

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, June 27, 1967.

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation (No. 1),

Supply (No. 1).

### QUESTIONS

#### DOCTOR SHORTAGE.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In view of the overall shortage of doctors in this State, which bears particularly heavily upon the country areas, can the Minister of Health state the present position and whether there is any policy regarding cadetships for medical students?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I should like to obtain a considered reply to that question. As a result of a question by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins last week, I have had inquiries made as to the overall position regarding doctors and any linking-up with cadetships and have asked for a full report as to what has happened in the last six months. I shall give a full reply to the question by the honourable member and also to the question by Mr. Dawkins last week. I am happy to say that the position now is a little brighter than I said it was last week.

#### SWIMMING INSTRUCTORS.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Education an answer to my question of June 20 concerning payments to swimming instructors?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The reply to the honourable member's question is in the following terms: claims for term time swimming instruction are lodged with the Physical Education Branch for checking prior to submission to the Accountant for payment. The claims are prepared by each teacher, and as a rule cover instruction over a period of some months. Claims for instruction during the third term of 1966 were paid in the main in January and February last. A check of a number of claims paid early this month showed that they were for instruction from February to the end of March. These claims were

received by the Accountant, some on May 25 and others on May 30, 1967. Claims are being received every few days and are dealt with as they are received. It is proposed that next season their payments will be processed with salary cheques on the computer. It is usual Government practice and has been for many years to deduct stamp duty in accordance with the provisions of the Stamp Duty Act from payments made to persons who do not issue official receipts. All claims for salaries goods or services are processed promptly on receipt in the Accounts Branch. No payments have been withheld through lack of funds in the Education Department.

#### GILES POINT.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask the Chief Secretary, representing the Government, whether he has an answer to my recent question concerning Giles Point.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I, as the Leader of the Government in this House, was asked last week what was the present position regarding Giles Point. The Government intends to spend about \$600,000 in the next financial year on this project.

#### SCHOOL BUSES.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Education, whether he has an answer to a question I asked last week which was a similar question to that asked by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper and concerned payment for service to Education Department buses.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Accounts for servicing of buses are processed by the Transport Office of the Education Department and then transmitted to the Accountant for payment. The accounts are given top priority and processed promptly in the Transport Section. I understand that machinery for payment in the Accountant's Branch is effective and efficient. Accounts are paid by the Accountant on a monthly basis which is normal business practice. Any complaints regarding late payment are investigated promptly by my officers. Delays in payment may occur in the department through sickness, but these occasions are rare. I am advised that the main reasons for any delay are:

1. Late submission of accounts by servicing agents;
2. Errors are sometimes found in accounts submitted by servicing agents which necessitates the accounts being returned for amendment and correction.

## AGRICULTURE.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to my question of last week about the number of students taking agriculture as a major subject in area schools and high schools respectively?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Education, reports as follows:

The figures for 1967 are not yet available, but in 1966 there were 575 students in area schools and 2,254 students in high schools taking agriculture as a major subject.

## HOUSE MORTGAGES.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: On behalf of my colleague the Hon. Mr. Hill, I ask the Chief Secretary whether he has a reply to a question my colleague asked last week about house mortgage funds?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I thank the Hon. Mr. Potter for bringing up this question today. The answer is that during each of the past two years provision has been for \$200,000 for lending on established homes. This is additional lending promised at election time, the previous Administration having restricted its lending of Government funds to new houses. Although the Loan Budget for next year has not yet been determined, I am confident the \$200,000 a year provision will be continued. Whether it can be extended will have to be considered with the Loan Budget, which will be brought before the Council in due course.

## NOOGOORA BURR.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I think that all or most honourable members will know something of the danger of noogoora burr, as we all know the importance of keeping uninfested areas free of this noxious weed. We have for some considerable time been sending large quantities of stock to Western Australia, which is most conscious of the dangers of noxious weeds. If their restrictions at present imposed on inspections at Kalgoorlie and on inspections before leaving are made more stringent, we may be in a position where this very valuable market will dry up, to some extent.

Reports have come to me from constituents, of stock coming in from Eastern State areas infested with noogoora burr and going to clean

areas in South Australia without a sufficiently thorough inspection by the authorities in the other States. In view of this serious happening, if in fact this is happening, will the Minister take up with his colleague the matter of approaching the Eastern States authorities to ensure much more thorough inspections, or, alternatively, to ensure inspections here of stock coming from Eastern States before they are delivered to the properties they may infest?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall refer the matter to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and obtain a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

## ANNUAL LEAVE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Last week the Hon. Mr. Rowe asked a question of the Chief Secretary about the cost of an extra week's leave proposed to be granted to public servants in South Australia. Has the Chief Secretary a reply to that question?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Honourable members will remember that during my reply last week a certain figure was mentioned by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that I said I did not accept. I want to explain that the Premier in another place is making a Ministerial statement on this matter. This is his answer (so that "I" in the answer does not mean me):

Upon checking the estimates of the possible costs of the proposed additional leave for Government employees I find that I mistakenly quoted in an earlier statement a figure of about \$2,600,000 per annum. This figure is the approximate measure of costs of an additional week's leave for all Government employees. However, as it is not proposed to grant the extra week to teachers and police officers, for whom special leave entitlements already apply, the cost of the actual proposals is estimated at \$1,750,000 for a full year. As indicated in my earlier statement this estimate has been calculated on the direct basis that a sufficiently enlarged work force would be engaged to provide the same aggregate of days actually on duty as is now secured annually from the present total Government work force. In practice—

and this is where I quarrel with it, and still do—

I have every confidence that the costs will turn out to be significantly less than \$1,750,000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In view of the apparent confusion that seems to have existed regarding the cost of the proposal, will the Chief Secretary say whether the decision to grant an extra week's leave was a Cabinet decision and, if it was, whether the extra cost to the economy was discussed at Cabinet level?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The answer to both questions is "Yes."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (on notice):

1. What are the respective annual leave entitlements of public servants employed within Australia by the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of the Australian States?

2. Where such annual leave exceeds the period of three weeks, what are the categories of employees so entitled?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are:

1. The annual leave entitlements of public servants employed within Australia by the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of Australian States are as follows:

South Australia: The present annual leave entitlement of public servants employed on five days a week is three weeks and, in the case of an officer whose ordinary duties require him to work on more than six days in the week four weeks' annual leave is granted, except in the case of senior attendant staff in mental hospitals, who receive 30 days' leave. As from January 1, 1968, an additional week will be granted in accordance with the recent Cabinet decision.

Commonwealth: Five-day week workers are entitled to three weeks' annual leave and seven-day shift workers are entitled to an additional seven consecutive days.

