

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 4, 1967.

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

QUESTIONS

T.A.B. AGENCIES.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the press over the weekend and today reference has been made to a possible delay in the introduction of legislation on the question of children entering T.A.B. agencies. The Chief Secretary stated in the press this morning that it would not be possible during the current session to introduce such legislation. I believe that this is a rather important amendment and, if it is not made during this session, the legislation will probably have to be delayed for 12 months. Will the Chief Secretary say why this legislation cannot be introduced this session?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: First, I wish to correct the impression given by the press statement; it is not my statement and it is not in accordance with fact. The statement was made by the President of the United Churches Social Reform Board, Sir Philip Messent. A deputation from the board came to me concerning four points, but I shall deal with only the one referred to. I made certain suggestions to it. This is what we are getting used to from the press—reporting that is not factual. The Rev. M. Trenorden, who is a friend of mine, was good enough to give me a copy of the release as given by him to the press. In dealing with the question asked by the Leader, the statement is as follows:

The deputation had made the following recommendations:

1. That legislative action be taken to prevent children from entering T.A.B. agencies, whether accompanied by their parents or not. The statement continues:

Mr. Shard in his comments and reply stated that Cabinet had considered the recommendations with the following results—

I ask that particular note be taken of this—

On recommendation No. 1: Cabinet had agreed in principle to this—

that is, that children should not enter T.A.B. agencies—

and would consider whether the question warranted an amendment but it would not be possible for any amendment to be introduced during the present session of Parliament.

That is quite contrary to what was printed: that is not my statement but the statement given by Sir Philip Messent to the press, which, as usual, has put its own interpretation on it—an interpretation that is not according to facts.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Transport obtained a reply from the Minister of Works to my recent question concerning emergency water supplies for Kimba and district?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have a reply. The Hon. Mr. Whyte, too, has asked a question on this matter, and I believe that the reply will cover both questions. I trust the Hon. Mr. Whyte will be satisfied with it. The Minister of Works has forwarded the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

This matter has been closely watched by the Water Conservation Committee for the last two years and in November, 1966, the position was reached where it was considered advisable to appoint a committee of Government officers stationed on Eyre Peninsula to investigate the position on the spot. This committee consisted of Mr. D. E. Martin, Regional Engineer at Port Lincoln of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Chairman; Messrs. D. H. Watson, Divisional Superintendent at Port Lincoln of the South Australian Railways, and M. A. Barry, inspector of the Department of Lands, as members. This committee met on a number of occasions and investigated the possibility of water being carted into the county by rail and by road. However, the combination of a cooler than average summer and some summer rains made it possible for the demand for water to be met from the existing supplies within the county.

Excluding the water stored in the tanks at Kimba for township supply purposes, the total amount of water stored in the 16 water conservation supplies in the county at present is 3,800,000 gallons, and this compares with a combined storage at the same time last year of 6,900,000 gallons. The total capacity of these supplies is 90,000,000 gallons, and despite the dry winter so far this year there is considered to be a reasonable chance of some intakes being received in these supplies before next summer. The maximum amount of work has been done by the Regional Engineer and his staff in preparing the catchment areas so that the maximum amount of runoff will occur from any rain that follows. No firm plan exists for the augmentation of supply to the area in the event of no intake being received and yet sufficient fodder still being available to carry the stock numbers mentioned. Previous investigations by the committee, however, would make it possible to formulate and implement an urgent plan of action should this become necessary. The above remarks do not apply to the Kimba township water supply, where water has been carted from

Iron Knob for many months to maintain a restricted supply. This carting will continue for as long as is necessary.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Premier and the Minister of Works have both assured me that strong representation would be made to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance necessary to begin work on the Polda to Kimba main. Since negotiations with the Commonwealth Government are now completed, can the Minister tell me what measure of success has been achieved?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will discuss the matter with my colleagues and bring back an answer to the honourable member as soon as possible.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In replies given to the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and the Hon. Mr. Whyte in relation to water supplies, reference was made to a committee of Government officers stationed on Eyre Peninsula who had investigated the problem on the spot. It is considered that it may be necessary for water to be carted to the county of Buxton by rail or road. Should it become necessary for water supplies to be carted to that area by rail or road for stock consumption, will there be a charge made to the people who require that water?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is a matter of policy and I have no doubt that the usual practice will be followed.

CAVAN CROSSING.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked on June 29 regarding the Cavan overpass?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The construction of the Cavan overpass has been delayed to study its effect on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation study. The reason for not proceeding with it during the past financial year was not that finance was unavailable.

DOCTOR SHORTAGE.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked on June 27 regarding the shortage of

doctors and on whether there is any policy regarding cadetships for medical students?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Cadetships have already been granted to two medical students to enable them to complete their course at the university. They will be bonded, after graduation and after one year as resident medical officers, to serve for a certain period wherever directed by the Government. One has successfully completed his course and is at present engaged as a resident medical officer. Regarding applications from foreign medical practitioners, the Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee set up under the 1966 amendment to the Medical Practitioners Act has up to date dealt with five applicants as follows:

One has been recommended to undertake two years' resident medical officer training prior to further examination and, if registration is granted, it will be on condition that he will be bonded to serve for a certain period wherever directed by the Government;

one has been deferred for further examination to be undertaken in October, 1967;

one was interviewed and examined on June 8 last, and the committee's recommendation is under consideration by the Medical Board; and

two were not recommended for registration.

A sixth applicant was unable to appear for interview and examination on June 8 and a date will be arranged for appearance.

MURRAY BRIDGE ROAD BRIDGE.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: On June 21 I made a short statement regarding the condition of the Murray Bridge road bridge. In that question I said:

Recently an accident which involved the replacement of certain girders appeared to reveal problems connected with the steel or iron in the structure. I therefore ask the Minister of Roads whether he will get an urgent report on the position in case the not impossible situation arises that the bridge has to be replaced.

I then suggested the possible construction of punts for the time being if the situation became urgent. The Minister gave an answer at the time based chiefly on the suggestion that we were dealing with the construction of further punts before we got the report on the condition of the bridge, and he offered then to get a report. I draw his attention to *Hansard*, which said that he would refer the

matter to the Minister and ask that it be investigated. I suggest that is a misprint and that it should be the "Commissioner". However, I now ask the Minister of Roads whether he has an answer to my query.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. I noticed the term "Minister" in the *Hansard* pull, and of course this should have been "Commissioner". I did obtain a report as suggested by the honourable member, and the answer is as follows:

Problems associated with providing a ferry service at Murray Bridge are as follows:

1. At least six ferries would be required to handle the volume of traffic which uses the crossing in 12 hours. To effectively handle peak volumes of traffic, a greater number of ferries would be necessary.
2. Selection of a site with satisfactory access on both sides owing to steep grades and difficult access on the town side and a long embankment on the river flat.
3. The cost of constructing concrete approach ramps similar to Taillem Bend and Jervois would be approximately \$160,000 a ferry crossing.
4. Land acquisition.
5. The cost of constructing the ferries at \$50,000 each.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Following the Minister's reply, I should like to point out that my question was: what is the condition of the Murray Bridge road bridge following an examination of the structure?—not about the desirability or otherwise of punts being constructed.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If the honourable member had asked what the condition of the bridge was, he would have obtained an answer accordingly. I draw his attention to his question, emphasizing whether I would give consideration to building one or two heavy duty punts in the event of an emergency happening to the bridge. Therefore, I obtained a report about the advisability of building the punts. If the honourable member wants to know about the condition of the bridge, all I can say is that the bridge is in sound condition. We have investigated this matter and I have stated previously that it would be necessary to replace the stress bolts in this bridge, which is being done at the moment. As a matter of fact, I signed a docket on this matter this morning to replace the stress bolts in the bridge because some of the necks of the bolts had been worn over a period of years. There is no danger at this stage, unless something unforeseen happens, of the bridge falling into the river.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Thank you; that is what I wanted.

SNOWTOWN POLICE STATION.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to the question I asked on Wednesday last concerning the Snowtown police station?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The answer to the two questions asked on this subject is as follows: Overtime is not paid to police officers who work additional hours: they are given time off in lieu. However, many members of the force consider their duties to be a public service and do not claim for the additional hours that they work. The answer to the second question is that Snowtown has been placed on the top of the priority list for country police stations and no doubt will be erected as soon as the Public Buildings Department has completed the plans and finance is available.

COOPER PEDY WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry representing the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the Coober Pedy water supply?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. My colleague has given me the following reply:

The solar still at Coober Pedy was commissioned late in November, 1966, and no wastage of water occurred. However, 25,000 gallons of production was not obtained during the latter half of December when water was recirculated. This capacity was offered to those residents who had storage at the time, but was not accepted. Plans are in hand to lay 6,000ft. of 2in. pipeline between the still and the 500,000 gallon underground tank at an estimated cost of \$5,000. This will enable any surplus production during next summer to be stored provided that natural catchment does not make this impossible.

The present ration to residents at Coober Pedy is 24 gallons a week, plus bulk rations of 200 gallons a week each to the medical centre and bakery, 50 gallons a week to the progress association for use at the drive-in theatre and one gallon a head a day is available to each traveller. In order to maintain this level of supply approval has been given to cart the necessary extra water. The overall question of future supply at the field is currently under review.

HOUSING TRUST.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the statutory inquiry into the activities of the South Australian Housing Trust?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. The reply is as follows:

In accordance with section 18 of the South Australian Housing Trust Act, an investigation covering the period ended June 30, 1965, was carried out and the report forwarded to His Excellency the Governor on July 8, 1966.

LUCERNE.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In Victoria recently lucerne wilt has been giving great concern; it is killing stands of lucerne in the northern rivers area. A report on this disease was put into the hands of the South Australian Government in October last. As a result of knowledge of this disease also, the New South Wales Government has banned the importation of all seed, hay and similar material from other lucerne and medicks from the affected areas.

This is equally important, or more so, in South Australia. Apart from the large areas of lucerne fodder plantings we have a very rich trade in lucerne seed and medick seeds, which must be lost if this disease comes into South Australia. How soon can we have protection for our industries in this matter?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and obtain a report as soon as possible.

