear!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: In the 26 years that Sir Thomas was Premier, one of his most notable achievements was that he never ran out of money. I hope the same will be said about those who follow him. He had one big deficit in 1954-55 (and I am talking about Revenue figures, because his Loan Budgets were always more or less what is known as a 'line ball', that is, either small credits or small deficits). Over the years he certainly worked off around £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 of overdraft in the Loan Account.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: How do you get a deficit without running out of money?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: He had a credit of that amount, and not a debit. He reduced the deficits he inherited; and, on the other hand, the present Government did not inherit one. During his regime he wiped off something like £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 of accumulated deficits that he had inherited. His biggest deficit was £2,234,000 in 1954-55, but that was not his fault, because it was dictated by the Grants Commission because he had had a surplus in the previous year of £1,800,000. The Grants Commission said that he had to wipe that out before he could get any further grants. His next biggest deficit was £1,429,000 in the following year which, I believe, resulted from the stringencies that were put on him in

the preceding year, because those three years were all grouped together.

Apart from that, his biggest deficit was in the last year of his Government, that is, the financial year 1964-65, amounting to £1,300,000. In the year 1963-64 he had a surplus of £1,600,000. All in all, in the Revenue account throughout his many years in office, he carried forward a surplus over the total period of, I think, £611,256. However, Labor in its first year of office incurred a total deficit in Loan and Revenue accounts of \$9,200,000, or £4,600,000, which is three times as much as any of Sir Thomas Playford's deficits in his 26 years of office, except the one forced on him by the Grants Commission, and even then this present deficit is more than twice as much as the greatest deficit that Sir Thomas ever had during his period of office. This deficit was accumulated in the first year of Labor Government, despite the fact that its estimates of revenue showed nearly £9,000,000 more revenue for the year than Sir Thomas had available to spend in the previous year.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That is a telling blow.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Labor had \$18,000,000 more to spend for the year than Sir Thomas had the year before, and yet it finished up with a deficit of over \$9,200,000 on the two accounts—a Revenue deficit of \$6,837,000 and a Loan deficit of \$2,404,000. That shows that the surplus Labor inherited from Sir Thomas Playford of \$1,220,000 was smartly wiped out and turned into a net deficit of \$8,019,000, which is a pretty speedy piece of work.

One cannot help feeling disturbed at the state of South Australia's finances when this sort of thing happens, even though, curiously enough, since the figures were announced in last Saturday week's newspaper, there has not been very much talk about it. It is by far the greatest deficit we have had in our history. I do not want to be over-critical; I always try to be fair, and I think honourable members will agree with that. Labor was out of office for 30 years, so it is natural that it must come into office inexperienced in Government finance. That is a matter of necessity, but as I see it, there is no difference, in principle, between Government finance and one's own household finances, company finance, or what is sometimes called "high finance". The principles behind the household budget are the same as those behind the Government budget, except that in the house the principles might be more apparent and might not be as complicated. The

principles, though, are there, so there is no reason why people cannot learn to handle finances of any sort, as long as they apply themselves to the job.

We have men of integrity in our new Government; there is no question about it, because I know all of them personally and I regard them as such. But they have a doctrinaire slant to them; and, I think, this is one of the things that, in their first year in office, has led them astray. They must have been under very great pressure for advantages to be given, for hand-outs, for the so-called fruits of office which, in many cases, prove illusory. In this debate last year I congratulated them on their success at the election. I sympathize with them now in the undoubted difficulties they are encountering, and I want to help in the way of tendering suggestions and advice and not in the way of carping criticism. At this stage I may say that, if we get a similar result in the current year, then I expect I shall be more critical, because they have already had a year's experience in office and, if they cannot tidy up things after that, I think we shall certainly have to examine the position much more carefully. After all, the State does depend on its finances, and if the State is going to be a healthy State economically, then we have to have healthy finances.

I would like to refer to the speeches of the mover and the seconder of the motion, and I would like to congratulate them both on the way they delivered their speeches. It was mentioned that the Hon. Mr. Kneebone was probably the first Minister to propose the adoption of the Address in Reply, at least for many years. I see no reason why it should not be done by a Minister; in fact, I see many reasons why it should. After all, he has information that the ordinary back-bencher probably does not always have and he has people to assist him, which is something most of us would dearly love to have. He made a very good speech, and so did the seconder.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone commenced his speech by saying he moved the motion with considerable pride and satisfaction as he looked back over the relatively short period that this Government had been in office and realized what had been achieved during that time. I suppose that that is a nice sort of thing to say but I would have thought it was a little early for any Government, however good, to have achieved a great deal.

For instance, in the works arena, one can hardly imagine that any Government in its first year of office could do much more than

carry on the works that had been commenced by the previous Government and, in that area, I think the achievements of the present Government were mainly in relation to works commenced by the previous Government. I am one of those who feel that some works have been slowed down during the past year. I could give one or two examples of this. This may be a financial necessity but, of course, the Government had an extra \$18,000,000 to spend during the year and one does expect a Government to get value for its money.