New South Wales: Five-day week workers are granted 20 working days a year and seven-day shift workers are granted five weeks' annual leave. In some instances six weeks' annual leave is granted where leave in lieu of public holidays worked is included in the period of leave.

Victoria: Five-day week workers are entitled to three weeks' annual leave and, where officers are employed on other than a five-day week basis, additional leave up to one week extra may be granted.

Queensland: Five-day week workers are entitled to 15 working days a year, while seven-day week workers are entitled to four weeks' annual leave. Additional leave is granted in the northern and western areas of the State.

Western Australia: Five-day week workers are entitled to three weeks' annual leave and other than five-day week workers normally receive four weeks' annual leave. However, each case is dealt with on its merits. Employees north of 26 degrees south latitude also receive four weeks' annual leave.

Tasmania: Five-day week workers are allowed 15 working days and generally seven-day week workers receive an additional week's annual leave.

2. In addition to the categories receiving annual leave in excess of three weeks as set out above, other specific groups of public servants receive annual leave in excess of three weeks; for example, certain medical officers in Tasmania receive 40 days' or 30 days' leave. Details of all categories of such employees in all States are not readily available.

#### HOME UNITS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently a person complained to me that the dividing wall in the home unit he had purchased did not go to the roof; indeed, it finished at the ceiling. To the concern of the woman of the house, an electrician entered the home unit through the manhole; he had come from the adjoining home unit. I believe that regulations under the Building Act provide that, if more than four occupants are in the one home unit block, the dividing walls must go to the underside of the roof and be of fireproof material. If the dividing walls do not go to the roof, the ceiling must be of fireproof material, too. It is clear that, if entry can be gained to a home unit through the ceiling or manholes, there is not much protection for the occupant. Will the Minister of Local Government seek the advice of the Building Act Advisory Committee on this problem?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. This appears to be a problem that was not visualized when the regulations were framed. Considerable numbers of home units are being built and purchased. If the walls do not go to the roof, a person could enter one home unit and gain entry to any unit in the block. Manholes provide opportunities for unauthorized persons to gain entry to home units. This matter needs investigating, and I shall certainly refer it to the Building Act Advisory Committee to see whether this anomaly cannot be removed.

#### WAIKERIE COURTHOUSE.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: About three and a half years ago the residents of Waikerie were promised a courthouse and it was almost due to be built at the time of the change of Government. I am not blaming the change of Government for the fact that the courthouse was not built, as it was decided that a more appropriate position for the courthouse would be desirable to fit in with overall town planning in the district. I led a deputation to the Attorney-General and to the Minister of Works, the outcome being that it was fairly confidently expected that plans would be ready and the courthouse built in a short time. Waikerie is a large growing district but has a small courthouse measuring only 12ft. by 14ft. No provision exists for accommodating witnesses, who have to wait outside or sit on a verandah. I have been asked by my constituents to discover when something is likely to be done in this matter. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry refer this matter to his colleague?

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

#### COUNCIL FRANCHISE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (on notice): In view of the many hundreds of inquiries being made of members in relation to the proposal of the Government to enrol more electors on the Legislative Council roll, will the Chief Secretary inform the Council:

1. How the computer was programmed for the issue of enrolment forms?
2. Under what authority was a tick printed against the category "inhabitant occupier" on all the cards issued?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are:

1. Objective of computer programme: The objective was to determine by use of a computer those persons who were not on the Legislative Council roll and who might be eligible for admission to the roll under the qualification "inhabitant occupier". Programmers were asked to arrange that, in processing separate tapes which contained the lists of electors enrolled for the House of Assembly and Legislative Council, the tapes should determine "all males (not on Legislative Council) from a household that does not have an 'inhabitant occupier' on the Legislative Council roll or, if there are no males at all in that household, then all females". This same programme was used to compare House of Assembly and Legislative Council rolls for the whole of the State. It should be noted that (1) where discrepancies

existed between place of living of members of a household as shown on the House of Assembly roll as opposed to the Legislative Council roll, and (2) where discrepancies existed between place of living of members of a household as shown on the House of Assembly roll itself, the computer would not recognize such different addresses as the same household.

2. For many years claim forms have been forwarded by the State Electoral Department to electors who have appeared to own either the freeholder or leaseholder or Crown leaseholder property qualification. Information for this purpose has been extracted from information received from the Lands Titles Office. Similarly, claim forms have been forwarded to men who appeared to possess war service qualification. It was the policy of the department to insert the qualification which the elector appeared to own on the card sent out in each of these cases. During the two-month period February 23, 1967 to April 20, 1967 there were 10,998 such cards posted to electors bearing the qualification number indicating "freeholder", "leaseholder" or "Crown leaseholder". The tick printed against the category "inhabitant occupier" on all cards issued on May 24, 1967 was in continuation of this departmental policy.

#### SUMMONSES.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins for the Hon. L. R. HART (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation during the present session of Parliament to provide for the delivery of summonses by post?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is unlikely that sufficient Parliamentary time will be available this session.

#### HOUSING TRUST.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (on notice): In view of the present concern with the state of the building industry, will the Chief Secretary indicate:

1. How many South Australian Housing Trust homes were in the course of construction at June 15, 1967?
2. How many completed South Australian Housing Trust homes were vacant at June 15, 1967?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are:

1. 2,186.
2. 517.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Deputy's Speech:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I have the privilege of moving the adoption of the Address in Reply. I accept this task with satisfaction when I look back over the two-and-a-quarter years this Government has been in office and recall the achievements during that time. We have had the honour of His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, Sir Mellis Napier, again opening Parliament this year. This is the ninth occasion on which he has carried out this duty and it is one of the many functions he has performed over a very long period as Lieutenant-Governor and as the Governor's Deputy. We are concerned at the continued indisposition of His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, and I know that all honourable members will join with me in wishing him a speedy recovery.

I wish to join with other honourable members of the Council who have paid a tribute to the late Robert Stanley Richards, who served this State with distinction for so many years. I was associated with Mr. Richards for a considerable number of years and I know from personal experience and very close association with him over that period of the services he gave to the State. I know that honourable members sincerely regret the passing of such an esteemed gentleman. I refer also to the passing of Rufus Sanders Goldney, who was a member of the House of Assembly for about 15 years, and to the late Charles Caleb Dudley Octoman, an honourable member of this Council for a short period. These respected members gave their services to the State, and I join with Sir Mellis in extending sympathy to the families of these worthy men.