RECREATION AREAS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of last week concerning funds for recreation areas?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, and it is as follows:

In 1964-65 the amount provided on the Estimates of Expenditure under "Part XIV Minister of Local Government—Miscellaneous" to assist councils to purchase public parks and recreation areas was \$92,000. The actual payments of grants totalled closely \$60,000. In 1965-66 the Government increased the provision for these purposes to \$250,000. Actual payments to councils were almost \$184,000 and the \$66,000 unspent was transferred to the "Deposit Account—Public Parks", to be used to assist local authorities in the future. The provision on the Estimates for 1966-67 was again \$250,000. Actual payments to councils amounted to \$190,000, of which \$66,000 was paid from the Deposit Account and \$124,000 from appropriation under "Minister of Local Government—Miscellaneous". The balance of the appropriation unused was therefore \$126,000 and this was transferred to the Deposit Account to be used as required in future for the purpose of assisting councils to acquire public parks and recreation areas.

TRANSPORT REGULATIONS.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have been approached by a member of a large transport organization in the South-East who expressed some concern at the prospect of the introduction of drivers' log books in this State. His alarm centred around the possible introduction, along with such log books, of compulsory rest periods on similar lines to the regulations in the Eastern States. Can the Minister inform the Council if the Government intends introducing similar legislation?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: First, I should like to explain that in the Eastern States there are compulsory rest periods for road transport drivers. After driving for 5½ hours a driver must have half an hour's rest; after a further 5½-hours' driving, the driver must take a compulsory rest period of 10 hours. In the opinion of many drivers and operators, this compulsory rest period of 10 hours leads to greater dangers on the road because the driver often tends to press on regardless in order to get his vehicle home within the 5½-hour period. There are other ways of tackling this problem. Before introducing regulations similar to those of the Eastern States, will the Minister inquire into this matter fully, from the viewpoint of both drivers and operators, and with due regard to the fact that the regulations in the Eastern States may not be in the best interests of road safety?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. The Bill has not yet been drafted and I shall consider the matters brought forward by the honourable member.

CHOWILLA DAM.

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: As with most people, I am concerned at the prospect of another investigation taking place into a possible new site for the Chowilla dam or for an entirely new system with headquarter storage. Can the Minister say whether it is a fact that, if tenders are not let by the end

of July, they will expire and it will be necessary for new tenders to be called? Also, when is it expected that the River Murray Commission will complete its current investigation into an alternative site (as reported in the press)?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I cannot answer the honourable member's questions in detail. I shall take up these matters with my colleague and bring back a report as soon as it is available.

WATER LICENCES.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I direct this question to the Chief Secretary as Leader of the Government and as the representative of Cabinet. On June 22 I directed a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Works concerning water licences and the Minister, in his reply, was quite confident that I would get a reply early last week. I have it on good authority that this matter has been before Cabinet for two weeks. I stress the grave importance of getting a decision on this matter. If it is only a matter of a shortage of water I am extremely interested, but if it is a matter of politics I deplore it. Can the Chief Secretary say what is holding up the report?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: All I am permitted to say is that Cabinet has discussed this matter. I agree that it is a matter of urgency. Let me say quite frankly that it is "water": I am not going any further (I have been on the road for a little while). Cabinet discussed this matter, and my understanding was that further consideration was to be given and it was expected that an announcement would be made before the end of this week.

BAROSSA VALLEY ROAD.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to what may be called the Barossa Valley Highway—that portion of the old highway 20 from Gawler to Tanunda via Lyndoch which was taken off highway 20 when the new Gawler-Greenock Road was built. I point out that this road through the Barossa Valley, despite the fact that it is no longer highway 20, is carrying a constantly increasing volume of traffic, but it has now become very rough and its shell of bitumen is very thin indeed. It is badly in need of reconstruction; there are

several bad corners. Can the Minister of Roads say whether plans are in hand to reconstruct this road in the near future?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As far as I am aware there are no plans to reconstruct this road in the near future. However, I shall ask for a report concerning the need for work on the road, and I shall bring back the report as soon as possible.

HIGHWAYS BUILDING.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (on notice):

1. What were the final total costs of the present Highways building at Walkerville, and surrounding areas, including the major details, incurred to the end of 1965?

2. How many permanent occupants of the building are there today?

3. Why was the new building, estimated to cost \$1,762,324 for the building alone, not referred to the Public Works Standing Committee as a matter of public policy, regardless of the provisions of the Highways Act?

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

1. The details of costs of the original building as at December 31, 1965, were as follows:

	\$
Land and Fencing	104,170
Building (Contract)	1,435,538
Architects' Fees	131,580
Soil Survey	3,198
Site Preparation and Drainage	15,968
Roadworks	68,876
Landscaping	12,556
Blinds and Carpets	2,306
Telephones	4,510
	1,778,702

2. There are at present approximately 430 people working in the building.

3. As the necessary money for the work could be lawfully provided without the necessity of introducing a Bill, and there was no statutory requirement to refer the work to the Public Works Standing Committee, approval to proceed with the building was given by Cabinet.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption. (Continued from June 29. Page 258.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I desire to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and in doing so I should like at the outset to compliment His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on the very dignified manner in which he again opened a session of Parliament. I express regret that

Sir Edric Bastyan was unable to preside at what would probably have been the last opening ceremony during his term of office. The Governor and Lady Bastyan have given excellent service to the people of this State and they have endeared themselves to all manner of persons in the community. In fact, I think that all honourable members regret that next year will see the end of the current term of office of His Excellency. I have heard suggestions from quite a number of people that it is rather a shame that it was apparently not possible to extend further His Excellency's period of office. I join with the Lieutenant-Governor and honourable members of this Council in expressing regret at the death of former members of this Parliament who have died since the opening of the previous session. I refer in particular to the sterling service given to this State by the Hon. Robert Stanley Richards. I have vivid recollections of being present as a teenager in the House of Assembly on a number of occasions when Mr. Richards was speaking. One could not but be impressed by him as being a first-class debater, and I think it was well recognized that he was one of the most able speakers in the House at the time. He made a distinct impression on me.

The Hon. Dudley Octoman occupied a seat in this Chamber for a comparatively short time. He had positive views and made an excellent contribution to the debates. I recall with pleasure the opportunity I had of travelling with him on one occasion throughout Eyre Peninsula, and I remember how intimately he was known to the people there and how he was liked by everybody. We miss him very much. I should like to compliment the Hon. Mr. Springett on his maiden speech in this Chamber. He made an excellent speech containing some very telling points. I wholeheartedly support what he said concerning the very urgent need for another teaching hospital to be constructed in association with the Flinders University. As honourable members will recall, I have raised this matter on one or two occasions, and it is becoming one of the most important matters calling for the attention of the Government. It is interesting to note that only last year the medical school at the University of Melbourne was doubled in capacity. This State is rapidly reaching the stage when it will be necessary for some similar doubling of our capacity. I have some reason to think that the necessary finance to establish the medical school at the Flinders University

will be forthcoming if some positive lead can be given by the Government by the establishment of a teaching hospital.

I shall confine my remarks in this debate to paragraph 21 of His Excellency's Speech and touch on one or two very important matters referred to therein. I hope later to raise one matter which I consider to be of very grave importance to the future welfare of the State and which, as far as I know, has not been given much prominence by anybody up until now. Paragraph 21 states, in part:

My Government will lay before you a complete revision of the Industrial Code particularly in respect of working conditions and the policy of equal pay for equal work. My Government will also lay before you a Bill to provide three months' long service leave after 10 years' of continuous service. It is pleasing to record that the Government's efforts to reduce industrial accidents have been effective there having been a substantial decline in the number of such accidents during the past year. The Hon. Mr. Springett congratulated the Government upon this latter result. I would be only too pleased to do likewise if I really considered that that was the true state of affairs. However, I am not convinced that this is so, because under section 329 of the Industrial Code, which is repeated in section 14 of the Construction Safety Act, it is necessary to report to the Chief Inspector an accident only if it incapacitates a person for three days or more.

The Governor's Deputy said there had been a reduction in industrial accidents. I do not think this is so, because the recent reports by the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Bureau of Census and Statistics figures refer only to accidents causing death or absence from work for one week or more. Admittedly, the 1965-66 figure for these accidents was 10,522 non-fatal, compared with 11,809 for 1964-65, but those figures represent only 18 per cent of the total compensation accidents. According to the same report, 58,350 effective claims for compensation, involving about \$9,450,000, were made in 1965-66, compared with 51,350 effective claims, involving \$7,732,000, in 1964-65. Therefore, it would appear that far more man hours were lost through industrial accidents on that interpretation of the position than on the one given in His Excellency's Speech. I mention this only in passing as a matter of some interest to honourable members.

The Premier recently returned from the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meetings, and I think it is to be regretted that he was not really very successful, because he

got no more for this Government than any one of us could have foreshadowed had we sat down and done a little arithmetic. On his way back the Premier stopped in Sydney and made a speech, as was reported in the newspapers, to some 70 leaders of industry. I note that the leading article in the *Advertiser* yesterday said that the Premier spoke "with admirable verve". Well, we all know the Premier, and I think we know that he always speaks with verve about any matter. I should imagine that we can expect in the future a lot more of the kind of things that he has been saying. I suggest that the Premier is a past master at putting up a veritable smokescreen when it comes to trying to set out what the position is in South Australia, but I say that we all must look behind the mists and the brave words at the harsh realities of the position in this State. The Premier is reported as saying that South Australia was "poised to enter a period of industrial development at a rate of growth unequalled in any part of Australia". Well, those are very brave words indeed.

I should like now, perhaps as a preliminary to my remarks, to set out what I consider are some indisputable facts about the situation of industry in this State compared with other States, particularly Victoria and New South Wales. I do not think these particular matters would be disputed by members of either Party. The first fact is that South Australia is a State small in population compared with the two States I have mentioned. Indeed, I believe that the city of Melbourne, with its environs, has a population double the entire population of this State. The second point is that South Australia is now a manufacturing State, and I submit that this has come about through the efforts of the Playford Government. In saying that I do not in any way want to minimize the importance of primary production in South Australia, for we all know how important that is. However, secondary production in this State is now beyond doubt the principal factor and the key to our economic viability. The third undisputed fact, I submit, is that we in Adelaide are many hundreds of miles from the principal markets for the manufactured goods produced in this city.