Certainly, it has made some social reforms since taking office. It has had a successful referendum, which suggests that it has done what the majority of the people wished it to do. I think one can congratulate the Government on correctly assessing the desire of the majority of the populace. We all consider that the majority popular opinion should be taken into account and an endeavour made to fulfil the considered requirements of the majority. The only record the Government has broken as far as I know is the record for a deficit.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You don't yet know what it will be.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If Sir Thomas Playford could have been regarded as having run a mile in four minutes, then I think we have a two-minute mile Government now, because it has doubled any previous achievement in that regard. I want to revert to the topic of Government finance and one of the problems regarding that matter is that one cannot live from day to day, because what is done today in a financial way has a definite bearing on what will happen tomorrow. For instance, if one spends all the money in the first 10 months of the year, he has nothing to spend in the last two months, except next year's money. So, the impact of that must fall in the following year, and so it goes on.

There are also severe sanctions under the financial agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. This means that, if Revenue deficits have to be funded against Loan moneys (which is what this Government will have to do, because that is the only way it can be done that I know of), this action must have a bearing on future allocations of Loan money, which is allocated in the agreement under the formula. It is the formula that matters. Although the Premiers always agree, they only agree to the allocations because they know that there is a formula that will apply if they do not agree.

The formula is worked on the average Loan expenditure by each State in the previous five years, leaving out any moneys that have been

funded. So, if a Government spends less Loan money on works, it receives less in the years to come. That is a reason why the finances must be put back into shape at the earliest possible moment. This appears to be recognized by the Government, because in Saturday morning's *Advertiser* we saw a statement by the Minister of Works, Mr. Hutchens, that the basic wage increase of \$2 would make it more difficult for the State Government to maintain "anything like" the present programme of public works. Mr. Hutchens added that he did not begrudge wage earners the higher salary. I think we can all say that.

Rising basic wage levels are part of our economy today, and we expect them. In some ways they may not be a bad thing, even for the greatest purist in finance, because they certainly give a shot in the arm to the economy and I would think that that is what we would like to see in regard to the economy at this time. However, the fact remains that, although the Minister of Works says that the \$2 basic wage increase will make it more difficult for the State Government to maintain "anything like" the present programme of public works, the Government of which he is a Minister actually advocated before the Arbitration Court at this hearing that it give not a \$2 increase in the basic wage but a rise of \$4.30. That is what the Government actively advocated in the court.

Yet, when the result is an increase of less than half of what the Government advocated, it says that that will make it more difficult for it to maintain "anything like" the present programme of Government works. That is what I mean when I say that the Government has to learn something about finance and has to be more sophisticated in its approach to the matter.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Are you advocating that the Government should have opposed it?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The Minister of Labour and Industry, the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, announced in the same newspaper that the \$2 basic wage increase would add \$5,750,000 a year to the State's wages bill. Therefore, on my arithmetic, if our State Government had been successful in its advocacy of an increase of \$4.30, the additional cost next year would have been \$13,250,000, instead of \$5,750,000. So, if the Government is going to find it difficult to maintain "anything like" the present programme of public works when faced with an extra expenditure of \$5,750,000 because of the basic wage increase, what sort of works

programme would it have been able to carry out if there had been, as it asked for, an increased wages bill of \$13,250,000? I think there are things to be learned, and the work in the current year will tell the further part of the tale.

I think most of us know a number of the items of expenditure that have accounted for this extremely large deficit. I do not know that the Government is altogether inclined to blame itself as yet, because we have heard talk about the impact of the so-called drought on the Government figures. We have been putting up with droughts off and on for as many years as any of us can remember, and far more serious droughts than anything we had in this last year. We have also heard criticism of this Chamber in which we are all ensconced at present.

I should like to deal with these two items. First, regarding the drought, I think it is true, on the figures I have been able to ascertain, that the cereal harvest was down between 25 per cent and 30 per cent this year, so State revenue certainly must have suffered to some extent because of that. I think it was claimed on behalf of the Government that railway revenue had suffered through this, and this is understandable. However, on the latest figures the railway revenue has been exactly as estimated, and we were not in the throes of a drought in the settled areas when the Budget was prepared. The latest figures I can get for the year show that receipts were within \$1,000 of the estimate. This is extraordinarily accurate budgeting, so it does not seem that the drought has had much effect there.

Certainly, the Government had to pump water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, but this happens in most years now, so I do not think it could have been totally unexpected. On the latest figures the sheep population of this State has actually increased by an estimated 785,000 to 18,074,000. It may be interesting to honourable members if I mention that the sheep population in Western Australia has increased by over 2,000,000 to 24,500,000 and that in Victoria it has increased by 500,000 to nearly 31,000,000. In Queensland and New South Wales, where the worst effect of the drought was felt, the sheep population decreased: in Queensland by 5,284,000 to 18,732,000, and in New South Wales by 11,750,000 to 60,600,000. So much for the drought, because it was not too bad a season. I know cereal growers had a poor season, but otherwise it was not too bad. For years now we have had droughts in the

country outside Goyder's line. We have had some relief rain since, but I do not think the drought in the outside country was any worse last year than it has been for years.

Certain Labor members have been muttering and grumbling about what this Chamber has done to some of the Government's legislation. One day last week the following report appeared in the *Advertiser*:

Much of the blame for the South Australian Government deficit must rest with "those irresponsible characters in the Legislative Council," Mr. Hudson (Australian Labor Party) said in the Assembly yesterday . . . The South Australian Government's deficit would have been at least \$2,000,000 less but for the Legislative Council, he said. "Last year a number of revenue measures were either defeated by the Legislative Council or amended."