I refer with pleasure to the appointment of the Honourable D. A. Dunstan, Q.C., as Premier of this State. He is a young, alert and capable man, and I have no doubt that

his name will go on record as serving his State with distinction and as a worthy successor to his distinguished predecessors. I pay a tribute to the work and devotion to duty of the Honourable Frank Walsh, who led this Government and served this State to the fullest extent of his ability during the past two-and-a-quarter years and his Party for many years before his advancement to the position of Premier.

As members will recall, the last session of Parliament was a very long one and many Bills were introduced. This is not to say that this session will be any shorter, as the Government has a list of Bills which will keep both Houses very busy for a long time. This programme has been referred to by the Governor's Deputy in his Speech and every effort will be made by the Government to push forward with this heavy programme of work.

It is unfortunate that, following on a dry year, there is every indication that this year will be even worse. This will throw a burden on the people and on the Government, but I can assure you that the Government will do all in its power to offset the adverse effect on the State as a whole. As Minister of Roads, I am endeavouring to keep work at the highest possible pitch, and my officers are pressing forward with planning on several major projects. This is in addition to the current work proceeding on the Keswick and Jervois bridges and on the Hills freeway. Two major projects in the country area will do much for the State. I refer to the new bridge over the Murray at Kingston, and a second bridge at Port Augusta. Both of these bridges will do much to assist in the transport industry. This indicates that the Government is spending considerable moneys on large schemes in the country as well as in the metropolitan area.

Some criticism has been levelled at the Government in relation to its expenditure on bridge works being provided for out of the Highways Fund. The Leader of the Opposition in another place, when addressing a transport meeting, stated that this work should have been provided for out of Loan moneys so that funds would not be diverted from road construction into bridge construction. The position is, of course, that these bridges are directly associated with roadworks, and I consider that it is not in the best economic interests to divert Loan funds for these purposes when the Highways Fund can be used.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There was no diversion of Loan funds, though.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: There would be a diversion if provision were made from Loan moneys. I assure honourable members that these works are urgent.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Didn't your Party vote for the Morphett Street Bridge Bill?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Only a limited amount of Loan moneys is available, and to have utilized Loan moneys on these bridge works would have meant a considerable slowing down and indeed a cessation of other important works in this State such as hospitals and schools. In addition, I point out that had Loan moneys been made available to the Highways Department for building these bridges, that Loan money would have had to be paid back into the Treasury. Also, the Highways Department would have been paying the interest on the Loan moneys made available, and this would have diverted more money than would be the case with the bridges being provided from the revenue of the Highways Department itself.

At the beginning of 1966, the Highways Department took over the control of roads throughout the Far North and, with special assistance from the Commonwealth Government plus a large contribution from the Highways Fund will, during the next financial year, press ahead with improvements to the Birdsville Track. A great deal needs to be done in the North, but this work will have a beneficial effect on the quick transport of stock for marketing purposes and also in case of need when droughts occur.

Work will continue on drainage problems within the metropolitan area. During the next financial year, there will be an increase in activity on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme and this will tend to keep employment in this sector at a higher level. As mentioned by Sir Mellis, about \$34,000,000 will be spent this year by the Highways Department, both on main roads and major works and also in grants and special allocations to local government authorities. This will mean that in this sector of Government work more money than last year will be expended, and this will keep the employment level on roadworks higher than last year.

Mr. President, the question of the amount of work this Government has been able to do is one which has given me a great deal of concern over the past two years or more. Honourable members of the Opposition have repeatedly attempted to discredit this Government by mentioning at every opportunity that the Labor Government has squandered all of the money

left in the Treasury by the previous Administration. The figure they mention is somewhere about \$17,000,000. What they forget to mention is that, while the previous Government may have left such a sum in hand, it did make quite sure that any Government to follow would have a difficult time trying to meet the cost of major works commenced, or approved, at the beginning of March, 1965. Whether the previous Government saw the "writing on the wall" and knew it could not possibly be re-elected is something I often wonder about, but at the same time it is a remarkable coincidence that by the time it left office it had committed the next Government to an expenditure on Loan works of over \$41,000,000. This makes the much publicized \$17,000,000 in hand look rather different. It was certainly not money in hand; it was less than half the debts left behind.

No doubt there will be many plausible excuses for this state of affairs, but I believe in dealing in facts, and the facts are that the previous Government had over-spent and would have been in a serious position if it had succeeded in being re-elected. If that had happened, maybe the position would have been much worse by now, with similar fictitious credits and much larger debts. As it is, the present Government has been able to carry on with these works for which it was committed and at the same time proceed with its own programme, although at a reduced level because of the previous Government's committal of funds, and has still been able to keep the State's finances in a reasonable position.

The type of problem this Government has been faced with is brought to light in the recent report brought down by the Public Works Committee on the Fulham Gardens and Henley and Grange Drainage Scheme. This scheme, approved by the previous Government, has had a sad history, brought about mainly by the fact that in setting up such an authority under an Act of Parliament the Government of the time took no action to properly control the spending of Government funds. The result is that the authority has come to the Government for more money to finish the scheme, which in the end will cost nearly double the original estimate. This is a state of affairs the Public Works Committee has recognized by criticizing the lack of control in its recent report and recommending that no funds, other than those approved under the previous Act, be made available to the authority. This will mean that the councils themselves will have to foot the bill. If proper control had been written

into the Act authorizing this scheme, it might have been possible to keep the cost within reasonable limits.

Mr. President, I point out to honourable members that this particular Act was assented to in October, 1964—only a few months before the previous Government failed to be re-elected. This is just another example of the State finances being committed, although in this case not to a major extent. The whole of the administration of the work, the calling of tenders, and the actual construction, was left in the hands of an authority comprising members of the two councils concerned. No provision was made for a Government representative on the authority and, in fact, Cabinet decided in January, 1965, not to be represented. All this Government has had to do is find the money, of which 50 per cent will be repaid by the councils over a period of 53 years.

The hard facts are that the Act authorized the spending of \$772,600, and by the time half of the scheme was completed \$503,000 had been spent by the authority, leaving a balance of approximately \$270,000 to finish the scheme. The latest estimate to complete the scheme is approximately \$830,000, making a total of \$1,602,600, which is almost double the original estimate. As I am dealing in facts, it is only fair to say that some of this increase must be attributed to rising costs; but, since the actual work commenced only two years ago, the increased costs cannot possibly be all attributed to normal increases in costs. I am not trying to blame the authority, the contractors or any particular organization associated with the work, but must point out the serious error by the previous Government which did not wish to have a Government representative on the authority or to provide for supervision of the work to ensure that the best results were obtained.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is a wonder the Minister did not take some action when he was a member of the Public Works Committee to look into this. I should have thought he would.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member may like to look at the previous report. If the Government had decided to have at least superficial representation, perhaps we would not have been in the position we are in today. As I stated, despite the recommendation made to the previous Government to have representation on this authority, it rejected it. This is all in documentary form.