I do not think any of these matters can be disputed, and in fact the Premier has on a number of occasions been reported in the press as emphasizing these facts. I therefore say it is important that in order to establish and hold successful manufacturing industries in South Australia there must be some margin of differ-

ence between the costs in South Australia and those that apply in the Eastern States. We all know that the Eastern States are themselves very large producers of secondary goods. I will ask the following questions and attempt to answer them: where can this margin be found; where can this differentiation in cost be looked for? The first point we might consider is transport costs, and the second thing on which we might look for some difference would be in taxation advantages. The third (which I think is the most important of all) concerns the basic costs of production. These basic costs could be broadly stated to be, first, the cost of power; secondly, the wages paid to employees in secondary industry; and thirdly, the ancillary costs that are related, of course, to the general conditions of employment for those people.

Every honourable member knows the difficulties that we face with regard to transport costs. Very often a double cost is involved, for there is the cost of bringing the raw material to the metropolitan area of Adelaide for manufacture and then the cost of transporting the goods back to the Eastern States, which are without doubt our principal markets. The Premier himself has said this. In fact, he has a tendency at the moment, I detect, to attribute South Australia's slackness to the effect of the drought in the Eastern States upon the purchasing power of the citizens there. We might ask whether these transport costs could in any way be reduced. I think that if we look a bit into the future one of the important things that can be done is the completion of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie rail link. This is of inestimable importance, and it must be followed, I suggest, by the standardization of the Adelaide to Port Pirie line.

Coupled with these two projects, any Government must make sure (and keep forever an eye on the fact) that freight rates on railways are realistic. As all honourable members know, when goods are transported by rail handling costs are inevitable. In fact, they are involved both at the beginning of the rail journey and at the end. Road transport, of course, is competitive with rail transport, and I hardly think that there is any room in the future for tax reductions on road transport. I consider that in the short run we seek in vain to find any margin of difference in favour of South Australia under this heading.

What about the question of State taxation? It seems here that the policy of the present Government is by hook or by crook to drag

us up to the level of the Eastern States. Indeed, more than once in the past we have had put as a reason and as an excuse for higher taxation the fact that the rates in South Australia were below the rates in the Eastern States and therefore they had to go up. I suggest, therefore, the present Government has not conferred any benefit on the manufacturers in this State under this heading. In fact, our taxation is up to the level of that in the Eastern States.

I come now to perhaps the most important matter of all—the basic production costs in South Australia. As I said, the first thing to be considered is power. I have had some figures of power costs in this State supplied to me by the Electricity Trust. The figures are difficult to use in a debate of this kind and to draw anything other than broad comparisons from, but we can see that our overall power costs for industrial purposes are higher than those of New South Wales and than those of the hydro-electric power supplied to Tasmania; they are just slightly lower than the costs applying in Victoria. So we appear to have no great power advantages in this State at the moment. But, of course, we are hoping that in the near future natural gas will be available in Adelaide, which will be of great assistance if it is available to industry at a comparatively cheap rate. We can look forward with confidence to being better off than Victoria in the cost of natural gas.

The most important basic production costs to this State are the wages paid to employees in industry and for ancillary benefits. The Premier seems to recognize that wages in this State must continue, somehow or other, to be lower than those in the Eastern States.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I do not think that is correct.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I think this can be so; in fact, this is so. The Premier was reported in the *Advertiser* of June 15 last, when talking about price control in South Australia, as follows:

The two main advantages in price control were (1) many items that the householder had to buy each week were lower in price here than elsewhere and this helped every householder's budget; and (2) because of this lower cost of living in so many things, wages could be lower in South Australia than in some other places. This does not mean that purchasing power is less.

That is some warrant anyway for suggesting that the Premier is recognizing that wages ought to be, or somehow or other must be

(from the point of view of production costs) lower in South Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He has not always been correctly reported.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Whether or not he has been correctly reported, one thing I would join issue with him on is the claim that price control has had a real effect on the cost of living in this State, because I suggest it has not had any real effect on it at all. I have had a look at the figures of the consumer price index from the time in March 1965 when the Labor Government came into power. We perceive that in March 1965 the consumer price index figure for Sydney was 129.1, and in March of this year it was 136.4, an increase of 7.3. In Melbourne in March 1965 the figure was 132.9 and in March of this year 140.7, an increase of 7.8. The average of the six capital cities was 130.9 in March 1965, and in March 1967 it was 138.9, an increase of exactly 8. In Adelaide in March 1965 our index figure was 128.9; now it is 137.2, an increase of 8.3. So, if we compare the figures over the time that the Labor Government has occupied the Treasury benches, we can see that proportionately the cost of living in Adelaide has increased compared with that of Sydney and Melbourne. In fact, these figures are significant. So I join issue with the Premier when he suggests all the wonderful things that have followed from the maintenance of price control. In any case, on the relevant matter with which I am dealing, I do not think that price control, even if we nourish some belief that it is important from the point of view of the cost of living, has any real effect upon the materials used in our basic industries and industrial production, because most if not all of the materials used for those purposes are not subject to price control.

Since 1949, South Australia has followed the Commonwealth basic wage as a living wage for this State. Under the provisions of our Industrial Code the Board of Industry in this State is empowered to fix what is known as a living wage. It is a wage that was fixed, when it was fixed, on a needs basis. The Board of Industry looked at costs and budgets, took evidence from people in the community and made its fixation. If we look back on the figures, we can see that on many occasions the living wage in South Australia has been lower than the Commonwealth basic wage. In 1949 a living wage was fixed in South Australia for the last time. Since 1950 the Government has by proclamation fixed the living wage of South Australia by adding the Commonwealth basic

wage increases that have accrued since that time. Those increases were added without inquiry and as a matter of course.

It has always been the fact that in South Australia industry has had the benefit of a lower basic wage than has applied in all other States except Queensland. Compared with the two important States of New South Wales and Victoria, we have been significantly lower in our basic or living wage (whatever we like to call it). The latest figures show that our present basic wage is 40c below that of Victoria, and \$1.20 below that of New South Wales. The fact that we have enjoyed in South Australia a lower basic wage than in the other States has been the major factor—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Who enjoys it?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Our industrialists enjoy the fact that this has been the situation in South Australia. This has been the major factor in keeping our costs lower and enabling us to compete with industry in Victoria and New South Wales. It is not the only factor that has caused this, but I suggest that it is the principal one, coupled with, perhaps, three others: first, that less overtime has been worked over the years in South Australia thus resulting in lesser payments of penalty rates; secondly, smaller over-award payments have been made; and, thirdly, fringe benefits have been carefully watched. When speaking of fringe benefits I refer to items mentioned in paragraph 21 of the Speech, including long service leave.

The point I am attempting to make is that recently a judgment was delivered by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission. I suggest that that is one of the most important events since the opening of our last Parliament. In that judgment the concept of a total wage was accepted by the Arbitration Commission. It has been greeted on the one hand by employers with, I think, over-enthusiasm and praise. On the other hand, unions have threatened industrial reprisals. I cannot see how unionists could be unjustly affected by the judgment. I appreciate that unionists may think it will spell the end of the self-perpetuating system of wage increases but, in my opinion, the blue-collar worker will get material benefits that he did not get before.

I now refer briefly to some comments I made in this Chamber in 1964 in the debate on an Appropriation Bill. I said:

The fitter who prior to that great day, November 5, 1954, was earning £14/3/- a week, today, after the application of the two-and-a-half times formula to the margin in 1954, the 28 per cent in 1959, and the latest 10 per cent this year, is receiving an increase in his total salary over that period of 37 per cent. By comparison, a man in the State Public Service, who prior to November 5, 1954, was on a salary of £1,728 per annum, today sitting at the same desk and doing the same job is on a salary of £3150, an increase over the same period of 82 per cent. In my book that is not wage justice.

It is a situation that will be materially changed in the future for the benefit of the people who have missed out as a result of the present system.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What will such people do when it is increased by a percentage?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am coming to that. That is how I see it from the unionist's point of view. On the other hand, from the employer's point of view, I see matters in the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission's judgment that may give rise to some real headaches in the next few years. The total wage concept recently introduced has potential difficulties, no less than the old system, and it will present great difficulties for industry in this State if some of the matters mentioned in that judgment come to pass. In particular, I wish to refer to what I think is clearly implied in the judgment that in the process of time the wage differential arising from locality will disappear. I quote briefly from that part of the judgment which commences:

The community is faced with economic, industrial and social challenges arising from the history of female wage fixation.

The judgment goes on to state that the problem calls for thorough investigation in which a policy of gradual implementation could be considered. It further went on to say that the same approach could be applied to the abolition of locality differentials. The implication is clear that locality differentials in the basic wage will disappear and we are faced with the economic, industrial and social challenge of doing it.

My question is: how will industry in South Australia fare if the employers in Adelaide have to pay their employees the same wage rates as are paid in Melbourne and Sydney; in other words, if the present differential in the basic wage disappears? If the employer has also to shoulder the costs of fringe benefits in excess of those given in other States,

then I say we will really be in a mess in South Australia.

In the last few days this Government has stated that it will give four weeks' annual leave to all public servants in South Australia and that this will bring us into line with New South Wales public servants. It does that, but with nowhere else in Australia. How long does the Government think it will be before the granting of that four weeks' leave will spread to outside industry in this State? I imagine that the Clerks Union will be on the job within five minutes, and it is inevitable that such an increase will follow throughout industry as a matter of course.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The honourable member's Government gave an extra week's leave to public servants.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, but it did not grant four weeks' annual leave.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But it did give an extra week to industry generally, and that is what is being done on this occasion.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: All I can say is that in this matter this State will be dragged up to the same level as New South Wales, compared with which we at present enjoy a differential of \$1.20 in the basic wage. It is also proposed in His Excellency's Speech to introduce legislation granting equal pay for women. What is more, the statement has been made that the Government will legislate for long service leave benefits that will be further advanced than anywhere else in Australia.

How can we ever compete with the highly-industrialized States of Victoria and New South Wales, which are small in area, large in population (and that population is in very large cities), and have no real transport costs, if we grant all these additional benefits? In addition, Victoria has its own natural gas on the way. What is worse, how can we compete if we have exactly the same wages, equal taxes, higher industrial costs than anywhere else in Australia, and higher transport costs? In the face of this, I suggest that the Premier's vision splendid starts to look rather faded. What is wanted is more than just a barrage of words to disguise the real difficulties that we shall be in.