Let us just examine this statement and see who is irresponsible. Even assuming that this man's figures were correct and that the Legislative Council was responsible for the Government's not getting an additional \$2,000,000 revenue through some of its extra taxing Acts, the Government would still have finished with a mighty deficit of \$7,200,000, which would be at least double any deficit made by the previous Government. However, I think I shall be able to prove that these figures are not just wrong but are completely and fantastically wrong. I shall go through the items of State taxation presented to us last year. It was estimated that land tax would bring in the Government an additional \$850,000 from an increase in rates, not from the increased assessments. This estimate was right, because the rates were not amended in this Chamber; the only thing we did was limit, on the motion of Sir Lyell McEwin, the operation of the Act for a year so that we could have a look at the new assessment. From what we have seen since this was a far-sighted move.

The legislation relating to stamp duties was amended, and we passed practically all the things asked for, including additional duty on cheques, but as a result of an agreement between the Houses at a conference an amendment was made in relation to the stamp duty on receipts. I have discussed this matter with people who are expert in these things, and the opinion they have expressed is that, through the provision relating to duty on receipts not going through, the Government lost about \$100,000 for the portion of the year this duty would have operated.

Honourable members will remember that we rejected the imposition of harbours dues that we thought would affect the local motor body

industry in relation to black sheet steel. I have ascertained that about \$24,000 has been lost there. We rejected altogether the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill. I looked up the second reading explanation of the Minister and found that his own estimate of what the new succession duties would have brought in during the remainder of last year was \$300,000. As that is the Government's own estimate, I think we can accept it as being somewhere near the mark.

We know that water rates have increased, but they have not been tampered with by this Chamber. A Bill relating to road and railway transport was rejected. That Bill contained two facets for improved finances—licence fees and additional railway revenue. As far as the Budget is concerned, we can forget the additional railway revenue because it has been up to expectations, so that, on the Government's own budgeting, was not a cause of the deficit. The final figures, subject to a few minor adjustments, are available, and they show that \$70,000 less than expected was received for licence fees. However, I do not think the Government would have got all that extra revenue, because honourable members will remember that the Bill did not come in until the beginning of this year, so there would have been very little time to collect the extra fees.

The Hon. C. R. Story: There would be many outgoings in setting up inspectors, too.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is so, but I have been dealing with revenue because that is the criticism I want to answer. If the losses are added together they total almost \$500,000 (£250,000), yet this gentleman I have quoted has a nice old guess and wants to blame the Legislative Council for depriving the Government of \$2,000,000 in revenue—revenue that we have never had, in any case; it was additional revenue. So I think that answers the question of where the irresponsibility lies.

There is just one other matter I want to touch on, and that is the topical question of natural gas. We hear from the Commonwealth Labor Party threats of severe controls and even, as I read it, expropriation of other people's discoveries. I deplore this because obviously the greatest natural gas and oil search is essential to this country. If we can find sufficient deposits it will make a tremendous difference to our economy and the balance of payments situation. What we ought to be doing for all we are worth is encouraging the search in all possible ways, as indeed has happened so far. But, now that people have started to

discover a few things, greedy eyes are being turned on them already. That is wrong, because surely we want as much oil and natural gas as we can possibly get and as much search as possible. If we get many discoveries we shall not have to bother about those artificial curbs on prices and rewards for effort: the competition itself will regulate the cost and the prices if we can get a reasonable number of discoveries. No-one can tell me that, if discovery goes back into the hands of the Government, we shall get anything like the tempo of oil search that we have at the moment. Indeed, our own Mines Department for years and years said there was no oil in South Australia: it was discounted that there was any oil at all. Yet, now that oil and gas are being discovered in various parts of Australia, it seems that certain people are out for themselves (and I am not referring to the Minister who is looking at me, because so far I have not seen any signs that he is not prepared to give everyone a "fair go"). This criticism is not directed at our Minister of Mines. I am talking more on the Commonwealth aspect. However, I hope that our Minister will see that everything is done to encourage people to outlay their money in search so that we can get as much gas and oil as quickly as possible for the benefit of South Australia, which is so poorly off for natural fuel.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I could not agree more with the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am sure the Minister agrees with me. The obvious way to do it is to let people who discover these things have a full reward for their enterprise and initiative in doing so, because searching for oil is not like investing money in some established line of business. A company can spend millions of dollars in the search for oil and discover nothing, in which case it may well go into liquidation. This must, indeed, be the fate of some oil companies engaged in the search for oil in Australia. They cannot all be successful. If they were, we should prove to be very rich indeed in oil and gas. I should have thought it was clear that we wanted to encourage people to search for all the oil and gas they could find.

There is only one way of encouraging them to that end, and that is for them to have the proper fruits and rewards for their efforts. In conclusion, I should merely like to revert to the fact that finances dictate the health and wealth of the State and its people. The

figures themselves will tell the story. I hope the Government will be able to achieve a better financial result this year than it did last year.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the motion and in doing so I wish to congratulate both the mover and the seconder on their dignified speeches. Speaking, as I am, late in the debate, I do not intend to reiterate the many sentiments expressed by previous speakers, other than to say how pleased we all were to have the Lieutenant-Governor open Parliament this session and to thank him for his graciousness on that occasion. All loyal South Australians will also be happy this week to welcome His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan home again after their brief time in Britain. We trust they will both be given good health to carry out their continuous and onerous duties.