I should like to point this out to honourable members so that, when they come to address themselves to this matter, they will know a

little more about the position before they criticize me for what I am saying today. In the report forwarded to the Playford Government, it is to be noted that it includes a recommendation for the formation of a constructing authority responsible to the Minister of Local Government: "Whatever the constitution of that authority may be, it would be very desirable that this department should be represented on it." That was a recommendation. I am citing this briefly because I do not want to delay honourable members by going into it fully now. When this matter was brought before Cabinet at that time, this was the decision:

The Corporations of Woodville and Henley and Grange have set up a constructing authority for this scheme (the drainage scheme) and Cabinet consideration of the following is required:

- (1) Desirability of Government representation on the constructing authority committee.
- (2) Approval for the financial arrangements set out in the Minute of the Commissioner of Highways dated January 20, 1965.

In Cabinet:

- (1) Not approved to have representation.
- (2) Approved.

That is, the financial arrangements were approved whereby the Government at this stage finds the whole of the amount of the expenditure but it is paid back 50 per cent by the respective councils over a period of 53 years. So the position in the last financial year is this. In the year 1965-66 the allotment in the Estimates was \$350,000 for this scheme. In December, 1965, I had to find, through Cabinet but under my administration, a further \$140,000 which was transferred from the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. In June, 1966, a further \$10,000 was also transferred from the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, which was a total of \$494,000 spent on the Henley and Grange and Fulham Gardens schemes during the year, of which about \$150,000 had to be obtained at the expense of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme.

People talk about what they call the maladministration by the present Government. There is no doubt in my mind that, had the previous Government done what it should have done about this, this Government would not be faced with the present position. I refer honourable members, in further substantiation of what I am saying, to the last report of the Public Works Committee, when the continued increase in what is known as Stage 2 of this scheme was referred back to that committee.

I do not intend to read it fully, but there are two passages that I want to draw to the attention of honourable members. The first is:

The Government subsidy on a fifty-fifty basis should apply to a maximum expenditure of \$772,600—

which was the original estimate—

and the Government should exercise strict control of the works to be carried out with the balance of subsidy funds available. The councils should be responsible to find the funds beyond this amount.

Under the recommendation of the Public Works Committee we find the following:

The Committee recommends the construction of Part 2 of Stage 1 of the Fulham Gardens-Henley Beach Floodwaters Drainage Scheme, at a total estimated cost of the complete Stage 1 of \$1,221,210. The Committee is apprehensive of this and similar schemes involving the Government in an expenditure in excess of the amount agreed upon when the scheme was promoted and since this could be used as a precedent, the Committee further recommends:

- (1) The Government should not be involved in any expenditure beyond \$772,600 originally agreed upon and the subsidy should be related to 50 per cent of this figure;
- (2) The tender of Roche Bros. (S.A.) Pty. Ltd. be accepted;
- (3) The Government should determine which drains are to be constructed with the balance of subsidy funds available under existing legislation and high priority should be given to the closed drains 2, 3 and 4 in Coronation Avenue and Cudmore Terrace and the open drain north of Grange Road; and
- (4) More effective supervision should be exercised in the spending of Government funds on any similar project and this should be provided for in future legislation.

That is the committee's recommendation on this matter. It is too late for this Government to come in now, because this was done by the Playford Government. However, I assure the Council that the metropolitan drainage scheme will be dealt with shortly by the Government and its financing and supervision will be properly handled. When members of the Opposition talk about maladministration they should look at themselves before they talk about the present Government; they should remember the problems that the Walsh Government inherited.

I have spent some time on this aspect of the problems inherited by the Walsh Government. It is necessary to point out some of the facts to refute the allegations made by members of the Opposition that this Government is squandering funds left by the Playford Government. This is not true; in fact, by the time we took office, we were committed to a rate of spending

on Loan works projects that the Playford Government had never been able to achieve.

As mentioned by Sir Mellis Napier, the Local Government Act Revision Committee is proceeding with the very considerable task of rewriting and revising the whole of the Act. Although evidence has been taken from many organizations and persons, many private rate-payers and councils are still continuing to submit their views to the committee, and until all these matters have been investigated the revision of the Act cannot be completed.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What is holding it up?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: We desire to allow everybody who desires to do so to place submissions before the committee, either in writing or in person. Some councils still desire to place matters before the committee, but the stage has been reached where the committee's inquiries are fast approaching an end. Shortly the committee will be on the job of rewriting the Act; its work will then be submitted to the Government, and later to Parliament.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They want to give everybody a fair go.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That is the purpose; we could have completed it earlier if we had not worried about giving councils sufficient time to submit their views. Although this revision is taking longer than at first anticipated, I am sure that the committee will produce an Act that will serve local government well for many years to come. Its report is expected soon. The committee investigating the local government accounting procedures is well ahead with its work and a report is expected shortly. Two of the three members of this committee are also members of the revision committee, and this dual task is adding to the work-load of these officers.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Has every council made a submission?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Every council was circularized very early in the piece. The purpose of the committee was explained to them and the circular informed the councils that they could submit evidence in writing or in person.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Don't you think you will find it necessary to co-ordinate the Planning and Development Act and the Local Government Act?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It is planned to bring the Planning and Development Act into force as from July 1 and to appoint the members of the State Planning Authority, the Planning Appeal Board, and the secretaries to both of these bodies. As honourable members



are aware, the administration of this Act has now been transferred to me, and I look forward to real development in this State as a result of this forward-looking legislation.

We heard a lot last week about the town planning of the Playford Government. I said, by way of interjection, that it took the Playford Government 32 years to do it. Elizabeth was mentioned; I do not think it can be denied that forward planning was involved in connection with the city of Elizabeth. We can learn much from the planning involved in that city's development. However, there are other areas where no action at all was taken by the previous Government. I refer to the Noarlunga township area. Port Noarlunga and Christies Beach are fast-developing areas where no planning has taken place. Noarlunga will become a very big centre. The previous Government's planning was confined to the one town of Elizabeth. I hope that under the new Act these matters will be dealt with adequately by the authority in full co-operation with the local councils.

As was recently announced by the Premier, negotiations for the mining of copper once again in South Australia are well advanced and it is hoped that this industry will be established in the foreseeable future. This has been made possible by the work of the Mines Department in its activity in exploring the State for mineral resources. Work is proceeding on the proposal to bring natural gas from Gidgealpa and Moomba, and legislation to enable this new fuel to be distributed for the benefit of the State will be before the Council during this session.