The hard-headed businessmen, as referred to in the *Advertiser's* leader (I think that was the expression), will understand; they will know whether or not South Australia is set for an industrial boom unprecedented in Australia's history. I strongly suggest that the Government should pause and think about all the

implications of the policies that it proposes to implement, according to that paragraph in the Speech of the Governor's Deputy. Certain sections of the community also should put aside their own vested interests and think first of all of the welfare of their fellow citizens and the State as a whole. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise to address myself to this motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, which I intend to support. First of all, I must express my concern, and I know all honourable members share my concern, at the unfortunate bout of serious illness that His Excellency the Governor has suffered in recent weeks. His Excellency, of course, has not spared himself in serving the community of South Australia over the last six years, nor has Lady Bastyan. I know that the Governor has the sympathy of all sections of the community in his illness, and we are glad about the later news of improvement in his condition. We wish him a speedy restoration to complete health and strength.

I should also like to congratulate Sir Mellis Napier, who has, as the Governor's Deputy or as Lieut.-Governor, opened Parliament on a number of occasions and who has given long and distinguished service to the State. With other honourable members I extend condolences to the relatives of deceased members of Parliament. I did not know the Hon. R. S. Richards to any extent, and I did not know the Hon. Mr. Goldney very well, but I did know of their long and valuable service to South Australia and (like the Hon. Mr. Potter) I was aware of the ability of the Hon. Mr. Richards as a speaker and of his service to his Party in this State. I extend my sympathy to the relatives of these two deceased gentlemen.

Also, I could not speak without referring to the lamented death of my friend and colleague, the Hon. Mr. Octoman, who served for all too short a period in this Parliament but who had given very valuable service to this State over many years. I believe that we all came to honour and respect the Hon. Dudley Octoman for the fine standard that he set in his service to the State and his work in this Parliament. I express my very deep regret at his passing, and I extend sympathy to his relatives.

It is my very pleasing duty (and I think it is the duty of all honourable members) to extend a warm welcome to the Hon. Mr. Springett. However, first allow me to say

a word of appreciation of his predecessor, the Hon. Les Densley, who preceded you, Mr. President, in the high office you now hold. I believe all honourable members appreciate very greatly the service that the Hon. Mr. Densley gave to the community and to this Parliament over a period of 23 years. His sincerity was unquestioned and his integrity was above reproach. We miss him from this Parliament and we wish him well in his years of retirement.

I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Springett on his maiden speech. I have heard him referred to, I believe somewhat facetiously, as "our doctor in the House". I very heartily join with other honourable members in welcoming him to this place. His maiden speech, if I may say so, proved (without any reflection whatever on the medical profession) that the Hon. Mr. Springett is far more than a doctor: he is a man of long political experience, both in the Old Country and in the country of his adoption. We are very glad indeed that he has come to join us in this Council.

Before I pass on to the Speech of the Governor's Deputy, I express one other regret: it is that, although I am constantly seeking a return to sane government in this State (and I am confidently expecting that this will happen within the next nine months), I regret the retirement before his time of the Hon. Frank Walsh. I have (and I believe all honourable members have) a personal regard for him. We do not question his honesty of purpose and his integrity, however mistaken we may think his policies were. I express regret that the Hon. Frank Walsh has had to retire from the position of Premier. He has been given, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said the other day, what seems to us to be a very minor portfolio and a very poor position in which to coast out, as it were, into his retirement.

Turning to His Excellency's Speech itself, I was anything but enthusiastic about what, to my mind, was the unimpressive and uninspiring programme set out. Paragraph 4 states:

The Premier's Department has actively pursued its policy of industrial promotion and has had successes in the establishment of industry as well as increased inquiries for the expansion of industry in the State.

I can find no enthusiasm whatever for this statement in the industrial areas of Elizabeth, Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully and Modbury. No doubt other honourable members will find the same climate in other industrial areas. We have had a rather severe reference in recent

days to the former Liberal Premier and two typistes; all I can say is that the former Liberal Premier and two typistes did a marvellous job for the advancement of this State.

We have been told about the establishment of the Premier's Department and the increased staff, and we have also been told that the accommodation in the Agent-General's office in London has been greatly improved and that the staff has been re-organized so that a Trade Officer is solely engaged to assist in the promotion of trade and the attraction of industries to this State. What has been the result? I have heard the former Premier, the Hon. Frank Walsh, get quite excited about a potato chip industry, although I have not heard very much about other new industries. Only today I saw a list of industries which were supposed to have been established in this State by the Labor Government. In practically every instance these industries were already in existence well before 1965. What the Labor Party was taking credit for was the fact that these industries were making some further moves, but the moves were planned long before this Government got into office.

The Hon. C. R. Story: There are a few not here now that were here in 1965.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, that is true, and some industries have had to reduce their activities or move out to other States. As a result, there are many empty homes in Elizabeth, Tea Tree Gully and associated areas. The meaning of the word "overtime" has been lost in South Australia. The economy of this State used to be buoyant and the work force was working on a budget set up on the expectation of overtime and buoyancy. Paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech states:

During the past season above average crops were reaped in all districts except the Murray Mallee, where conditions deteriorated after a poor start, and very little grain was reaped. Almost a page of the Speech is devoted to primary industries. It is quite the largest comment I have seen on rural industry since this Government has been in power. If my memory serves me correctly, I think the comments in its first year were one paragraph of about 28 words on this matter of primary industry.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The salt of the earth.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is about it—the Governor's Speech in that year contained about 28 words about the salt of the earth, but on this occasion the comments take up almost a full page.

However, I am afraid some of it is not very accurate. To say that all districts had above-average crops was not correct. Some areas were very good; some were average; and some were mediocre. Eyre Peninsula, in particular, was phenomenally good. Therefore, I repeat that the statement that good crops were reaped in all districts, except the Mallee, is not accurate. The Hon. Mr. Story last week had some comments to make on the situation in the Murray Mallee and the parts of the Mallee that are drought stricken at the moment. Of course, all parts of the Mallee are not in this difficulty, as there are some parts where farmers have been able to sow their crops and they are coming up, but there are considerable areas of the Mallee, particularly in the Loxton area and, I think, east of Loxton, and in other areas, where conditions are very bad indeed. Yet, we find that water rates accounts are being sent out to be paid by July 15, at a time when some farmers are at the bottom of the trough financially and suffering a great deal of embarrassment.

I endorse the honourable member's comments and ask that something really practical be done to alleviate the situation. The Hon. Mr. Story went on to refer to cloud seeding. I know that in Victoria Sir Henry Bolte has been doing something positive about this, but unfortunately this Government has done nothing, except that the Hon. Mr. Dunstan has generously offered to write to the banks to suggest that they might give a little more credit to the people in trouble. However, I have my doubts as to whether the banks will take much notice of him after seeing the manipulation of figures that he carried out recently in order to create the impression of a balanced Budget. Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech states:

Enrolment at Roseworthy for the current year stands at 112 which is believed to be a record. A contract has been let for a second group of new buildings consisting of Science Laboratories, Lecture Room and a plant breeding centre. It is expected that these buildings will be ready for use by March, 1968.

Nothing was said about the fact that the existing set of buildings which has just been completed has been built by Commonwealth Government money, and this will apply also to the second group of new buildings. The Premier is very good at screaming for more Commonwealth aid, or blaming Sir Thomas Playford or the Legislative Council, or saying that the Commonwealth Government does not give sufficient aid whenever it suits him to get out of his own troubles, but when the

Commonwealth Government does give worthwhile help he forgets to make any acknowledgment of it. The first set of new buildings, which consists of a machine shop and associated facilities, is excellent. I suggest that honourable members, particularly those who know the place well, find time to have a look at these buildings. They are really first class and are a splendid contribution to the continued progress of Roseworthy College.

I have no doubt that the new set of buildings now being commenced will also add to the effectiveness of the college. The intake at Roseworthy is limited to about 45 a year. I understand that the principal now has about double that number of applicants coming forward every year. I am one of those who believe that we have to give some consideration to the establishment of a second agricultural college and possibly in the future to the establishment of a third one to cope with the number of applicants.

It has been decided to add a fourth year to the Roseworthy Diploma of Agriculture, and those students who continue and do the fourth year will receive a Diploma of Agricultural Technology. This is a good idea for those who are going into the extension services. The re-arrangement of the academic year to coincide with the calendar year is also a good move, because the college has now double the number of students it used to have. It was felt in time past that lectures ought to be stopped for harvest for a couple of months. There is no earthly reason why a man should have to go back after Christmas in the heat of January to study and then sit for examinations for the diploma course. The re-arrangement of the academic year at Roseworthy is a very good move.

However, there is no gainsaying the fact that Roseworthy, from being what one might call a semi-tertiary institution, has now become tertiary in its application. The mere fact that only half as many men can get into Roseworthy as apply means that the standard of entry is extremely high and that a person really needs a five-year secondary course before he enters upon the three-year or four-year course of the college. Therefore, I believe that not only is it necessary for a second college to be established in the not too far distant future but that this college needs to be established upon the lines or the standards, possibly, that Roseworthy used to have. I understand that Gatton, in Queensland, which is an overcrowded college, has, as well as the three-year diploma course, a second course which is established

after the third year of secondary education, which is a two-year course for a certificate, and which is a more suitable course in many respects for the sons of farmers than perhaps is the actual course now at Roseworthy, which is fast becoming a course for extension officers.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Wouldn't Urrbrae fill the bill here?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Urrbrae may have some application. I believe there is a move to alter the course there, but so far Urrbrae is just like any other so-called agricultural high school, in that it is a high school that teaches agriculture but it certainly is not an agricultural high school. However, I believe there is a possibility that Urrbrae will be improved quite considerably in that respect. We are in the situation today where we are trying to educate more and more people—in the cities and on the land—and of course this means that more and more individuals (not more on a percentage basis but on total numbers) will not be able, through no fault of their own, to measure up to the academic requirements of a university or of a technical college, such as the college at Roseworthy is becoming. I believe there is room for a second college such as has been suggested, perhaps at Urrbrae or at Loxton or at Turretfield, which would give two years of agricultural education (including a continuation of one or two basic subjects in the secondary course) following a three-year secondary course which had been taken elsewhere.