Recently, too, there returned to South Australia a man greatly respected by all South Australians who know him. I refer to Mr. Malcolm Pearce who, after five years' excellent service as South Australia's Agent-General in London, has returned to his home State with Mrs. Pearce. During his term in London he was a friend and mentor to many hundreds of South Australians, who will never forget his kindness and efficiency; but even more important to us was the fact that he by his work and ability became well known in many different spheres in Britain and proved himself a true ambassador for our State.

The Speech itself foreshadowed a lengthy legislative programme for this session and honourable members may well imagine that it can be likened to an iceberg—a large proportion not revealed. It always seems a strange thing to me that anyone should think that a heavy legislative programme is anything to be proud of or indeed hailed. It can mean only more and more control and correspondingly less and less freedom for the community. However, I would say that no matter how painstakingly the Parliamentary Draftsmen strive to write good laws and no matter how sincerely honourable members strive to make those laws foolproof, if, at the end, the laws themselves are not enforced then it surely means that Parliament's work is being nullified.

In this respect I refer to the Road Traffic Act, and specifically to section 53 (2), which is being ignored every day. That is the section relating to the speeds of heavy vehicles. I have already drawn the attention of this Chamber to glaring abuses seen daily in respect of this

section, which has been in the Act for many years. I draw honourable members' attention to this matter again. The section reads:

A person shall not drive on a road within a municipality, town or township a commercial motor vehicle (whether drawing a trailer or not) at a speed in excess of those hereinafter prescribed:—

- (a) If the aggregate weight of the vehicle and every trailer drawn thereby exceeds three but does not exceed seven tons—thirty miles an hour.
- (b) If the aggregate weight of the vehicle and every trailer drawn thereby exceeds seven tons but does not exceed thirteen tons—twenty-five miles an hour.
- (c) If the aggregate weight of the vehicle and every trailer drawn thereby exceeds thirteen tons—twenty miles an hour.

Last Tuesday at approximately 11 a.m. on Kensington Road I found that I could not pass a truck laden so heavily with rock from the quarries and travelling so near to the centre of the road as to obscure my vision, unless I accelerated well past the speed limit. I could not pass it. I timed this vehicle at 36 m.p.h.

Two days later, again, I could see in my rear vision mirror a huge lorry returning empty to the quarries coming rapidly behind me. I continued at 35 m.p.h. and found that the driver roared past, obviously at over 40 m.p.h. and this at 8.50 a.m., again on Kensington Road when literally hundreds of children were proceeding to school by foot or by bicycle. One is forced to ask why this state of affairs is continuing. It seems that there is general acceptance of the fact that heavy trucks, far from being kept to the limited speed that Parliament has decreed, travel at anything from 10 to 15 miles an hour over the prescribed limits. It would seem that the Police Department is being weighed down with too much work and that many policemen who could be enforcing our laws are snowed under with paper work, with interminable form-filling, and with other matters that could easily be performed by other people.

Every honourable member must be aware that we are failing in our duty if we cannot do something to stop this appalling rate of road deaths. Last week, two young boy pedestrians were killed; the previous week two young boy cyclists were killed. These are terrible tragedies for everyone concerned and our hearts go out to their parents. It is an appalling waste of good young lives. Whatever is wrong with us that we rightly deplore the deaths of young soldiers serving their country, yet hardly comment on this never-ending killing on the

roads? The reasons for this carnage are complex, but I venture to say that one reason is something that we, as legislators, could do much to remedy—the necessity to introduce a system of inspection for roadworthiness of all vehicles. The number of times we see at intersections and in dangerous situations shabby and ill-kept motor vehicles, which seem to be hurtling along without any efficient braking mechanism, would suggest that there is a big field for investigation of badly-maintained and dangerous vehicles in South Australia.

A system of inspections is not impossible to plan or to put into operation; it has been done for years in other States. Last week, there appeared in the press a report from Victoria that stated that, when police inspections were recently carried out in Melbourne's used car yards, nine out of every ten cars were proved to be unroadworthy. The Chief of the Police Traffic Branch said, "Many of the cars were certain death traps." I urge the Government, if it takes the seriousness of the road toll to heart, to legislate for a system of inspection in South Australia of all vehicles and, particularly, of older motor vehicles.

Another matter on which the Government will have to act in the near future must surely be the number of accidents involving semi-trailers on our main highways. Hardly a week passes without some vehicle being ripped to shreds and its occupants mangled in an accident with a semi-trailer. Irrespective of where the fault lies, it is true that these very heavy vehicles can be seen travelling at over 50 miles an hour on our main highways at any time. Whether the accidents are being brought about by tired drivers who are on the roads for too long a period without rest, or whether they are being caused by the difficulty of controlling anything up to 20 tons of hardware travelling at 50 miles an hour over the imperfections of any road, it is still a matter crying out for legislative attention.