Whilst the Government has done a great deal in the last two and a quarter years, I feel sure that for the balance of its term of office the Government will press ahead at an even greater pace, and this must bring rewards for the people of South Australia. In the portfolios that are under my control, I can assure the Council that I will be doing my utmost to keep the level of activity very high and will continue to do those things the people of this State elected us to do. Mr. President, I have much pleasure in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I am indeed honoured to again have the opportunity to second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I congratulate my friend the Hon. Stan Bevan for the very able manner in which he moved the motion. I express appreciation to the Governor's Deputy, Sir Mellis Napier, who was

called upon at short notice to declare this session of Parliament open. Sir Mellis has now performed this duty on nine occasions, which I believe is a record for any Lieutenant-Governor of this State.

It was as a result of a slight illness suffered by His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, that Sir Mellis was called upon to perform the opening ceremony of Parliament. I sincerely wish His Excellency, Sir Edric Bastyan, a speedy and complete return to good health. I regret very much that His Excellency was unable to declare open this session of Parliament, as it was possibly the last opportunity His Excellency had to carry out this part of his duty before the expiration of his term of office as Governor of this State. The people of South Australia are indebted to His Excellency and Lady Bastyan for the very fine and able way in which they have carried out their duties over the last six years.

Both Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan have shown very real and keen interest in the welfare of this State and its citizens. They have travelled extensively throughout the State, winning the hearts of the people wherever they went. They have not spared themselves one bit in their desire to give of their best during their term of office. We shall all be sorry to say farewell to Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan, but we are united in expressing our thanks and appreciation for services well done and we wish them both good health and future prosperity.

Reference was made in His Excellency's Speech to the passing of two former members and one sitting member of this Parliament, and I desire to associate myself with those references. First, the late Robert Stanley Richards gave service to this State as Leader of the Opposition for 11 years. He served also as a Minister of the Crown for three years and held the position of Premier for a short period. Secondly, the late Rufus Goldney also served this State for a long period, being a member of the House of Assembly for about 15 years. The third reference was to the late Charles Dudley Octoman, who became a member of this Council at the same time as I was elected to it. The late Mr. Octoman was well respected by all members of this Chamber and showed a great amount of ability and a dedication to the position he held.

The last 12 months have brought many changes to this Council. I refer to the stepping down of the Hon. Les Densley from the

position of President of this Council, and to his subsequent retirement. I express my appreciation and thanks to the Hon. Mr. Densley for the help he gave me and his tolerance during my early days in Parliament. I regret that his retirement was brought about by ill health, and I sincerely wish him a complete return to good health and many happy years of retirement. That retirement, Mr. President, brought about your elevation to your honoured position. Your long service to this Council, Sir, gave you experience for the position, and that experience could now react against any member who might think that he could "put one over" you at any time. No doubt you are well aware of such a possibility and no doubt you will, on occasions, turn the blind eye and give all members a reasonable and a fair go. I am certainly looking forward to that. Your elevation, Mr. President, resulted in the appointment of a new Leader of the Opposition in this Council. I have previously congratulated the Hon. Mr. DeGaris; I now express the wish that he may continue to hold his position for many years. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Springett on his election to this Council and I look forward to his participation in the affairs of this Chamber. I do not know whether there is any significance in the present trend of the Liberal and Country League in pre-selecting doctors as members of Parliament but I noticed in the press that, following the election of the Hon. Mr. Springett, another doctor won pre-selection for the House of Assembly seat of Norwood.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is the members of the L.C.L. who do that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is a few of the members of the L.C.L. who do it. However, it is not general practitioners that the L.C.L. needs so much as plastic surgeons, because the L.C.L. will have to change its ways considerably and perhaps take another name before being elected as the Government.

We commence this session of Parliament with a new Premier, the Hon. Don Dunstan, and I heartily congratulate him upon his appointment to that high position. Mr. Dunstan is a young man with high ideals and qualifications. He is also a man of high principles who has the welfare of the citizens of this State at heart. In addition, he has a burning desire to see the further and better development of this State. South Australia and the Government can be proud of having such a man at the head of affairs. I think the members of the Labor Party made a

good choice when they elected Mr. Dunstan as Premier. Unlike their opponents, they were fortunate that when their Leader stepped down they had a man with practical experience and plenty of ability to take his place. They did not have to go outside Cabinet when making a choice.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: You'll get on!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I got on before he was elected Premier and it is because we got on so well that we are now working in harmony today.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What the honourable member is frightened of now is getting off!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will not get off, at least as a member of the Government, for many years. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Story and his colleague on their pre-selection for the next election. I know they will continue to occupy the Opposition benches! The Government was able to find a capable man to appoint as Leader, a man with experience in Cabinet, whereas the Opposition treated its Cabinet members in the same way as the people of South Australia treated it and completely ignored those members when looking for a new Leader in both Houses of Parliament.

I also pay a tribute to the Hon. Frank Walsh for the fine work he performed during his short term of office. As Premier, he lost no time in putting into effect many of the promises he made before the last election. Mr. Walsh worked with strong determination and a desire to make this one of the leading States. He achieved more in his two years of office than any other Leader achieved in any six-year period. His most notable achievement was when, mainly through his efforts and those of the Hon. Mr. Bevan, he made it possible for the State to construct a pipeline to carry natural gas to Adelaide. With it came the prospects of a great future industrial expansion for this State.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I wonder whether the electors of this State will be "conned" into believing this?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They are not being "conned" like the two members of another place were "conned" when they visited Victoria recently into believing that that State's economy was buoyant! South Australia owes a debt of gratitude to the Hon. Frank Walsh. It was not his fault or the fault of the citizens of this State that he was not Premier for a longer period; it was because of the deliberate, undemocratic and most vicious form of gerrymandering brought about by the members of the Liberal Party. Those members

obtained power and clung to office despite the fact that throughout the past 30 years (with the exception of one election) they received a minority of votes while the Labor Party persistently received a higher percentage of votes but was denied the reins of Government. I was pleased to hear the Hon. Mr. Rowe say on Thursday, when speaking on another matter, that certain action was legal but not ethical. I wonder where the ethics were when he was a party to a Government that was prepared to hold office when it received only 46 per cent of the votes election after election? I should be glad if an honourable member would show me the ethics in that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who supplied those figures?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member may go to the statistician in the same way as anybody else may go. He cannot deny that repeatedly in the last 30 years the Labor Party obtained more votes than the Liberal Party, with that one exception, yet that Party clung to office despite those figures and the wishes of the electors of South Australia.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I will get the correct figures for the honourable member later.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Leader will find himself further down the drain, because the figures I quoted were conservative.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is a change!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It may be a change, but nevertheless it is a fact. The Government, before its election, promised the people that it would attempt to bring about a fairer and more democratic representation in Parliament. It attempted to do so, but its efforts and the wishes of the people were frustrated by the members of this Council. If those members received 100 per cent of the votes from voters on the Legislative Council roll they would still be representing less than 40 per cent of the electors of this State. Despite this they still set themselves up to frustrate the Government in its attempt to give everybody a "fair go" when voting. During the last session, the Opposition attempted to get political kudos through the unfortunate people who were unemployed. The Government does not like to see anyone unemployed, nor do I, and I sincerely hope that no-one does. The Government is to be complimented on the fact that, despite unwarranted attacks upon it because of the