Mr. President, I believe this course would be more easily attained by many capable young men from the land who may find the more academic course difficult. It would be a course to which many farmers would be more readily prepared to send their sons. We must realize that even today we have on the land a considerable number of farmers who have had a limited amount of secondary education or who may even have ceased their education at the primary level, and those farmers are not prepared to send their sons to a secondary school for five years and then to a college or a university for another three years. Therefore, many of the sons of these farmers at the moment are coming home with a useful secondary education (a very good secondary education in some cases) but with absolutely no agricultural education whatever. I believe we must give serious consideration to the introduction of a certificate course that would finish the education at somewhere around the Leaving level.

The capital costs of acquiring farms will deny many from becoming farmers except the sons of farmers who are likely to inherit farms, and after all is said and done who are better able to carry on the job of agricultural advancement in this State than the sons of farmers? I was pleased to note in the *Stock Journal* last week that the Minister of Agriculture agreed with this statement, because he said:

My idea of the land is that it is somewhere where a family can stay for generations, and for this to happen the land must be looked after and not abused unnecessarily.

Now to my mind this statement is accurate. I believe the Minister must have been talking to some members of the Liberal Party when he made this statement, because it is most unsocialistic, and I would be very interested to know what the Trades Hall had to say about a statement that suggests that land should be held by one family for generations. Nevertheless, whether the Labor Party agrees with it or not, that is the best way of developing land and improving the productivity of the State as a whole. I suggest that we must give further consideration to this matter of extra agricultural facilities in our education system.

I want to refer now to some other matters in His Excellency's Speech. I turn to the question of public health, which is dealt with in paragraph 13. I notice that the School for Dental Health Services has been commenced. If the Chief Secretary would listen to me, I am about to give him a pat on the back. I notice that the two-year course for the School Dental Health Services will have an annual intake of 16 girls. I support this move, for I believe it is a step in the right direction, and I am glad to see the co-operation with New Zealand and of New Zealand in this matter. I also note with some satisfaction the fact that the Sabin (oral) poliomyelitis vaccine is now to be used, commencing from yesterday. I am glad to see that this is now an actual fact. This vaccine will replace the previous Salk vaccine.

Passing on to paragraph 14, I am sorry that I cannot be quite so complimentary to the Chief Secretary in this regard, because I here have to take note of the comments made by the Hon. Mr. Springett in his excellent maiden speech last week. The honourable member said that the necessity for a teaching hospital at the Flinders University before the establishment of a hospital at Modbury was very urgent. His actual words were as follows:

The proposed hospital at Modbury will bring new and better facilities to that area, but a new hospital in the south-west region near the Flinders University would surely do just as much good to the local population and would be ready to receive students in training for medicine, thus supplying a means of potential replacement in the pool of manpower which is so badly needed.

A little later the honourable member said:

Therefore, it seems to me a pity if there is to be any pressure to have a hospital at Modbury before there is one at the Flinders University. To staff any hospital requires manpower.

These are words from the horse's mouth, so to speak.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They are not factual.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is the opinion of a medical man who is now a member of this Chamber, and strangely enough it happens to coincide with the opinion of quite a number of members of this Council over some considerable time.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: It coincides with the opinion of the medical profession.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, I understand that it coincides with the comments made by the Australian Medical Association.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The A.M.A.'s opinion coincides with the opinion of the Government, too.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That would be a change. I should be interested to see how the A.M.A. and the Government managed to agree. There would have been a hospital at Modbury or Tea Tree Gully in operation now if the Labor Government had not just cancelled the plans of the Playford Government to set up such a hospital.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: A 60-bed community hospital.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: There was an area of 10 acres.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not correct; that is not factual.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The information I have is that it was an area of 10 acres.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No; 60 beds was its maximum.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In any case, I had some discussions about the Lyell McEwin Hospital, the hospital that has the honour to bear your name, Mr. President, and I discussed with the Chief Secretary the fact that I felt it was unfortunate that the Lyell McEwin Hospital was all on one floor and people had to walk half a mile or so (which may be a good thing for some patients) to cover the area of that hospital. It ought to have been

built upwards. The Chief Secretary came in like the tide and said, "That is what we think". If that is so, why did they not allow the hospital for Tea Tree Gully to be built so that it could be enlarged by going upward and brought up to date later if necessary? There is only need in that area at present for a hospital of the size mooted at the time—of about 50 beds.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't go out to Modbury and tell them that!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Conversations are out of order.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The fact is that today there would have been a hospital of that size, and it could have been increased as required but at the moment what do they have in that area? They have a post with a sign on it, costing a few dollars, a few trenches dug by the Mines Department, and nothing else. The nearest hospital is the Lyell McEwin Hospital, about five miles away, which is only about half full, anyway.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not correct.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: We know that the Tea Tree Gully hospital was planned by the Playford Government and would have been in operation today if the Labor Government had not interfered. This hospital would have been adequate for the present.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That depends on the original size.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: There is still this large hospital at Elizabeth only about half full. I am sorry to see that we are in this position where, after a lot of talk about hospitals and two-and-a-half years of the Government's term of office, nothing has been done except possibly a little planning and the buying of a paddock.

Paragraph 16 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the road programme. Here, we see the bituminous road system was extended by about 200 miles. Recently, I was in Western Australia and saw many more thousands of miles of bitumen road than we have here. I do not say that they are as good as ours; the bitumen roads we are at present building are excellent, but I wonder whether some of our secondary bitumen roads need quite as much foundation as we are putting into them, because it is limiting the number of miles of road that we can build. While I fully agree that the main highways should be constructed as solidly as these are now being constructed, possibly some of our secondary roads can be

sealed as in Western Australia where they have lasted for many years with much traffic passing over them, although with the smaller road count they have on their secondary roads. Also, we are at present building our major bridges and so-called depots entirely out of road money. When the Playford Government was in office, we used some Loan money for this purpose and we were able to use as much money as possible on the roads. At the moment the country councils, while they are getting Commonwealth rural areas money, are being restricted as regards main roads money, some of which is going into these other projects that have been built partly by Loan money and partly by highway revenue in the past—and I believe they should still be built upon that pattern instead of being built by highways money.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Which bridges are you referring to?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The major bridges that are being built or are going to be built, and a so-called depot at Walkerville. Paragraph 17 deals with the railway standardization programme. I underline the need to continue this work with unabated vigor, and the need to continue to keep up with similar projects going on in Western Australia, where they are at present using a considerable portion of the new line on the journey between Perth and Kalgoorlie. There is a pressing need to complete the agreement with the Silverton Tramway Company. I am pleased that the Minister is aware of this and appreciates its necessity. I also endorse the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Potter when he said that it was also a pressing need to arrange for standardization from Port Pirie to Adelaide and, I add, to build a standard gauge line from the fast-growing city of Whyalla to Port Augusta.

We see from paragraph 18 that some progress has been made on the Kangaroo Creek dam and the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla, Tailem Bend to Keith, and Swan Reach to Warren trunk mains. I am sorry to know that, while apparently some progress has been made on some of these works, in some cases they have been slowed down. I understand (I hope I was not correctly informed but I fear I was) that the so-called progress on the Tailem Bend to Keith main has extended to the stage where instead of putting extra pipes down they have actually been taking up pipes which were placed there to be laid. I protest that these works have been allowed to slow down and that development in country areas will also be retarded, because there is a considerable area

in that part of the State between Bordertown and Pinnaroo which has to be developed and which will need at least some stock water if it is to be opened up.

I cannot see very much more of value in His Excellency's Speech. I turn now to land tax. I am sorry that the Hon. Mr. Bevan has left the Chamber, because I wanted to quote something that he said. On Wednesday last (I think it was) the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said with reference to land tax that our first action under this Government was to agree to the new rate until the new quinquennial assessment came forward. The Hon. Mr. Bevan interjected:

It was nothing of the sort! You tossed it out until the new assessments came out.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan then said that the Minister had not done his homework and was not familiar with the legislation passed in this Chamber. That is right, because we did what Mr. Gilfillan said we did. What concerns me is that, at the moment, some areas have been declared under the Underground Waters Preservation Act, and they had previously been assessed for land tax on the assumption that they were available for development with underground water. In the Angle Vale area, and in the Virginia and Mudla Wirra areas, some land is valued at up to \$600 an acre. Such land has been reduced in value to about \$200 an acre because not enough water is available or, if its use is possible, it is a doubtful proposition under permit. Some of this land was assessed at an unimproved value of about \$400 an acre, but that was on the assumption that there would be an unrestricted use of water. I ask the Minister whether he, or preferably Cabinet, will examine this matter to see what can be done. Much of the land has been assessed on the basis that it will be used in a concentrated manner. However, owners cannot now use it for irrigation and, even if they could, they could not do so to the same extent as they would wish. The land is now not worth anywhere near the value placed upon it when the assessment was made, and I repeat my request to the Minister and ask that consideration be given to this subject.

I do not wish to conclude my speech without referring to my good friend the Hon. Mr. Banfield. I was flattered when the honourable member mentioned me twice, although certainly on the first occasion it was in a somewhat anonymous way. During the course of his remarks the honourable member said:

I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Story and his colleague on their pre-selection.

As I pointed out, the first reference was almost an anonymous one. He went on to say:

I know that they will continue to occupy the Opposition benches.

I am sure that we will not continue to occupy the benches as Opposition members, although I hope that I will be able to sit in my present position in this Council with a Liberal Party Chief Secretary in front of me. I also look forward to seeing the faces of members of the Labor Party looking at me from the opposite side during the next Parliament. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said that he knew the Hon. Mr. Story and I would continue to occupy the Opposition benches. I thank him for conceding the election to us, but I thought that as a loyal member of the Trades Hall he would have given some chance of success to his colleagues who, strangely enough, have been chosen from Gawler and Two Wells. However, it was nice of him to say that Mr. Story and I would continue to occupy these benches. We certainly would not occupy them if we did not win the election.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If you do not occupy them you will not be here, will you?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The honourable member is muddled.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am certainly not muddled in what I am saying; it was the Hon. Mr. Banfield who was muddled in his thinking. He said in his speech, referring to the Industrial Code:

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.