Another reason for this road carnage may well be the result of the growth of violence in the community. In a way, the truculence and bad manners of many of our drivers, their determination to have their right-of-way even if it means speeding up wildly to intersections—all these things are manifestations of a deep malaise, not only in our own community but throughout Australia and, indeed, in many parts of the world. Recently, I read an article by Sir Arthur Bryant in an issue of the *Illustrated London News*, in which he speaks of the preservation of public order as being the first duty of government. He says, "It

is the enforcement of law", and he then goes on to say (and he is speaking about the British Police Force):

The legislature has imposed on them and, increasingly and with every new Parliamentary session, continues to impose on them a vast range of duties whose performance has little or nothing to do with the suppression of crime. One of the most onerous and time-wasting of these duties is that of regulating traffic on the roads—of providing, that is, the staffing of a vast new national industry which has grown up in the last half-century and yet which, except by our over-burdened and under-staffed police, is almost unregulated. Though no-one seems to realize it, it is as absurd to expect the police to perform this function as it would be to expect them to provide the entire station and signalling staff of our national railways. I believe that here in South Australia we could give that matter consideration. I do not know if there is anyone better than the police for doing this job of keeping road traffic under control—certainly someone has to do it. But it does seem that far too high a proportion of our limited Police Force is perhaps spending too much time operating radio stations, training troops of horses used only on ceremonial occasions, and doing the multifarious tasks I have mentioned before, tasks that have little to do with on-the-spot law enforcement and crime detection.

Turning to the detail of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, there are one or two items I wish to mention. Turning to paragraph 11, it appears that no mention was made or is going to be made of that famous hospital which was to be built in or about Tea Tree Gully.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I think it was promised at the last election campaign.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I understand that subsequently there was a picture taken of a member of Parliament standing on the site. I would be interested to know if the site on which the hospital was to be built is still in the hands of the Government.

Paragraph 36 refers to the collection of water rates. Although superficially this would seem to be a service to the public, when one considers this matter of quarterly rate-paying a number of problems arise. For every rate-payer there will have to be three more forms, three more envelopes and three more postage fees emanating from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. For the return journey there will have to be three more envelopes, three more stamps and three more cheques from the ratepayer to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This means a colossal cost, even without knowing if receipts

are going to be issued. This legislation will cost every ratepayer at least 50c a year, and Heaven knows what the Government costs will be! There will be a necessity to employ extra staff, and one of the jobs to be done will be to rectify the mistakes made by the computer—a costly luxury, as all computers are—and all this without considering the extra work for every ratepayer and every bank.

One of the most distressing things in the Speech was the revelation of the unfortunate state into which our Treasury finances have fallen over the past year. This has not passed unnoticed by other honourable members of this Chamber, so I shall limit my remarks to two major aspects of the effect of this situation. We are greatly indebted to the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill for his very fair treatment of this subject this afternoon. First, inasmuch as this situation will slow down spending on Government projects generally and will reduce the amount of employment for our work force in South Australia, it is already being freely spoken of as a matter of great concern to the working people of South Australia, who are becoming scared of unemployment. I can assure honourable members that I have been informed by many of my constituents that this is a very real worry in the community at present. Secondly, this situation is not only worrying the man in the street but has begun to worry many of our senior members of the Public Service. They see the work of their departments being hampered and restricted by lack of funds.

When other States are developing at such a high rate, this slowing down in South Australia will produce only frustration among many of our trusted servants. It will be a grievous thing if South Australia now starts to lose many of her most competent servants in governmental and semi-governmental departments to spheres of higher activity in other States. There is a further pernicious result of this situation. If South Australia develops a reputation for being a go-slow State, where jobs are hard to get, we shall cease to attract our proper proportion of migrants, and then we shall see another snowballing effect of bad financing. South Australia will fall behind other Australian States in developing the population she needs for her future. I support the motion.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech delivered on this occasion by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. In doing so I pay

a tribute to the conspicuous part played by Sir Mellis Napier in the judicial field in this State. He has set a standard that I trust will be emulated by those who follow him in succeeding years. I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. Further, I join all other honourable members in expressions of gratitude to Sir Edric Bastyan and Lady Bastyan for the dignified and gracious manner in which they have acted as the Queen's representative in this State. To Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second I re-affirm expressions of loyalty and it is a matter for deep regret that those sentiments are not held by all citizens of this State.

Although we are living in a free society, actions of disloyalty are neither accepted nor condoned by the vast majority of people in South Australia. If, however, a minority group wishes to form a republic, let it do so on its own merits or the merits of its own case instead of by adopting a name that incorporates the abbreviated title of a great organization whose members have twice in the last generation fought and who are fighting at present to uphold the principles of freedom of action of the individual. When we witness such outrages of community loyalties as the laying of lavatory seats as mock wreaths on the war memorial in Kings Park, Perth, and the desecration of the war memorial in Adelaide, we see that law has no binding force and democratic processes no ultimate validity.

I extend my sympathy to the relatives of former members who have passed away during the year. Of these, I have had personal contact only with the late Sir Frank Perry who, together with other members of his family, played a significant part in the development of the industrial welfare of this State. The late Sir Richard Butler could perhaps well be said to be the instigator of the industrial revolution in South Australia. It was during his period as Premier that the flow of industry to the State began in earnest. Sir Richard was brought up in an atmosphere of politics, as his father, also Sir Richard, was a member of the House of Assembly for 34 years and Premier for about 4 years. Further, the two Butlers, senior and junior, served in the House of Assembly simultaneously for two periods, namely, from 1915 to 1918 and from 1921 to 1924.