State's financial position, it continued with its major works programme. This meant that at least this Government was able to keep the State's total unemployment figure to about 2,000 less than the figure in 1961, when there was a similar recession throughout Australia and when there was a Liberal Government in this State.

The Hon. Mr. Hill admitted last Thursday that 2.1 per cent was the average of unemployed in 1961, compared with 1.9 per cent today. This is better by about 9 per cent than the 1961 figure. And bear in mind that the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to play politics and deny to this State a fair share of its new civil and defence works spending. This can be borne out by the official figures released in the press on Thursday, May 4, showing the money spent by the Commonwealth on new works in this State since 1956. The figures are as follows:

	Commonwealth.	South Australia.	Per cent of Commonwealth.
	\$	\$	
1956-57 ..	34,162,000	5,386,000	15.7
1957-58 ..	34,274,000	4,732,000	13.8
1958-59 ..	41,638,000	7,598,000	18.2
1959-60 ..	44,792,000	11,884,000	26.5
1960-61 ..	42,578,000	7,746,000	18.2
1961-62 ..	44,884,000	7,094,000	15.8
1962-63 ..	45,058,000	6,461,000	14.3
1963-64 ..	47,538,000	5,580,000	11.7
1964-65 ..	64,318,000	4,970,000	7.7
1965-66 ..	89,247,000	5,387,000	6.0
1966-67 ..	107,790,000	4,420,000	4.1

(estimated)

I point out that there was a slight recession in 1960-61, when there was more unemployment than there is now. Is it reasonable for the Commonwealth Government to play politics simply because the Government of the State is not of the same political colour? When there was a recession in 1960-61, the Commonwealth spent 18 per cent of its expenditure on civil and new works, but in 1966-67, when there is a similar Commonwealth-made recession, the Commonwealth Government is prepared to spend only 4 per cent of an estimated \$107,000,000 in this State. Is it any wonder this State has something to complain about?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But that includes defence expenditure, doesn't it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, but the Commonwealth Government is spending an extra \$20,000,000, yet it is giving South Australia nearly \$1,000,000 less than it gave it last year, when it was spending only \$89,000,000.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: What do you suggest it should spend it on?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Do not tell me there are not works in this State on which the Commonwealth Government could spend its money. How many times has the honourable member complained about the Adelaide Airport? The Commonwealth Government could build more offices instead of paying to occupy seven floors of the *Advertiser* building so that this company will have its building paid for at the taxpayers' expense. Let the Commonwealth Government spend some money in this State instead of playing politics and giving South Australia a miserable 4 per cent of its spending, whereas in 1959-60 it was able to give 26 per cent and in 1960-61 it was able to give 18 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It cannot build a rocket range every year!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, but it could spend money on the airport.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Aren't the pressures greater in the more populous States?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The only States where the pressure is great are those with Liberal Governments. The Commonwealth Government is not prepared to give a fair deal to the people of this State, but it is prepared to bow to the wishes of the Liberal Governments in other States. It is showing itself weak in regard to the pressures put on it by those Governments.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you included in your figures the \$15,000,000 for the pipeline?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We have not received that yet. These are the estimated figures given by the Commonwealth Government. You, Mr. President, have no doubt read them and are aware that South Australia will not benefit as much as the other States will, but did you raise your voice in protest? I have not heard or read about it in the press. The figures I have given show an estimated record expenditure by the Commonwealth on new works for 1966-67 of \$107,790,000, yet this State's share is a record low since 1956 of \$4,420,000 or 4.1 per cent of the total expenditure by the Commonwealth on new civil and defence works, compared with the spending of \$7,094,000 or 15.8 per cent at the time of the previous Commonwealth-made recession of 1961.

The Hon. C. R. Story: On what specific project were we knocked back?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not know that we have been knocked back on any project, but how many times has the Commonwealth Government had to knock back something it wanted to do on its own property at West Beach? How many times has the Commonwealth Government been asked to improve conditions at the Adelaide Airport, not only by the Government of this State but by Senators from this State? If the Commonwealth Government wants to keep employment high in this State it must exercise its share of the responsibility. We have lost out on Commonwealth Government spending in this regard. The people in this State wanted a Labor Government, and the Commonwealth Government said, "You will pay for it; we will not spend money in South Australia."

I was interested to read in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday, June 14, that the Leader of the Opposition in another place said that he and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris were looking at aspects which may be of benefit to South Australia and which could help the Liberal Party formulate its policy for the next State elections. Honourable members will recall reading in the press some time ago that questions were fed into a computer seeking a policy for the L.C.L. This was not satisfactory, as the computer came out with the answer, "Give up the ghost. The Labor Party is so far in front and you have no policy." Not satisfied with the answer, the Opposition sent its two leaders to Victoria to have a look at the position.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Computers give some queer answers.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They certainly do, and that is why some people had to go to Victoria to try to get something that might benefit them in their policy for the next election. Mr. Hall said that Victoria's economy was obviously buoyant. It is true that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris did not make a statement, but it is also true that he went with Mr. Hall to another State and he has not denied what Mr. Hall said.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We know what you are going to say. The reason is that so many South Australians are over there looking for jobs.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They were certainly disillusioned when they went over to Victoria to look for a job. Mr. Hall's statement about the buoyancy of Victoria's economy was repeated on television on Monday, June 19. One wonders how he could arrive at such a decision when the Premier of Victoria (Sir Henry Bolte) said

when speaking to his Budget last September that although Victoria had budgeted for a balance on the accounts for 1965-66 the revenue had, in fact, fallen short of expenditure by \$8,000,000. From the report given to the press by the Leader of the Opposition in the other House it would appear that the Opposition was anxious to get the same buoyant position as that in Victoria. Consequently, it must be in favour of higher charges and certain transport controls that operate elsewhere. It probably favours also the higher amount paid per capita in Victorian State taxation, which is \$52.96 compared with \$36.68 in this State. Members of the Opposition talk about the buoyancy of Victoria, but the fact is that the per capita taxation in South Australia is about \$16 less than it is in Victoria.