I did not say any such thing, and the honourable member was wrong in making such a statement. I did say that farm labourers, generally speaking, were well treated and received quite a lot of extras on the side. I also said that farm labourers got a bonus at the end of the year, and I stand by that statement.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The honourable member said "if the season is good".

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Well, in my experience it has always been paid even if the season is not good. The honourable member may laugh at that statement, but I repeat that he was completely wrong in his comment in his speech. I did not make the statement alleged by him. I now refer to the statement of the present Premier that we are now about to enter a period of development unequalled in any other part of Australia. That was one of his airy views. It is through no fault of this Premier

or his Government that that is what the State experienced during the 20-year period 1945 to 1965. Development slowed up only with the advent of the Labor Government. During the 20 years I mentioned the population increased from about 600,000 to a little over 1,000,000. The State at that time had a high percentage of migrant intake; in fact, the highest percentage of all States. The State also had a buoyant economic position and a balanced Budget. Incidentally, the balanced Budgets were really balanced, not just Budgets balanced by figure manipulation as we had the other day. In addition, a situation existed in those 20 years when working people knew something about overtime, but they do not know what it means today. That is what happened, in the 20-year period I mentioned, in a situation sneeringly referred to recently as "a Premier and two typistes". If that is the case, I think the sooner we get back to the situation where a job is being done efficiently by "a Premier and two typistes" then the better it will be for South Australia. I look forward to a return to sane Liberal Government in this State next year.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I support the motion. I agree with honourable members who complimented His Excellency the Governor's Deputy on opening Parliament. With them, I appreciate the work that Sir Mellis Napier has done over the years, particularly when he has opened Parliament in the unavoidable absence of His Excellency the Governor. I also agree with the many references made to His Excellency the Governor and express regret that he has suffered from an indisposition that has lasted so long. Although it has been stated that His Excellency is recovering, it is unfortunate that this recovery has taken so long because, like the rest of the people of the State, we miss him when he is not available.

I join with other honourable members who have expressed sympathy to the families of former members at the loss suffered by them since the last occasion on which the Governor opened this Parliament. I refer first to Bob Richards, whom I knew and who was a colleague of my father. I held him in high esteem for the magnificent work that he did for Parliament and for his district. I also sympathize with the family of the late Mr. Rufus Goldney. I join with other members in saying how sorry I am that the late Dudley Octoman spent such a short time with us, because he endeared himself to all members, whether of

my Party or the other Party. We sincerely regret his passing. Also, I want to refer to the Hon. Les. Densley, whom I have known since I have been in this Parliament. I had indeed a high respect for him. I respected the way in which he carried out his duties as President of this Council, and his retirement has been well-earned. I also wish him good health, although we know that there were occasions during his term as President when he laboured under difficulties because of his indisposition. We hope that his health will improve and that he enjoys his retirement.

To you, Mr. President, who have stepped up to the office of President, I want to say that I wish you well in your honoured position. You have already indicated how well you are able to control this Council, and we look forward to serving under you. When you were the Leader of the Opposition we knew where we got off; I know that I have been on the receiving end of some comments from you, and I hope that you were on the receiving end of some from me during our exchanges across the Chamber. I hope that no hard feelings remain. I believe that I can give and take in the same way as other members can. I well remember those occasions when we used to cross swords across the Chamber.

I want to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Springett on winning a seat in this Council; I have not had the opportunity to do this publicly before. I want to compliment him on his maiden speech which he made the other day; I listened with interest to what he had to say. I was particularly interested to hear the Hon. Mr. Springett say that he was interested in industrial safety, workmen's compensation, and in Industrial Code matters; I look forward to his participating in debates when these matters are brought forward.

Turning to His Excellency's Speech, I should like to say a few things regarding the matters referred to therein. His Excellency commented on the Industrial Commission. From the time it was established on July 1, 1966, it has dealt with approximately double the number of claims which were made to the Industrial Court during the year 1965. This is an indication of the confidence of both employers and trade unions in the new system.

Whilst there was an increase in the number of claims made for Conciliation Committees or the Industrial Commission to consider, there were fewer industrial disputes in South Australia. The bulletin of the Commonwealth Statistician reveals that in 1964 there were 55 disputes, in 1965 there were 48, and in 1966

there were 42. Although those portions of the Industrial Code which relate to the industrial arbitration system were completely revised by Parliament in 1966, the sections of the code relating to physical working conditions have been amended only in a piece-meal fashion in recent years. In fact, that part of the code has not been completely reviewed since it was enacted in 1920.

The Lieutenant-Governor indicated in his Speech at the opening of Parliament that the Government would introduce, during the current session, a complete revision of the Industrial Code. This includes a review of the provisions relating to physical working conditions—for example, the safety, health and welfare of persons employed in factories, shops, offices and warehouses. In preparing this Bill to bring the Industrial Code up to date and in line with modern provisions, consideration is being given to similar legislation in other States of Australia and recommended standards of physical working conditions which have been devised generally over the last 20 years by the Commonwealth and State Departments of Labour.

I turn now to a matter of which we have heard much recently. In an effort to discredit the Government much has been made of the unemployment situation in this State by members of the L.C.L. On purely political grounds there was a full scale attempt to cause a situation of lack of confidence in the future of this State. It would appear that every effort was being made to knock the State for selfish reasons and create a situation where, through lack of confidence, there would be more people unemployed. The reason was that then the State Government would be blamed for the situation and this would bring about its defeat. I regret to say that in a mild way our new member also indulged in this exercise. When we look at the true position we find that the unemployment position today is not as bad as it was in 1961.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You would not expect it to be, would you?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We would not expect it to be, and I am saying that it is not as bad as it was then.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Australia has not a recession now.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is interesting to note that in 1961 the then State Government was blaming the Commonwealth Government for the situation. In fact, one member in another place, who is now a member of the L.C.L. Opposition, was extremely caustic about

a Commonwealth Government spokesman on the matter. It appears that when things are different they are not the same. When considering the employment position it is necessary to look not only at the numbers registered for employment but also at the number of registered vacancies for employment.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: You must remember the number in interstate employment, too.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Unless the two figures are taken together it is not possible to get a true perspective of the situation. The figures for 1961 and 1966 are as follows: the monthly average of males registered for employment for 1961 was 5,335, and for 1966 it was 4,210; for females, for 1961 the figure was 3,096 and for 1966 it was 2,816. The monthly average number of vacancies registered for the respective years were as follows: in 1961 the figure was 1,000 for males and 323 for females; and in 1966 it was 1,963 for males and 535 for females.

From an examination of these figures it will be seen that there are less people unemployed now than in 1961 and, even more significantly, there are nearly twice as many job vacancies available now than in 1961. Surely this is an indication that the economy has turned the corner and it gives me at least confidence for the future, despite calamity-howlers who for their own advantage are prepared to knock this State. When we look at the Victorian and New South Wales figures for last month and compare them with those of this State, it is evident that this State is making a swifter recovery than these two States.

For the benefit of honourable members I shall quote the figures recently issued for South Australia and the other two States. Here again, I ask honourable members to take note of the employment vacancies also. In South Australia there was an increase of people registered for employment for the month of 154; in Victoria the increase was 2,607, and in New South Wales 386. The number of vacancies in South Australia dropped by 103, in Victoria by 2,792 and in New South Wales by 917. In South Australia one of the areas most hit by unemployment was meat processing. Here is where employment has been hit by seasonal conditions, as all members know.

In addition, the late opening for the season has affected directly seasonal occupations, and indirectly other industries where, through uncertainty of seasonal prospects, many people have delayed ordering a variety of things from household goods to farm implements and motor vehicles. Had the season opened on time I am

confident that this State would have been one of those which showed a drop in unemployment rather than the slight increase which we suffered. It is interesting to note that last year when we also had a late opening to the season the increase in unemployment in this State for the same month was 700, about five times as great as the increase for this year.

The industry in which there has been a downturn during 1966 is the building industry. The Government has been aware of this, and no effort is being spared in an attempt to bring about an upturn in the industry. It is pleasing to note from the latest bulletin of the Deputy Commonwealth Statistician regarding building approvals in this State that in the first five months of 1967 the total value of new buildings approved rose from \$6,200,000 for January to \$13,500,000 for May. For the period January to May, 1967, the total value of new buildings approved was \$45,100,000, compared with \$40,500,000 for the corresponding period in 1966. The largest increases in value of buildings approved between these two periods occurred in shops, offices, factories and other business premises.

Another matter referred to in the Governor's Deputy's Speech was industrial safety. In the year 1965-66, the number of industrial accidents involving lost time of a week or more declined for the first time since 1961, when these statistics were first collected. The number of such accidents declined by 11 per cent from the previous year (from 11,809 to 10,522).

The Hon. C. R. Story: What was the main cause of it?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Government has gone out of its way to promote safety in industry. Also, the Department of Labour and Industry has been particularly active in this work. It was started by the L.C.L. Government, but the present Government has built the department up. The Government has trained people in other departments in regard to safety aspects, and lectures have been given in factories. Schools have been held in the department, and industry has been encouraged to improve safety factors. Despite what the Hon. Mr. Potter has said in regard to this and the fact that compensation amounts may have risen, I have been asked on a number of occasions in the last year to attend at factories which carried out many hours of accident-free operations. This is encouraging to me and must be encouraging to the Government and to industry alike—that people can go to work in a reasonably safe atmosphere.

This is something the Government must continue to do. It is spending money by engaging inspectors and safety officers to train others in all aspects of safety. Recently, three full-time officers were engaged by the Railways Department to do work solely concerned with safety. This work had previously been carried out by other officers. Despite this encouraging trend, the matter of industrial accidents requires continued attention, as the total number of effective workmen's compensation claims (covering all industrial accidents) has shown a steadily upward movement; and the Government is continuing the industrial safety campaign aimed at educating management, supervisors and workmen to provide safe working conditions and to observe safe methods of working at all times in all sections of industry.