We are seeing the departure from political leadership this year of another great South Australian and possibly the greatest Premier South Australia has ever had. As honourable members have no doubt gathered, I refer to the

Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and, indeed, I regard it as a great privilege to have had the opportunity of being in Parliament during part of his record term. Sir Thomas also came from a family deeply steeped in politics, as his grandfather was not only Premier of this State but also served as a Senator. This could well be a year for the retirement from office of great men, as Sir Robert Menzies, who served as Prime Minister of Australia with great distinction for a record term, has also relinquished office.

As the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said earlier this afternoon, Government personalities have stated that the reason for the unsound economic position of this State is the action of the Legislative Council, and Sir Arthur has clearly pointed out that these reasons do not pertain. There were 97 Bills considered by this Chamber last year and only four of those Bills were lost here. Of those four, only two were money Bills. As I have said, it has already been pointed out this afternoon that these are not the only cause, or a major cause, of the Government's declining finances.

The Legislative Council has been criticized from time to time as being a Chamber that does not sit often or for long periods. It is interesting to do a little research into the contributions by members of this Chamber as against those of another place, particularly as against members of the Labor Party in that other place. In doing this research, we find that the average number of speeches made in this Chamber last year was 32.5 for each member, and the average number of speeches made by members of the Labor Party, the Government Party (excluding Ministers), in the other place during the same period was 8.5.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You do not want to hear them, though, unless they have something to talk about.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That may be so, but I consider these figures significant. They show clearly that the members of this Chamber apply themselves to all matters brought before them. The average for the Opposition Party in the other place was 30.5, so the number for all members is 32.5 for the Legislative Council and 21 for the House of Assembly.

There is a number of interesting items in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, one of which is paragraph 11, dealing with hospitals. When the present Premier made his policy speech, the reference to hospitals occupied several pages. In the Governor's Speech last year on the same subject, there was one paragraph

dealing with this specific question and I shall read it for the benefit of honourable members. Last year, in paragraph 13, His Excellency said:

My Government will pursue an active policy in connection with the health services in the State. Two new general hospitals are being planned and additional teaching hospital provision is included. Improvements will be effected in connection with the care and treatment of the mentally sick and mentally retarded patients.

This year there was even less reference to hospitals in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech: he said:

My Government continues to pay attention to provision of adequate hospital services throughout the State, particularly in the field of mental health.

It was rather interesting to read a recent press comment about the Government's intentions in relation to financing hospitals in the future. The Premier is reported to have said during a telecast:

The Totalizator Agency Board will pay a percentage of its revenue to the Government. This revenue will be used for the provision, maintenance, development and improvement of public hospitals and equipment.

I believe the Government is misleading the people of this State in referring to the way in which revenue from T.A.B. will be used for the benefit of hospitals. I think it should be made perfectly clear whether it intends to apply the additional funds raised from T.A.B. for the benefit of hospitals or whether it intends (as I believe to be the case) merely to substitute that revenue for the general revenue now provided. The Premier referred to public hospitals, but what did he mean by "public"? I presume all hospitals are public hospitals.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Private hospitals, too?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Community hospitals must be regarded as public hospitals, and the only finance they get is a Government subsidy of \$2 for \$1 on capital costs. Unless they are able to get increased funds, they will not be able to get additional subsidies from the Government. This talk of hospitals benefiting from T.A.B. is misleading the electors of this State. The Government's budgetary position may be improved by T.A.B. revenue, but I cannot see how hospitals will find themselves in any better position.

Recently an application was made for increased salaries for nurses in Government hospitals. The July issue of *Public Service* stated that on June 16 the Public Service Association lodged with the Minister of Labour and Industry a log of claims for an industrial agreement

on behalf of more than 2,000 nurses employed in Government hospitals throughout South Australia. The nurses' agreement expired on June 30, but it will remain in force until superseded by a new agreement or an award. The last agreement was signed in July, 1964, and, although the association has been actively seeking measures to improve it, it has not met with any success. As a result, it now has an application before the Public Service Commissioner for increases in salaries. What will the Government's attitude be to this application? I presume it will support it, but one has doubts after reading a report of a statement made by the Minister of Works at a recent Australian Labor Party convention in this State. The report is as follows:

Mr. Hutchens, the Minister of Works, opposed a Naracoorte motion for travel concessions to nurses training in hospitals more than 50 miles from home. Mr. Hutchens said, "South Australia has an unhealthy deficit, and if we give money to these girls, deserving as they are, we have to get it from someone else. Such requests are only killing the Government that is trying to do the job for you."

If that is the Minister's attitude to a genuine application for some relief for nurses, who obviously are underpaid or they would not be making an application for increased salaries before the Public Service Commissioner, what will be the Government's attitude to the application for salary increases? If the salary application is successful will the Government see that the agreement or award is applied to all nurses in the State in the same way as it has recently applied the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission's award to all persons employed under State awards? If nurses are granted the increases sought and they suffer taxation injustices, will they be treated in the same way as teachers were recently treated, and be granted *ex gratia* payments?