While the Leader in another place was speaking on television about the buoyancy of the economy of Victoria, I was reading in the *News* the same day that Victoria had the biggest rise of any State in unemployment figures for the month of May. The Victorian figure for May rose by 2,666, compared with a rise in South Australia of 154. Yet the Opposition talks about the buoyancy of Victoria, and it sends its Leaders there to get their election policy. Someone must have been able to sell a good story to the respective Leaders during their recent trip. Let us hope we do not have that type of buoyancy here.

In my maiden speech in this Council I was very critical of the way in which the Playford Government had failed to keep up with other States and with other countries in making provision for the proper care and training of the mentally handicapped. I criticized the Playford Government for taking nearly two years to reply to certain requests made to it by the Mentally Retarded Children's Society. I went on to say that eventually something had been done for the mentally handicapped.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It would be a help if they could get a new hospital.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member will see that something will be done about a new hospital before the present Government's first term expires. The honourable member's Government was in power for 32 years, and all it could come up with were plans. The Labor Government has been in office for only two years, as the people know. The people are pleased that we are in Government, because we are coming up with something practical in this regard. It took the Liberal Government 32 years merely to prepare plans.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Our Government always came up with matching money for projects we started.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Your Government was always 32 years too late with anything.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I challenge the Hon. Mr. Story to name one instance when we haven't come up with something we promised.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What about Elanora and Strathmont?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You had the project before you for 10 years but did not lift a finger.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We will not need 30 years to put up Strathmont.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the university?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Is it any wonder the Playford Government could not come up with anything more than plans at the end of 30 years when it took over two years to answer correspondence addressed to it by the Mentally Retarded Children's Society? Eventually something was done for the mentally handicapped. I am pleased to report that the Labor Government has continued to provide facilities for the training of the mentally handicapped, and at present there are 16 occupation centres in South Australia being conducted by the Education Department. These have 95 trained teachers and three teacher aides, and they are training 850 children.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: And you are completely satisfied?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I said that I complimented this Government for continuing to do things for the Mentally Retarded Children's Society. Many years ago the Liberal Government sent Dr. Constance Davey overseas, but when she came back her report was pigeon-holed by that Government for about 24 years. Is it any wonder we are so far behind in this regard? Eventually, this work was started by the Playford Government. In addition to the 16 occupation centres in this State, there are three sheltered workshops catering for another 100 mentally retarded adults. These are outside of the institutions. The Mentally Retarded Children's Society was grateful to the Labor Government for providing a subsidy for its third sheltered workshop, which is situated at Kent Town, and it appreciates the assistance received from the Government for the purchase of another property at Stepney. The first sheltered workshop in this

State erected by the society received no subsidy at all. The Playford Government came to the party with the second sheltered workshop.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You must have pioneers.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The only time the Liberal Government woke up was when it was pushed. The officers of the Psychology Branch of the Education Department are to be complimented on their dedication to the welfare of the people under their guidance. It is pleasing to see that the Commonwealth now intends to assist in the establishment of sheltered workshops for the handicapped. As a result, the State Government may not be asked for assistance in this field. Of course, this does not mean that the Government will not be asked for further assistance, which I know it will be happy to give. I can tell honourable members that this Government will be asked for assistance in providing subsidies for hostels for children attending occupation centres in the country. The Psychology Branch now believes it is better for children from outlying districts to be taken into a large centre for training, rather than that small centres should be set up throughout the country. I fully agree with that.

Early in the life of the Labor Government two former Ministers of the previous Government who had previously been in charge of town planning decided that this function should now be placed in the hands of the Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You opposed it.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not oppose it: I said that this Council had the right to make a recommendation but that the Government had the right to say who would administer town planning. The fact remains that honourable members decided in their wisdom that this would be a good recommendation to make to the Government. No doubt members were pleased to learn that the new Premier had acted quickly on the recommendation of this Council to have the administration of town planning transferred to the Minister of Local Government. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Bevan, because I know he will do a very good job. The report to the Liberal Government in 1962 will now see the light of day, something that would not have happened had that Government remained in office.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Are you glad that he took notice of the Council on transferring town planning to the Minister of Local Government?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. President, you can see how they try to misrepresent the position. I have already pointed out that I did not oppose its going into the hands of the Minister of Local Government. What I did object to was the fact that the two Ministers concerned in a previous Government were getting up and saying, now that they are out of office, that they thought the portfolio should have been transferred. They were the two people concerned with this matter in the previous Government; they were handling it, but it was not until they were in Opposition that they decided it would be a good idea that town planning should be administered by the Minister of Local Government. I opposed the Opposition's seizing the opportunity to bring forward that resolution. I did not oppose its going into the hands of the Minister of Local Government.

It appears, from a pamphlet called the *Voice of South Australia*, brought out by the Liberal and Country League that, in addition to finding Andrew Jones, it has had some luck, in that it has been able to find, after more than two years of this Government, a 28-year old truck driver, a 30-year old housewife, a 27-year old housewife, a 42-year old clerk and a 36-year old stenographer, who were prepared to say that this Government was not keeping the promises made to the people prior to the last elections. They say this is the *Voice of South Australia*. We all know what a fact is: it is a lie and a half. Let us look at the truth of the position. Subject to the members of this Council passing the Bills as forecast in the Deputy Governor's Speech, this Government will have fulfilled over 90 per cent of its promises in a period of less than three years, which is something that no other Government has been able to achieve. It is obvious that the eight people out of a population of over 1,000,000 that the Liberal and Country League was able to find were either prepared to tell straight-out lies or were grossly misinformed.

The Government promised, prior to the last elections, that it would amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. This has been done, giving protection to every worker in this State while travelling to and from work, in spite of repeated statements by Sir Thomas Playford that he would never agree to such a provision. He did not think it reasonable that a worker travelling to and from work should receive protection under the Workmen's Compensation Act. That is different from what the workers had to say about it.

In addition to that, the amount of compensation payable has been increased. The worker also benefits from compensation if he receives an injury outside work other than by way of accident. We promised amendments to the Apprentices Act. We set up an Apprenticeship Commission and gave it the right to go in and see whether apprentices were being trained properly. It also had the right to refuse apprentices permission to train at factories that did not have the proper training facilities. Previously, we often found that boys were apprenticed to the motor car industry, for instance, and all they were doing was selling petrol.