Among the Bills which it is proposed to introduce is one for a Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act to replace the Steam Boilers and Enginedrivers Act, which has been amended in only one minor respect since 1935 and is now out of date in many of its provisions. The present Act applies only to steam boilers or vessels in which water or air is stored under pressure. There are now many liquids and gases stored at high pressures, and it is necessary to have legislative measures which will provide that proper steps are taken to ensure the safety of the containers in which any liquid or gas is stored at high pressure.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Will this Bill contain provisions for the storage of containers as well as the condition of the containers?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It may not be in the Bill but it will be provided for in the regulations at least. I appreciate the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins in regard to rail standardization, and I think he will be interested in what I have to say now. I am pleased to report that rail standardization between Port Pirie and Cockburn is proceeding on schedule and in accordance with financial estimates. The main problem, of course, is the section of line between Cockburn and Broken Hill. This Government has for a long time stressed the need for the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments and this Government to jointly confer as to the method of standardization for this section. I am pleased to say that a joint conference was held last March. As a result of these discussions I am certain that, in the very near future, it will be clear how this line will be standardized or constructed, and work will then proceed as

swiftly as possible. I have heard some fears expressed that there may be this section between Broken Hill and Cockburn as a break of gauge in a transcontinental line. Whatever fears still exist, there is no doubt that there will be complete standardization.

The Government is also most concerned that work to standardize other lines in South Australia follows as quickly as possible after or towards the completion of the present project. Considerable information has been submitted to the Commonwealth Government on standardization between Port Pirie and Adelaide. A decision by the Commonwealth Government is still awaited, but the Government will energetically press for this work to be done. During this year construction of a further eight 300 Class and twelve 400 Class suburban railcars will continue, 16 of which will be completed this financial year. These cars are capable of carrying suburban commuter traffic at speeds enabling passengers to reach their destination quickly, and during peak periods in much less time and with less strain than can be achieved by the use of private motor cars. The accommodation offered in these cars equals the best standard for suburban travel available in any other part of Australia.

When these cars come into service, beginning in about 12 months' time, it is hoped that the travelling public living in reasonable distance of suburban lines will use the facilities to the full. In addition, parking space is now available at most suburban stations. This is being expanded where possible. The suburban commuter has much to gain in using this space and it will also help to relieve road congestion at peak periods—a problem in all major cities. A further two twinette sleeping cars for the Overland will also be in service in that time.

People at Mount Gambier from this week have the Bluebird passenger train arriving at Mount Gambier at 4.40 p.m. and on the return journey arriving in Adelaide just before 5 p.m. This has been requested by Mount Gambier residents for a long time, and I am pleased to say that circumstances have made the change possible. In addition, since February the South-East has been served by four additional fast overnight rail freight services.

There has been considerable concern in the State arising out of publicity to the rail freight rate for the carriage of ore concentrates between Cockburn and Broken Hill. I am pleased to advise that frank discussions have been held between the mining companies and the Government and that complete agreement is imminent.

During the financial year 1966-1967 a record tonnage of 850,000 tons of these concentrates was carried between Cockburn and Port Pirie. The previous best before that was 830,000 tons in 1963-64.

We are all concerned at the occurrence of level crossing accidents. Let me emphasize that the Railways Commissioner, the Government and all connected with road safety are most concerned. The question of improved protection is continually being investigated, but the answers are not as simple as they may seem to some people. The lines of the South Australian railway system are intersected by about 1,700 open level crossings. All are provided with warning signs, and a large proportion are provided with warning signs in conformity with the current Australian standard. Older pattern signs are being replaced progressively at a rate consistent with demands upon departmental resources, having regard to priorities determined by hazard and use of related roads.

Automatic warning devices are installed at 242 level crossings. Where appropriate, such devices are actuated by train movements. The provision of such equipment is being extended progressively on a basis of priorities determined from time to time by an inter-departmental committee comprising officers of the Railways and Highways Departments. The systems at present employed for protection of level crossings by audible and visual warnings conform with Australian standards and are as simple as is consistent with the high degree of reliability expected of such systems. All diesel locomotives are provided with two lights on each side which mark the positions of steps and, in addition, illuminated number designations that are also visible from the sides. Such lights are turned on when the locomotives operate at night.

Consideration has been given by this and other systems to the provision of reflective markings on the sides of vehicles. Trials have disclosed that such markings give rise to false signals in shunting yards. This constitutes a hazard, and the Australian systems oppose the suggestion accordingly. It should be appreciated that rolling stock of four systems, that is, the Commonwealth, South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, now move freely throughout all four systems in consequence of bogies exchange. With a view to providing the optimum condition of visibility of rail vehicles, consistent with safety in shunting, South Australian vehicles are painted in a light shade of grey and repainted at intervals.

It is pertinent to add that there are on record instances of collisions between road vehicles and passenger trains at night, notwithstanding the indication given by lighted windows.

Dealing further with reflective markings on the sides of vehicles, the question of fitting reflectorized material to goods wagons has arisen on many occasions in recent years. However, it is not a workable proposition. A difficulty is that it would not be possible to locate the reflectors, strips or the like, on all types of wagons where it would always be visible or not covered by tarpaulins or be protected from dust or damage. In addition, there could be a degree of unsafe railway operation resulting from conflict of the illumination from reflectors, etc., with signal lights, especially on curved double tracks and in shunting yards. In the United States of America, reflective paint is used to a minor extent on rolling stock, and then only as a means of advertising the private railway system during the day and when suitably illuminated at night.

A 25-year plan has recently been adopted in Canada to fit reflectorized material to box cars only. It is interesting to note that at this early stage of the plan the results are unsatisfactory. The reflective material is stuck to the vehicles but it falls off in time. Experiments are being conducted with painting about 4in. diameter areas with reflective paint but, under railway operating conditions of having to contend continuously with weather, dirt, dust, rain, etc., their effectiveness is doubtful. In Japan and the United States reflective material is, for all practical purposes, not being fitted to railway vehicles.

An important aspect is the position in which the railway systems could be placed in the event of a road vehicle colliding with a train only partially equipped with reflectorized material or where the material has become ineffective through dirt, etc. If it were decided to fit reflectorized material to all rail wagons, the process would, of necessity, be gradual. The appropriate time to carry out the work would be when the vehicles were in the workshops for repainting. On this basis, it could be some time before all vehicles were so fitted. In the meantime, trains would be running with only some vehicles fitted with reflectorized material. If a road user collided with a part of a train where there were no reflectorized vehicles, there is a distinct possibility that the Railways Commissioner could be held liable to have been negligent.

All locomotives are equipped with headlights which are turned on both by day and by night. It is contended that the provision of revolving flashing lights on locomotives would give rise to confusion with road vehicles specially equipped with such lights under the authority of the Road Traffic Act. Considerable effort has been expended with the aim of devising a type of wing fence which may reduce the damage to road vehicles caused by secondary collisions, and at the same time comply with the provisions of the Railways Commissioner's Act.

Long-term searches of recorded information relating to other railway systems has disclosed no evidence that a satisfactory solution of this problem has been found. It is pertinent to add that if wing fences were abandoned altogether, the secondary effects arising from collision with cattle pits and grids, drains, signals, poles and other structures within the railway right-of-way may be no less severe than those recorded in the present circumstances. Investigations are, nevertheless, being pursued as urgently as possible.

Since October last year, pensioners have been able to commence travel on public transport at 9 a.m. instead of 9.30 a.m. The Government is fully mindful of the need to assist pensioners, but at present any extension of the current times is not possible. Since April 27 open hailing of taxis has applied in the metropolitan area. The position has been closely watched since then, and open hailing is undoubtedly a success. Whereas previously there were complaints from the public to the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board regarding difficulties in obtaining a cab, not one complaint has been received since open hailing was introduced.

The Government proposes to introduce a Bill this year to regulate the hours of driving of commercial motor vehicles. It is a safety measure that operates in New South Wales and Victoria, and I am sure it will be welcomed by responsible road transport operators in South Australia. I hope that honourable members here will in due course give it their full support.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Has the Royal Commission on State Transport Services been asked to make comments on this?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am not aware what questions have been directed to the Royal Commission throughout its hearings. I have been unable to keep up with all the transcript, which is fairly voluminous. I have not been able to read all the questions, so I cannot answer that question.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Do you know whether provision is being made for two drivers to be able to carry on?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: There are provisions of this kind in the Bills of other States, which have been studied. I was asked today whether the Bill would be similar to those in other States. When we say "similar" we do not mean that it will be absolutely word for word the same as in other States. There may be some differences between this State and the other States.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: We do not want this applying to private truck owners who do not carry for fee or reward, which is what they have in Victoria. There was a fair amount of comment about that.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have not studied that aspect of the Victorian Act. I was interested in the speech of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris the other day in this Chamber on this motion. He spent a little time praising the Hon. Frank Walsh, the former Premier. Incidentally, this must be praise indeed, for the honourable member has not been over-generous in his praise of the same gentleman in the past few years. He has never been outspoken in this respect about him. Apparently, the only time when Labor Premiers or Prime Ministers are praised by Liberal and Country League members is when they retire or die.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The only time I ever heard Tom Playford praised by members opposite was when he retired from being Premier.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris then spent a long time in an endeavour to discredit the present Premier and at the same time give praise to Sir Thomas Playford.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: I thought he did very well.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: For the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan's information, the late Ben Chifley came from union ranks and was referred to after his death by all sections of the community as one of the best Commonwealth Treasurers, if not the best Commonwealth Treasurer, this country had seen. Apparently, it is not necessary to have been a recruit from big business to become a good Treasurer. For my part, I give credit where it is due and I join with other members in honouring Frank Walsh for his great service to this State during a long term in the Parliament of this State. This he capped by leading the Labor team

to victory on two occasions in the past five years, because on each occasion he had a majority in another place.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Is "majority" the correct word?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: A Labor majority was returned in another place, although two members were said to be Independent.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They were elected as Independents.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: However, it was not until 1965 he was able to claim the fruits of those victories.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You cannot govern unless you have the votes on the floor of the House.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: But the previous Premier did not have the votes on the floor of the House in the first instance.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: He got through.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: During the past two-and-a-quarter years Mr. Walsh led the Government during a period when much was done for the benefit of the people of this State. In Cabinet he led a team on which every man has pulled his weight to the best of his ability and with the result I have referred to. I also give credit to Sir Thomas Playford, who has stepped down and will retire, too, at the end of this present term of Parliament. He, too, has given great service to the State during a long term in Parliament both as Premier and as a private member.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Are you saying this because he is retiring?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The State advanced during his term of office. It would have been unusual if it had not, for it was a long, long time, as we who were in Opposition know. I give credit to him for the way he steered that development. I also give credit to the new Premier, Don Dunstan. He has indicated during the short time since he assumed office that he has the youthful vigour and determination necessary to revitalize the economy of this State.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris took umbrage at some things said about the actions of the previous L.C.L. Government led by Sir Thomas Playford. When the actions of that Government are criticized, we are always told we are trying to destroy the image of Tom Playford. For a good few years now the approach to a State election in this State by the two major Parties has been as follows: The Labor Party asked electors to vote for the Labor

Party. The L.C.L. always asked the electors to vote for the Playford Government. Tom Playford was built up as the vote-catching symbol of the L.C.L. When the L.C.L. Government did anything thought to be vote-catching, it was always publicized as having been done by Tom Playford. And it worked, what is more! I have encountered people in previous years, when campaigning, who have told me that they were not particularly in love with the L.C.L., but while Tom was there they would vote for him. And then, despite the gerrymander, the population influx began to catch up with the L.C.L. It dawned on the Party organizers that the people wanted a Labor Premier; so then they said that Tom Playford was the best Labor Premier the State had ever had. High praise indeed. But it did not work this time, as we now know.