His Excellency said that the Government was still providing money for various industries throughout the State, particularly the fishing industry, and mentioned facilities for an unloading jetty at Port Lincoln for the fishing fleet. In the Loan Estimates last year \$32,000 was provided for a fishing jetty at Edithburgh, and I must give the Government credit because this is one of the projects it has finished. With the Hon. Mr. Story, I recently inspected the jetty. The application for that jetty was of long standing. The structure was in two sections, the first being a stone causeway coated with concrete and the other being a wooden structure. On each side of the causeway is a raised section about 4in. or 5in. high. This

section is not properly drained and after a rain or an extremely high sea about 4in. or 5in. of water is trapped. However, I suppose fishermen are used to water, so this is no problem to them. They had requested that the wooden section be made wide enough to enable them to bring their trailers along it so that they could be loaded direct from the boats, and then be taken back along the causeway and over the cliffs. However, the wooden section is about 6in. too narrow, yet I have been informed by the fishermen that the planks supplied were wide enough to make the jetty the required width. However, 6in. was sawn off them, and as a result the jetty is not wide enough to enable the men to get their trailers on it, so they have to take fish in hand trucks back to the causeway.

Mooring rings are provided for the boats along the causeway, but it is 8ft. to 9ft. high and there is no provision for the fishermen to climb up, so that, when they moor their boats, they practically have to swim ashore; but these are only little matters. When we go out to the end of the jetty we find there is a swinging boom provided for lifting material from the boats on to the jetty. This boom when swung into position to lift the material is so placed that the winch on it is out over the seaward side, so there is no hope of being able to work the thing. Consequently, it is there rusting and nobody seems keen on rectifying the position.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Did Heath Robinson design it?

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is a matter of having wings or being able to walk on water, but it is a little too high for that.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Where angels fear to tread?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes. Recently, I had reason to ask the Minister of Roads a question about the median strip on Grand Junction Road. From his answer it appears that we shall have to accept that median strips are here to stay: at least, this one is here to stay although it is provided on a road of minimum width. But another matter I raised at that stage was the placing of a girls technical high school in a heavy industry area and on the side of the road from which I doubt whether 5 per cent of the children would come to attend the school. I think that 95 per cent of the children attending that school would have to cross this busy thoroughfare. Admittedly, when the Education Department decided to put that school there, it might have appeared expedient to do so. The land was available and

perhaps was reasonably cheap, but, with the passage of time and the development going on in this area, this school has clearly become an island among traffic and heavy industry. Surely the Education Department through its experience would realize that this move was unwise? But now I am informed that it is investigating the building of, or has practically decided to build, a new school on the site of the old sewage farm at Islington.

Let us look at the position there. At present, a dual railway line runs along one side and we are informed that a portion of the sewage farm area will be used for the building of railway marshalling yards. So on the eastern side let us assume that the area is cut off from the residential area by a railway line. On the western side there is a busy highway and it appears certain that a freeway, too, will go along the western side of this area. To the north is an area completely industrial, with no residential area at all. To the south there is some residential and some industrial area. Surely the Education Department, with the experience of having placed schools in areas in which it must have known development would take place, would not perpetuate this mistake? The attitude of the Education Department in trying to be pennywise in the first instance must be deplored. It will be difficult to get children to these schools located amongst heavy industry.

Paragraph 17 of His Excellency's Speech deals with the Housing Trust, to which I pay tribute. Irrespective of Party, we all agree it has done a magnificent job. Undoubtedly, with the magnitude of the task it has had to carry out, some problems have cropped up, unforeseen in the beginning. I draw the attention of this Chamber to a problem that appears to have arisen in the Elizabeth area. When Elizabeth was first built we had what is now known as the town centre, which has developed into a large shopping centre. In addition, each housing area had what was known as a neighbourhood shopping unit. These units were supposed to supply the immediate locality with its shopping needs. We all know of the attraction of a large shopping centre. We see the same thing in Adelaide, where people prefer to come into Adelaide to shop rather than shop in their own suburbs. This applies in Elizabeth, too. These neighbourhood units in the early days may have supplied the need of a shopping centre, but Elizabeth town centre has developed to such a degree that it is now an attraction to the people living in the whole area, the result being that the neighbourhood shopping units are

suffering. Indeed, I understand that one could not give away the lease of some of these units in certain areas. I point this out because I hope the Housing Trust will take note of the present position at Elizabeth as regards neighbourhood units.

The reason for this is fairly obvious when we look back. I take Elizabeth as an example. It is probably over-supplied with shops. The shopkeeper who takes on a lease in a neighbourhood unit usually contracts for about five years, during which period he is required to keep his shop open. Even though he may be losing money and if he cannot sell it, he is not permitted to close his shop. It is obvious that, when his lease does expire and that shop goes back into the hands of the Housing Trust, it must reduce the rent or otherwise not be able to re-let it. I hope the trust will look at this problem and, if possible and if it thinks it desirable, it should perhaps in certain cases reduce the rent where it is known that the shopkeeper is not making a living. This can be ascertained, because the shopkeeper is required to supply returns to the trust and, if it is proved that he is making more than an adequate living, when that lease is subsequently transferred the rental for the shop is increased. These figures are available to the trust and I hope it will view this matter sympathetically.

Paragraph 28 of the Speech deals with the Government's intention to set up a State Government insurance office. It states:

My Government has received many complaints concerning the operations of certain insurance companies, particularly in the fields of workmen's compensation, personal accident and comprehensive motor vehicle insurance. As a means of enforcing satisfactory general standards of service to the public, in accordance with my Government's policy, a Bill to provide for the establishment of a State Government Insurance Office will be laid before you.