We promised free school books. That has come to pass in every primary school. We promised to hold a referendum to see whether the people wanted the State to run a lottery. Although the former Leader of the Opposition in another place said, "It is like putting poison in the hands of children", everybody knows that as a result of the referendum the overwhelming majority of people favoured the establishment of a lottery; and now most people are patronizing the lottery and keeping the money in this State instead of allowing it to go to other States. We promised equal pay for teachers. We promised service pay for daily and weekly paid Government employees. We promised improvements to the Act making provision for better safety in the building industry. These things have been accomplished. I was pleased to see a report by the Minister recently that the number of accidents has been reduced as a result of the provisions of the latest Building Act.

We promised to improve the welfare of the under-privileged and of the Aborigines. This we have done. We promised to provide extra housing. This we have done. In the two years prior to March 31, 1965, the Housing Trust completed 6,072 permanent dwelling units, while in the two years since then it has completed 6,606 permanent dwelling units. We promised to make amendments to the Superannuation Act, giving increased pensions to retired persons and reducing the contributions of present contributors. The Public Service Association has publicly stated that more has been done in this State in the matter of superannuation in the past two years than was done in the previous 10 years. This was published in its journal.

Trainee teachers have received the first increase they have had for over 10 years. We have given women the right to sit on juries,

thus bringing the equality of the sexes much closer. We have introduced Totalizator Agency Board betting, and we are well on the way to 10 o'clock closing. We promised that Parliament would spend more time in session than the previous Government was willing to sit. In 1964 the House of Assembly sat for 37 days, and the Legislative Council sat for 33 days. In 1965, when this Government took office, the House of Assembly sat for 82 days, compared with 37 days in the previous year, while the Legislative Council sat for 70 days, compared with 33 days in the previous year. In the last session of Parliament the House of Assembly sat for 73 days and the Legislative Council for 66 days—exactly double the number of days it sat in 1964. Members of both sides have appreciated this. If we need further proof, we can look at the number of pages in *Hansard*. In 1964 there were 1,673 pages. This shows that members like to get together and have a chat! We gave them that opportunity, as a consequence of which the pages in *Hansard* increased to 4,381 for 1965-66, and in 1966-67 they numbered 4,054.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It improves the employment position, also!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, it certainly does, and we are the boys who look after employment more than the Opposition or the Commonwealth Government is prepared to.

The Hon. C. R. Story: All that talk for nothing.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member says "All that talk for nothing", but I am prepared to give him further illustrations if he wants them. Apparently, when he says that, he is like the truck driver who is referred to in this little pamphlet I have mentioned: he has been in the wilderness for some time. He says that all this talk has been for nothing. This Government in its two years of office, with the sanction of this Council, has passed 171 Bills, each of which has been in the interests of the State and its people. When we came into office we were told that this Council was a House of Review. In the period 1960-65 this Council had only two conferences with the other place; this is an indication of how much members who are now in opposition wanted to review what was done in another place. The present Government has been in office for only two years, and 17 conferences have been held between the two Houses. In addition, there have been occasions when this Council

has refused a conference. It refused to grant a conference when a resolution was adopted calling for a conference between the two Houses.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Usually, conferences are called for by another place.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The only reason for the conference being requested was that members of this Council had fiddled around with the Government's legislation, and the only way in which we could get out of the difficulty was to have a conference between the two Houses so that a compromise might be worked out; in this way we attempted to get what the people of this State desired and needed.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It is not the number of conferences that matters: it is the number of amendments accepted. If your people had been more reasonable we would not have needed all those conferences.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Surely it is reasonable to seek to give the people the things they want; they elected this Government so that it could see that they got these things, and then their wishes were frustrated by members of this Council, who represent less than 40 per cent of the electors of this State. And then members say it is only reasonable for amendments of this Council to be accepted!

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I think we shall be able to judge this better next year.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We shall come back with a greater majority, and then this Council will have to sit up and take more notice of what the people want. Members of this Council have had their heads in the sand for the last 30 years. In addition to what we have succeeded in doing (171 Bills have been introduced), we have also attempted to carry out other promises that we made, but we have been frustrated. We attempted to give concessions under the Succession Duties Act; the break-even point was only about \$40,000 and so about 70 per cent of the estates of this State would have been covered by this concession. We were going to increase the ante from \$9,000 to \$12,000 but members of the Opposition knocked it back. The Government also attempted to protect the assets of this State by the introduction of the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill, but Opposition members knocked it back too, despite the fact that we had told the people before we were elected what we intended to do.

The Government also attempted to achieve uniformity in trade practices, but this was thrown out of the window. We attempted to amend the Industrial Code to allow the court to consider making an award to cover agricultural workers. As the Hon. Mr. Dawkins said, when speaking on the Bill, such workers at present are living on the promise of bonuses if and when we have a good season, but this promise must be fading from week to week and year to year, for we are getting no rain. The second proposed amendment to the Industrial Code was the insertion of a clause in State awards giving preference in employment under awards to members of trade unions, the very people who pay for the conditions of employment set out in the awards. We also attempted to give an employee the right to claim wages for a period of up to six years prior to the date of the claim; such a right is given to people who wish to claim civil debts. These things were denied the people by this Council. Actually the second reading of that Bill did not pass.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It also gave the legal right to strike.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No; it did not. At least employees would have been given the opportunity to collect their just amount of wages which was denied them by some unscrupulous employer for up to six years. The honourable member has the right, and so has the Hon. Mr. Potter, to collect his debts. Lawyers even insist on getting payment before they go into court, in case they lose the case.

The matters I have mentioned regarding this Government's promises given and carried out give the lie to the claims made in the infamous *Voice of South Australia* in which opinions are expressed by the L.C.L. I can only agree with the man who was arguing the other day regarding the *Voice of South Australia* and another paper, *New Horizons*. The two fellows were arguing about the relative quality of the two papers; one said, "Have you read the *Voice of South Australia*? It is a very good paper." The other fellow said, "Yes; I have certainly read the *Voice of South Australia*, and I have also read the paper called *New Horizons*, and I think that it is well out in front." The man who was sticking up for the *Voice of South Australia* said, "I think you are mad. I only use *New Horizons* as a bath mat." The other fellow said, "All right. If you keep that up you'll soon have more brains in your toes than you have in your head."



I now desire to express my appreciation to members of the *Hansard* staff; I admit that I have not given them an easy run today and I express my appreciation to them, and also to all the Clerks, messengers, and catering staff for the way in which they have carried out their duties over the last two years. We shall be happy to look after them for the next five or six decades. I have much pleasure in seconding

the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, June 28, at 2.15 p.m.