I am afraid that, in common with many of his colleagues, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has been indoctrinated by his Party's medicine designed for the electors. Is it any wonder we do the same and blame Tom Playford for what was done by his Government?

The Hon. C. R. Story: This is not a home consumption model; this is for export!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is right. I, too, have had some experience in campaigning, don't you worry! Sir Thomas Playford was the leader of his Party for many years. During that time many things occurred, both good and bad, for which his Party was responsible. I give Sir Thomas great credit for being a very capable and efficient leader of his Party during its occupation of the Treasury benches. He led his Party well and already, as evidenced by the speakers from the other side, they are losing their confidence because they will no longer have him. Two years ago I was told by one honourable member opposite that the Labor Government would be out before 28 weeks had passed. Here we are at the 28-month mark, and we are still here. Truly a prophet has no honour in his own land!

Another point being made at the moment is in regard to the announcement made that the Government would balance its Budget. During last year and during the early part of this session, we of the Labor Party became accustomed to hearing spokesmen from the Opposition, both in this Council and in another place, holding forth about this State's being bankrupt as a result of the Government's action in not being able to balance its Budget. They were aided and abetted in their attacks on the Government for this failure by their henchmen

in the newspaper and business world. They metaphorically raised their hands and eyes in horror and said, "What a major catastrophe this was for the State." In fact, I was told on the quiet by a supposedly well-informed acquaintance that some thought had been given to the question whether or not the Government should be forced to face the people on this issue: could the Government balance its Budget or not?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did you balance the Budget last financial year?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have explained this. In fact, I think I can remember an honourable member daring the Government to face the people on this issue. Now, because of the announcement I referred to, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris says in effect that nothing is achieved by balancing the Budget—every Government does it every year in some way or another.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan was cross because, owing to unexpected underspending in some directions on the planned Loan programme, some funds were transferred, and thus the Budget was balanced. I cannot decide whether he was cross because the Budget was balanced or because the funds were transferred. The commitments we were left as a legacy from the L.C.L. Government are all being met. However, the need to meet these commitments has resulted in stretching the Loan allotment to the full in an endeavour to complete them all. This has resulted in delaying commencement on some other projects which it was anticipated would have been started before this.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan deplored the fact that the Labor Government had not among its number some men with business and administrative ability. He listed this as one of the great handicaps that the Labor Party must overcome if it is to handle the administration and finances of this State. I had thought better of my friend than this. I knew that there were members of his Party who believed that only big businessmen and their representatives were fit to govern the State, but I did not think I would hear it expressed here. Is this an admission that the L.C.L. represents big business?

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: The State Government is fairly big business.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: For the information of the honourable member, although the four Government members in this Council may all have a trade union background, we have all had to make our own way, as the

honourable member said about his newly appointed Leader in another place.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: I don't want to sound difficult, but this does not sound terribly like the Hon. Mr. Kneebone.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is I, all right. We were not trade union officials all our lives; I, for one, had my own business for a number of years and I know of at least one other Minister who had been in business for himself. In another place the members of the Government followed a greater variety of occupations and professions than the members of the Opposition followed. I would say that each one of them would have had to "make his own way". I do not know of one who was born with a silver spoon in his mouth.

In making their own way they probably learnt more about the economy and economics than could ever have been learnt in a business college or from a course of business management or, for that matter, around a board of directors' table. They have learnt in the school of hard knocks.

Earlier, I referred to the fact that during the past two years the number of industrial disputes in this State had decreased. This speaks well for the responsible attitude of our trade union leaders. My colleagues in this Council and I are proud of our trade union background and of our contribution during those years to the responsible attitude of the people we represented. By this responsible attitude, more than anything else, the situation was created for industry to come to this State. I am sure that this responsibility will continue.

As at all times when there is some unemployment we hear business leaders coming forward with announcements like that made by Hon. Mr. Potter, that we must have a low-wage, low-condition structure in this State if we are to compete with the Eastern States. The L.C.L. Government supported this line and in 1960-61 went to the Commonwealth court to assist the employers in this endeavour. I do not know how they could support such an attitude and still say they supported a full employment situation. Under anywhere near a full employment situation they would have had difficulty in finding enough manpower to keep industry going. As one with industrial experience, I know that even today real wages and conditions in this State do not measure up to those in some Eastern States. In the area of over-award payments the Eastern States have always been in advance of this State. It is not long since there were missions overseas to get manpower for this State. What happened when

we got those migrants? We lost them to other States in many instances, because they found that real wages were higher there.

We have heard references to a smear campaign being conducted by the Premier, and I hope that we do not continue to hear them. I am surprised that such remarks have been made here, because it is a serious matter. A very scurrilous smear campaign was carried on against the Premier in his own district, and this campaign affected not only the Premier but also his family.

I was told by people who were approached in the Premier's district that those conducting the campaign said that they represented the L.C.L. This scurrilous campaign had to be refuted in television broadcasts by the Premier. Any comments I make here are not for the purposes of smearing, and I hope that no member will undertake smear campaigns. Let us forget this term "smear campaign". I had great sympathy for the Premier during the smear campaign he had to face; it caused me much concern. Let us hope we hear no more of it.

We have heard it said here and by representatives of big business that wages and conditions here should be less than in other States. This is the sort of thing that is always put up when there is some unemployment. I do not know how this argument can be substantiated, and I do not know how members opposite can still come along here and give lip service and token support to a situation of full employment. Because of a lack of manpower, there would be difficulty in keeping industry going in a situation where there was anywhere near full employment.

The Hon. Mr. Potter spoke about the living wage. Anybody who had been mixed up in industrial matters over the years, as I was, would know that there was a lack of people available for certain occupations because, when people were allocated to a job, they said, "We can get more than that in the other States". They went to Victoria because not only was the basic wage lower here but also over-award payments were lower here. The real wage that was taken home by people in the Eastern States was much higher than that which was mentioned here in regard to the Eastern States.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Did they have more spending power in the Eastern States?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am concerned about the living wage. The point is that we were told this afternoon that the wage

here must be less, and we even had the situation (heaven forbid that I should hear such a statement here again) that we enjoyed a wage here lower than that of the Eastern States. I asked the honourable member who enjoyed it, and he said that the industrialists did.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Everyone who was working enjoyed it, because we had full employment then.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: When the Playford Government was in office it advocated this approach: wages here must be lower than those of the Eastern States. The Government sent people on oversea missions to attract people here to fill vacancies in the work force. What happened when they got here? They got out as quickly as they could, because of the higher wages and better conditions in the Eastern States. This State became known as a low-wage State. When people were asked to migrate to Australia and were told that South Australia was the low-wage State, they went to the other States.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They used to come here, but now they do not.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: They did not come here because of the conditions.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: This State had the biggest percentage of migrants in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member says these people are not now interested in South Australia. They were not interested before. People were brought out to work in the Government Printing Office some years ago. Their furniture was brought out on condition that they stay with the Government for two years, but I ask him to go to the Government Printing Office and find out how many are working there today. They have gone to other States, where they can obtain higher wages. I can speak with authority on the printing industry. The over-award payments in the other States are much higher than in South Australia. Members opposite say they are happy that the basic wage in South Australia is low, but over-award payments and margins are the important consideration. It is the take-home pay that counts with most people. It is not a matter of saying that, because wages have been increased, this situation will cause South Australia to be priced out of its markets.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you believe in over-award payments?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, of course I do.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The award rate is only a minimum rate.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The court fixes the minimum rate, and some employers look upon the minimum rate as the maximum rate. The minimum rate is required to be paid to a man no matter what experience he has had. Justice Higgins and others have expressed the view that the rates they have fixed have been minimum rates, and for any degree of skill, loyalty or service, the employer is at liberty to pay higher rates. The employers in other States recognize that.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Don't you think employers in other States have had to increase over-award payments to get employees?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: They have not had to do so; they have been able to pick them up in South Australia because of its lower wages.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: On June 15, the Hon. Mr. Dunstan said that one of the main advantages of price control was that wages could be lower in South Australia than in any other State.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Premier has been misreported on more than one occasion. I have never heard him say that. The Hon. Mr. Potter mentioned the differences between South Australia and the other States

that had to be taken into consideration when competing for markets in other States. He listed them as (1) transport; (2) taxation; and (3) basic costs. Point (3) boils down to power, wages, and ancillary conditions under which people work. Mr. Potter admitted that the power situation in South Australia could be better than that in Victoria and that, with the advent of natural gas, our power would be cheaper than that in Victoria. In his estimates, Mr. Potter should have put the third point first, because it all boils down to the point that he thinks wages must be reduced and working conditions must be worse here if we are to secure markets from the other States. Mr. Potter said that the people in this State enjoyed a lower wage.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Do you think over-award payments should be reduced?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I believe a person should be paid the value of the work he does—from the minimum rate fixed by the court to the higher rate, whatever it may be, according to his value to his employer. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.17 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 11, at 2.15 p.m.