I am not going to debate the merits of a Government insurance office at this stage, because when the Bill is before this Chamber we shall have ample opportunity to do so, but there are two points I should like to make. One is that it is well known that, when accident victims are taken to hospital and where insurance is involved, the hospital fees are not finalized until any court action has been decided. I suggest that an endeavour should be made to set up a fund that would provide for payment of hospital fees of accident victims pending court action. This, I consider, would be of considerable benefit to many hospitals that have to wait for long periods to obtain the fees incurred by accident victims.

Also, it appears that insurance companies have to make a contribution to the Fire Brigade in this State. I have not done much research in this particular matter, but it seems to me that South Australia is the only State where this applies. This, I consider, is a penalty on the person who insures against fire, because obviously the cost of meeting the Fire Brigade levies has to be passed on to insurance policyholders. I consider that this is a liability that should be borne by all taxpayers, not only the prudent few who insure against fire.

Paragraph 42 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech refers to some of the problems that this Government is facing, particularly in relation to the dry season and to the increased costs it is incurring in pumping water from the River Murray. When we look at the Supplementary Estimates placed before this Chamber a week or so ago we find that the Government has only one item dealing with increased costs incurred by the pumping of this water. This item is lumped in among a number of other items and, in total, it amounts to only \$280,000, which is not a large amount in the finance of a State. Obviously, when the Government budgeted for its expenditure for the coming year, it would have made provision for the increased expenditure on pumping water, yet the amount it is claiming now for the balance of this item is not particularly large. I urge the Government to try to reduce the cost of pumping water into reservoir areas.

I do this not to be critical, as I think Opposition members should offer constructive criticism wherever possible, and I would refer to the great advances that have taken place in recent years in rainmaking. Rainmaking has advanced from the age when it was looked upon with some suspicion and, indeed, it has begun to develop as a new science. Since the dawn of history the Australian Aboriginal has practised the rites of rainmaking, but today, with our advancing civilization, more sophisticated methods are adopted. The modern science of rainmaking was born in 1946 in the laboratories of the General Electric Company of America, following the discovery that fog produced in a cold chamber could be converted to snowflakes by dropping a piece of dry ice into it. Scientists repeated the experiments with snow clouds over the town of Pittsfield in Massachusetts. The first man-made rain to reach the ground did so over the Blue Mountains west of Sydney some three months after the Pittsfield experiment.

Many experiments in various areas have since been conducted, each confirming that, where

suitable conditions prevail, rain can be precipitated for increases ranging up to 25 per cent. In addition, there is fairly conclusive proof that there are cumulative effects due to cloud seeding that persist after seeding has ceased. If this can be confirmed by continued experiments, there is a possibility of achieving long-term changes in climate. It appears that cloud seeding has emerged from the experimental stage and that its practical application is now justified. This is the view of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization which in a recent report stated:

In light of the body of experimental evidence which now exists in Australia and overseas as to the possibilities of increasing rainfall by seeding supercooled clouds with silver iodide, C.S.I.R.O. considers that practical cloud-seeding operations are now justified on a growing scale.

If cloud seeding is to be carried out there must obviously be an approving authority, and the appropriate body would certainly be the State Agriculture Department. Cloud seeding is not by any means confined to Australia, although we are well in the forefront. Confirmed sceptics in the United States now admit that economically important increases in precipitation are possible. It is interesting to note that Congress is providing considerably more funds toward the practical exploration of the knowledge that now exists. Responsibility for this is vested in the Bureau of Reclamation, whose budget for 1966 is \$3,000,000, and a Bill is now before Congress proposing that this should be increased to \$30,000,000 in 1967, \$50,000,000 in 1968, and \$75,000,000 in 1969.

In Soviet Russia, research activity in the field of atmospheric physics exceeds that of the United States by a factor of two to three times, while in Israel, using burners of Australian design and manufacture, an average increase in rainfall of 15 per cent has been established. Over hydro-electric catchment areas, Japan has induced precipitation from isolated clouds and has demonstrated increases up to 15 per cent. The economic implications of cloud seeding have not yet been fully assessed, but in hydro-electric regions, where there is an immediate financial return from additional water as well as electricity, it is reliably established that a 1 per cent increase in precipitation would pay for the whole operation. In agricultural regions the break-even figure would probably be 5 per cent.

Timing in these areas is very important, as every additional half-inch of rain during the period August and September over wheat-growing regions could well mean an increase

of \$2,000,000 or more in the wheat yield. South Australia, with its limited reservoir catchment areas and its continuing and increasing pumping costs to bring River Murray water to the metropolitan area, should give serious consideration to the practical application of the cloud-seeding knowledge that is now available to it. As I have stated earlier, only one authority is in a position to do this, and that is the Agriculture Department. I sincerely suggest that the Government investigate this matter.

South Australia is a dry State. We have, I am sure, conditions over our catchment areas that would be suitable for cloud seeding and

doubtless the cost would be justified because of the increase in the water in the reservoirs. In addition, all those catchment areas are also agricultural areas, so there would be a two-fold return. Further, scientific knowledge would be gained by the large-scale and practical application of this modern science. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.16 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 13, at 2.15 p.m.